

Suicidal Crisis

When No Future Feels Reachable

Tomer Avraham, PhD

Creator of FlowHijacked.com

English edition · 22 chapters in seven parts · Evidence reviewed through 23 September 2026

What changes when someone can describe another future, yet cannot experience a workable path toward it? This lecture follows that question through pain, memory, relationships, time, and the conditions that make care possible.

The title names one possible experience of crisis. It does not describe every person, establish a diagnosis, or imply an inevitable sequence. Some people continue to imagine the future vividly while struggling to experience a safe or bearable way of reaching it. Others encounter different patterns. Understanding begins by making room for those differences.

The argument brings scientific findings into conversation with human experience. It distinguishes thoughts from actions, explanations from predictions, and promising treatments from universal guarantees. The proposed Flow Hijacked framework appears after the evidence and its complications, where it can be examined as a hypothesis rather than mistaken for a settled mechanism.

A note before reading

This lecture discusses suicidal distress and recovery. You can pause, skip a section, or return later. It offers scientific education, not an individual assessment or emergency care. If you or someone else is in immediate danger, contact emergency services now: in Israel, [Magen David Adom, 101](#); elsewhere, your local emergency number. For emotional support in Israel, [ERAN's telephone line, 1201](#), operates 24/7. Its website lists online support options and their hours.

The lecture draws on a critical integrative review of 71 selected publications. This was a focused, documented synthesis, not a fully systematic review or a new meta-analysis. Relevant full-text sections were examined for selected key sources; others were assessed through abstracts. Citations identify support for particular claims and do not make all sources equally strong. The full bibliography and methodological boundaries are retained in both language editions.

Flow Hijacked is a free, nonprofit educational project. The English and Hebrew editions contain the same substantive argument, examples, qualifications and source numbering. Their phrasing is written for each language.

Contents

Part 1 · Entering the Crisis Without Reducing the Person to It

1. When Tomorrow Exists but No Longer Feels Reachable

2

2. Thoughts, Distress, Intent, and Action	3
3. Different Maps of the Same Pain	5
Part 2 · What It Takes to Have a Future	
4. Remembering in Order to Imagine	6
5. A Future We Can Imagine and a Future We Can Reach	7
6. When Even a Better Tomorrow Becomes a Burden	9
Part 3 · How the Paths Begin to Narrow	
7. When There Seems to Be No Way Out	10
8. When Every Step Costs Too Much	11
9. When Connection Exists but Help Remains Out of Reach	12
Part 4 · Time Within the Crisis	
10. When the Present Fills the Horizon	13
11. From Hour to Hour	15
12. What We Can Predict and What We Cannot Yet Conclude	16
Part 5 · The Conditions Surrounding the Person	
13. Beyond a Single Diagnosis	17
14. When the World Really Does Close Off Possibilities	18
15. When Continuity Breaks	19
Part 6 · Expanding What Is Possible Again	
16. What Actually Helps	21
17. Turning Help into a Step Someone Can Take	22
18. Working with Pain, Flexibility, and Problem Solving	23
19. A Future We Can Begin Moving Toward	25
Part 7 · The Flow Hijacked Synthesis and How to Test It	
20. Future Accessibility Through the Flow Hijacked Lens	26
21. How Would We Know Whether the Framework Holds?	27
22. Restoring Possibility Without Promising Certainty	29

PART 1

Entering the Crisis Without Reducing the Person to It

CHAPTER 1

When Tomorrow Exists but No Longer Feels Reachable

Imagine an ordinary conversation, offered here as an illustration. Someone can name an appointment next week, a person who might listen, a task that could wait. The possibilities are intelligible. Yet when asked what they could actually do next, no workable movement follows. An observer sees several open doors. The person may experience the distance to each door as something the observer has not understood. This gap is where our inquiry begins.

The title of this lecture describes a question, not a definition of every suicidal crisis. Accounts gathered with people who have attempted suicide include changes in experienced time, agency, relationships and the sense of being oneself. They also contain differences, ambivalence and recovery that cannot be reduced to one sequence. Such accounts help us ask better questions; they do not establish how common one experience is or prove a mechanism shared by everyone. [71]

Research gives the inquiry firmer ground without completing it. Psychological pain is associated with suicidal thoughts and attempts, while feelings of defeat and entrapment are associated with several forms of psychological distress, including suicidality. These findings make pain and the experience of having no way out important to understanding the crisis. They also prevent a convenient shortcut: neither painful experience nor entrapment is a unique signature of an impending suicidal act. [7, 9]

Flow Hijacked proposes the phrase future accessibility for a distinction worth investigating. Imagining a future, wanting it, believing it possible and finding a workable first step are different questions. A person might answer them differently. The proposal is that their relationship can change with the person's present condition and surroundings. This is an integrative research question, not a validated scale, a diagnosis or evidence that an invisible future has literally disappeared.

Something similar applies to help. Knowing that a service exists differs from expecting a bearable encounter, managing to contact it and receiving a useful response. Research on seeking professional help describes varied barriers, while accounts of care give considerable weight to how people are received and heard. Neither literature justifies assuming that reluctance is simply irrational or that the presence of a loving relative makes further support unnecessary. [63, 70]

We must also leave room for doors that really are closed. In our imagined example, the appointment might require transport the person cannot obtain, or support might be available only during working hours. Calling these difficulties a narrowed perspective would misdescribe the problem. A careful account asks what the person experiences and what their circumstances permit. Compassion becomes more precise when it allows both answers to matter, rather than locating every obstacle inside a mind.

The chapters ahead follow the distance between a possibility and a life in which someone can begin to use it. They examine memory, pain, relationships, changing states and the evidence for care, before returning to the proposed framework and its tests. We will distinguish what has been observed from what is being suggested. The aim is a more exact kind of attention: to the person, to the conditions around them and to what might make a safe next step actually available.

CHAPTER 2

Thoughts, Distress, Intent, and Action

Before explaining a crisis, we need words that do not silently merge different experiences. Distress describes suffering; it does not by itself specify suicidal thinking. Suicidal ideation includes thoughts of ending one's life or wishing one were dead. A wish

not to be alive and thoughts about taking action deserve careful differentiation rather than treatment as interchangeable statements. The distinctions matter because research becomes misleading when one outcome is measured and another is implied. [1, 6]

Intent concerns whether and to what extent a person intends to act. An attempt is a behavior involving at least some intent to die and a nonfatal outcome; a death by suicide is a different outcome again. Self-harm is often used more broadly in research and services, sometimes without separating intent. A study of that broad category cannot automatically answer a question about attempts, and a reduction in thoughts cannot establish a reduction in deaths. [1, 33]

These terms do not describe stations through which everyone passes in order. They allow us to ask different questions without assuming the answers. How did the thoughts emerge? What changed around an action? What was the person's experience of wanting to live? Accounts from people with lived experience describe conflicting wishes and changing meanings, which a single declaration may not capture. Neither a wish for relief nor a wish to die can be assigned as everyone's underlying truth. [71]

The distinction between thinking and acting is also an empirical problem. A meta-analysis comparing people with thoughts alone with people who had attempted suicide found that familiar variables did not separate these groups nearly as strongly as they separated people with thoughts from people without them. This does not make depression, pain or history irrelevant. It means that explaining why someone suffers or thinks about suicide is not yet a complete explanation of an attempt. [6]

A crisis adds a question about present configuration: what is happening together, and over what period? The proposed Suicide Crisis Syndrome attempts to describe an acute state involving entrapment, affective disturbance, reduced cognitive control, heightened arousal and withdrawal. A prospective study in hospitalized adults found that its proposed criteria added information about subsequent attempts. That is promising evidence in a selected population, not proof that every crisis shares the syndrome or that it supplies a universal diagnostic boundary. [10, 14]

Measurement has consequences beyond terminology. If researchers combine thoughts, interrupted behavior, injury and death into one score, a reported improvement may concern only some components. The question then becomes which components changed, for whom and compared with what. Likewise, a model that distinguishes groups in the data used to build it still needs testing in independent people. Recent appraisal finds some externally validated prediction models alongside widespread methodological limitations; neither certainty nor blanket impossibility is warranted. [33]

Precision should make care more attentive, never turn conversation into a test someone must pass. A person need not deliver an orderly explanation before their distress deserves a response. The distinctions here are tools for understanding evidence and preventing false equivalence, not instructions for judging another person's safety from their wording. Throughout the lecture, we will name the outcome under discussion and keep open the difference between understanding a person's experience, estimating an uncertain future and deciding how human support should meet the present.

CHAPTER 3

Different Maps of the Same Pain

A useful theory changes the questions we ask. It directs attention toward relationships that a list of symptoms might leave unexplained. But a map also leaves things out, and confidence in its appearance can exceed confidence in its evidence. Three influential approaches share the effort to distinguish the emergence of suicidal thoughts from the transition to action. They disagree about which relationships do the explanatory work. Those differences are opportunities to test understanding, not inconveniences to smooth away. [1, 2, 3]

The interpersonal theory asks what happens when a person feels disconnected and experiences themselves as a burden, while seeing these conditions as unchangeable. It distinguishes suicidal desire from the capability to act on it. Crucially, perceived burdensomeness describes a person's experience, not an objective verdict on their value or their effect on others. The theory offers a proposed conjunction of conditions; its original formulation also allows that other pathways may exist. [1]

The integrated motivational-volitional model brings defeat and entrapment into the foreground. Defeat concerns the experience of being beaten or unable to overcome a situation; entrapment adds the felt absence of an escape. The model proposes a pathway toward suicidal thinking while distinguishing factors involved in enactment. Its contribution is to ask why distress becomes experienced as inescapable, and why a thought becomes a behavior in some circumstances. The proposed sequence still requires empirical testing. [2]

The three-step theory organizes the question around pain, hopelessness, connection and capability. In this account, pain together with hopelessness contributes to thoughts; connection to people, roles or valued activities can limit their escalation; capability matters for action. The initial study supported several predictions, but it used an online adult sample and measurements taken at one time. A fitted pattern among responses cannot establish the order in which experiences developed within a person. [3]

Subsequent evidence makes the maps less tidy and more useful. A large synthesis of the interpersonal theory found small interaction effects and results that depended on how attempts were measured. An independent prospective inpatient study did not confirm the central three-way interaction, although perceived burdensomeness remained associated with later attempts. Substantial loss to follow-up and the long observation period qualify that challenge. Evidence should restrain both enthusiasm for the theory and claims that it has been decisively disproved. [4, 11]

The other approaches also require discrimination. A systematic review found support for the defeat-entrapment pathway, but mixed findings in prospective and multivariable tests. A later test of the three-step theory found that connection was associated with less suicidal desire more broadly than its specific prediction suggested. Reviews focused on adolescents found incomplete tests and mixed support, reminding us that a model developed in adults cannot simply be carried across developmental stages. [5, 12, 13]

These disagreements establish the standard for the framework proposed later in this lecture. Future accessibility cannot earn credibility by translating each existing construct into a new name. It must clarify something the older maps miss, and survive comparison with them. For now, their shared value is a disciplined set of questions about pain, belonging, entrapment, possibility and action. Keeping the questions distinct leaves more room for a person's account than deciding beforehand that one theory must contain the whole explanation.

PART 2

What It Takes to Have a Future

CHAPTER 4

Remembering in Order to Imagine

To understand what it takes to imagine a different life, begin with something smaller: remembering a particular afternoon. In a hypothetical example, someone recalls being overwhelmed before a difficult appointment. A friend came along, the conversation became manageable, and the afternoon ended differently from how it began. That memory contains people, actions, and a sequence. It offers something more usable than the general statement that difficult days sometimes improve.

This is the distinction between a specific autobiographical memory, an event from one's own life, and a broad summary of repeated experience. A review of memory research found that people with a history of suicide attempts tended to recall their lives in more general and less specific ways than comparison groups. Yet memory was not uniformly impaired: short term memory did not distinguish them from psychiatric comparison groups. The relevant question concerns particular features of remembering, rather than whether someone has a globally defective memory. [24]

The possible connection with action appeared in an earlier study of interpersonal problem solving. People assessed after an attempt showed more general autobiographical recall and greater difficulty producing solutions; within that group, the two difficulties were associated. A plausible interpretation is that particular memories can make particular responses easier to consider. But the study did not establish that improving recall would prevent an attempt. It also contributes to the literature summarized by the later review, so the two publications cannot count as independent confirmation. [24, 25]

There is another limit that matters just as much. Much of this evidence compares people according to what has already happened. It cannot tell us whether a memory difference preceded the crisis, emerged during it, or reflected another condition. A task completed after an attempt is not a recording of the person's mind beforehand. The difference between those questions is the difference between describing an association and establishing a mechanism. [24, 25]

Research measuring both memory and imagined future events gives a more uneven picture. In two adult studies, the measures did not significantly predict later suicidal thoughts. The more consistent difference involved how long an imagined event lasted. An imagined conversation lasting an afternoon and one lasting several days differ in duration; that tells us nothing by itself about how far into the future either conversation is placed. Event duration must not become evidence for a shortened future horizon. [21]

A study of adolescents offers a different clue: sparse descriptions of actions within imagined events predicted later suicidal thoughts after several adjustments. The finding was preliminary, with substantial attrition and many exploratory analyses. It suggests a question worth pursuing: whether imagining what one could actually do adds information beyond imagining a scene. It does not establish a shared pathway from memory difficulty to suicidal action. [22]

Returning to the hypothetical afternoon, the useful distinction is between having a reassuring story and having something specific to work with. Memory may contribute to that specificity; the evidence does not make it the master key. Our next question is what happens when a person can construct a detailed future and still cannot find a workable way into it.

CHAPTER 5

A Future We Can Imagine and a Future We Can Reach

Suppose someone can describe returning to work: the familiar entrance, the desk, the conversation with a colleague. The scene is vivid. Now suppose the person has no transport, fears the first conversation, and cannot work out how to arrange a gradual return. This hypothetical future is imaginable, but its route remains unresolved. Describing the destination has not answered what would make the first movement toward it possible. Nor does this example establish anything about that person's suicide risk.

The research gives us reasons to separate these questions. An early study found fewer positive future expectations in clinical groups, without a corresponding overall increase in negative expectations. A later follow up study found that fewer anticipated positive events predicted more suicidal thoughts beyond several baseline measures. However, the follow up sample was selected, attrition was substantial, and broader analyses generally did not reach significance. These are informative findings about particular tasks and populations, rather than a rule that counting positive futures reveals a person's safety. [17, 18]

We can therefore ask several distinct questions of the same imagined scene. Can it be described? Does it feel desirable? Does the person expect it to happen? Can they identify an action within it? Are the necessary resources available? These are distinctions proposed for understanding future accessibility. The selected studies have not validated them as one scale, shown that they always move together, or established how much each contributes to a crisis.

The adolescent study introduced earlier makes the distinction about action especially interesting. Difficulty describing actions within positive events was largely explained by depression. Sparse action detail across positive and negative events nevertheless predicted later suicidal thoughts after several adjustments. These are different results. The prospective finding came from exploratory analyses without correction for multiple comparisons, and the study excluded imminent suicidal intent. A promising measurement idea should not quietly become an account of every acute crisis. [22]

Adult findings require equal attention. Their memory and future thinking measures did not significantly predict later thoughts. A later analysis of the adolescent cohort distinguished patterns of future thinking associated with hopelessness and suicidal thoughts, but it reused the earlier participants. It enriches the description without providing an independent replication. Together, these studies ask us to specify which property of a future we mean, and whose experience we are trying to explain. [21, 29]

Even performance on a future thinking task may depend on the situation in which it is measured. A small laboratory study found a larger reduction in positive future thoughts after a negative mood induction among adults with a suicidal history. All participants received the negative induction, and there was no randomized neutral condition. The study supports further investigation of sensitivity to mood; it does not establish that the task measures a mechanism that causes attempts. [23]

In the return to work example, transport and a gradual schedule are practical conditions; fear and uncertainty are experiences that also deserve attention. Future accessibility, as used here, asks how those conditions meet. It is an organizing question for Flow Hijacked, still awaiting direct validation. The next complication is that even an attractive future may carry pressure when its meaning and its possible routes are left unexplored.

Several different questions can hide inside “I cannot see a future.”

Image	Can I picture a particular event?
Value	Does it matter to me, or feel worth approaching?
Credibility	Does it feel plausible for someone in my circumstances?
Path	Can I identify and begin a feasible next step?
Support	Can I ask for help, and can someone actually respond?

Conceptual distinctions used in this lecture, not a diagnostic scale or a validated five-factor model. The questions may overlap and need empirical separation. [17, 18, 21, 22, 63]

CHAPTER 6

When Even a Better Tomorrow Becomes a Burden

A better tomorrow can be an invitation. In a hypothetical example, it can also become a demand: the picture of returning immediately to a former level of achievement, with no space for a slower return. The image is positive in content, yet the comparison with today is painful. This is a possible interpretation of an experience, not an established explanation for suicide. It helps us see why the emotional meaning of a future cannot be read from its pleasant content alone.

One prospective study makes that caution unavoidable. Among adults recruited after a suicide attempt, more positive future thoughts focused on the self were associated with subsequent hospital treated attempts or suicide deaths. Outcomes were linked to national records, an important strength. The result runs against a simple assumption that more positive future thinking must always be protective. It does not show that positive thinking caused the later events, or that hope itself was harmful. [19]

The distinction matters because the study did not directly measure whether those futures were achievable or whether they intensified entrapment. Thoughts were measured once, recruitment came from one center, and the statistical model selected predictors partly from their initial associations. A painful gap between an imagined self and present circumstances is one interpretation to investigate. Presenting that interpretation as the mechanism discovered by the study would claim evidence that the researchers did not collect. [19]

A small adolescent study adds a related complication. Defeat and entrapment were more strongly associated with suicidal thoughts three months later among participants who generated more positive future events. Further exploratory analysis highlighted events that did not occur. Yet the sample was small, the result depended on the follow up time, and adjustment for depression weakened the overall finding. An event failing to happen also does not establish that expecting it was unrealistic. Plans can be reasonable and still encounter obstacles. [20]

These findings change the question we bring to hope. Instead of treating a positive image as a uniform protective ingredient, we can examine its content, meaning, expected likelihood, and connection to possible action. None of this licenses discouraging someone's hopes. It asks us to notice whether the person feels invited toward something valuable, judged against an ideal, or unable to begin. Those distinctions are part of the proposed Flow Hijacked inquiry, rather than conclusions already validated by these studies.

Nor must a crisis contain an empty future. A later analysis of adolescent data linked repetitive negative future imagery with suicidal thoughts, while an everyday sampling study found that thoughts about a distant future could be negative, intrusive, and repetitive at moments when suicidal thoughts were also reported. The first analysis reused an earlier cohort; the second measured contemporaneous associations. Neither establishes causation. Both challenge a universal story in which the future simply disappears. [29, 43]

The phrase better tomorrow therefore needs room around it. Better in what way, under what conditions, and with what permission for uncertainty or delay? The answer cannot be supplied by requiring optimism. Our argument is moving from the presence of a desirable destination toward the experience of having a way forward. That is where the question of entrapment becomes especially important.

PART 3

How the Paths Begin to Narrow

CHAPTER 7

When There Seems to Be No Way Out

There is a difference between finding a situation painful and experiencing it as inescapable. For this lecture, entrapment names that second experience: the sense that one needs relief or escape but cannot find an available route. The pressure may concern circumstances, one's own thoughts and feelings, or both. The integrated motivational and volitional model places defeat and entrapment near the formation of suicidal thoughts, while distinguishing that process from the transition to an attempt. It proposes a pathway to investigate, not an inevitable sequence. [2]

That distinction protects against two opposite mistakes. We should not hear entrapment and assume that an attempt must follow. We should also not dismiss the experience because an observer can list alternatives. A possible opening on paper and an opening that a particular person can use are different propositions. Taking the experience seriously leaves room to investigate the circumstances, the person's understanding of them, and what assistance might change either.

The evidence supports the relevance of entrapment while limiting its specificity. A meta analysis found substantial associations of defeat and entrapment with depression, anxiety, posttraumatic distress, and suicidality. The underlying analyses were cross sectional. Entrapment therefore matters across several forms of suffering; it does not identify a uniquely suicidal state or establish which process came first. A concept can be useful without being exclusive to one outcome, provided we do not give it diagnostic powers it has not earned. [7]

A clinical study of people hospitalized after suicidal thoughts or an attempt found associations between entrapment, psychological pain, and suicidal thoughts. Its statistical mediation models were compatible with entrapment linking other crisis features to those thoughts. But all the relevant measurements came from a cross sectional design. A model that fits a proposed sequence is not direct observation of that sequence unfolding. Even a poorer fit for the reverse model cannot turn simultaneous measurements into evidence of causation. [8]

A broader systematic review of studies testing the motivational and volitional model found support for the defeat, entrapment, and ideation pathway, alongside mixed prospective and multivariable findings. Evidence about several proposed moderators

remained insufficient. The responsible conclusion is substantial reason to study the pathway, with unfinished work on timing, conditions, and differences between people. It would be premature to make entrapment the single mechanism through which every crisis must pass. [12]

Consider a hypothetical person whose living arrangements depend on an unsafe relationship. An observer may identify leaving as an option while overlooking income, housing, caring responsibilities, or the consequences of seeking help. This example illustrates why an account of entrapment must admit real constraints. It does not establish how common any particular constraint is. Treating the entire problem as a mistaken belief would remove precisely the conditions that the example asks us to understand.

Future accessibility brings a question to this territory: what separates recognizing a possible opening from being able to approach it? That is the proposed Flow Hijacked synthesis. It must demonstrate an advantage over existing accounts of entrapment rather than borrow their evidence as proof of a new construct. At the human level, the distinction directs attention toward the work required to make an opening usable, beginning with what each possible step asks of the person.

CHAPTER 8

When Every Step Costs Too Much

A suggestion can sound small from the outside and contain several tasks from the inside. In a hypothetical example, making an appointment requires finding a number, explaining what is happening, anticipating the response, arranging time away from work, and reaching the service. The suggestion names one action; carrying it out may require a sequence. This example does not prove a mechanism of suicidal crisis. It makes explicit what we mean by asking about the cost of a step.

Cost here includes practical demands, emotional demands, uncertainty, and the effort of organizing a sequence. These are proposed questions for the lecture, not components of a validated score. A person might want the outcome yet lack one of its conditions. Another might reject the suggested outcome itself. Before interpreting a stalled action as unwillingness or inability, we need to know which situation we are describing. The same visible pause can leave very different questions unanswered.

Research on cognitive flexibility, the capacity to shift how a problem is approached, offers relevant but limited evidence. In adolescents followed after psychiatric hospitalization, inflexibility was more strongly associated with suicidal thoughts under chronic stress, even after accounting for depression. However, the study found no prospective associations among inflexibility, stress, and later thoughts. Assessments six months apart might miss more rapid processes, but that possibility cannot be used to erase the negative result. The study did not measure the cost of seeking help. [26]

Research on searching among alternatives brings a further distinction. Across two clinical cohorts, a history of more medically severe attempts was associated with narrower exploration in a laboratory task and difficulty leaving an unrewarded option.

Histories of less medically severe attempts were associated with excessive switching instead. Both patterns deserve attention. The difference concerns recorded medical severity, not the legitimacy of suffering or entitlement to care, and the task is not a direct recreation of choices during a crisis. [28]

There is therefore no sound basis for assuming that everyone simply becomes more impulsive or values only immediate relief. A study across three adult samples found inconsistent reward valuation more consistently associated with medically severe attempt histories than a general preference for immediate rewards. The task involved monetary choices. It challenges a simple explanation based on impatience without establishing how someone evaluates relief, relationships, or help in their own life. Those translations remain questions for further research. [27]

Within the Flow Hijacked proposal, these findings motivate separating the available options from the ability to search them, evaluate them, and begin one. They do not validate a single chain connecting all three. In the appointment example, providing transport would address one barrier; it would not necessarily address fear of the response. Helping organize the sequence would address another. These are illustrations of matching a condition to a difficulty, rather than evidence that any isolated adjustment prevents suicidal behavior.

This changes the attention we bring to the word possible. We can ask what is missing between the suggestion and its execution, without turning the person into a failed decision maker. Some missing conditions may lie in services or relationships. The next chapter examines an especially important gap: having people or help somewhere in one's world and being able to reach them when they are needed.

CHAPTER 9

When Connection Exists but Help Remains Out of Reach

Having someone in one's life, feeling close to them, expecting an understanding response, and being able to ask for help are different conditions. Imagine, hypothetically, a person who knows that a friend cares but fears being a burden during a difficult week. Another person might trust the friend yet lack privacy for a conversation. Both have a relationship. The questions about reaching help are different. Simply recording that family or friends exist would leave those questions unanswered.

Prospective research supports taking the social world seriously. A review linked loneliness at baseline with later suicidal thoughts and behavior, while two large community cohorts linked greater social support with fewer later suicidal thoughts. These studies concern associations over time, with varied measures and populations. They do not show that adding a relationship by itself prevents an attempt or death, or tell us how support functions within the next few hours. We must keep the outcome and the time window in view. [59, 61]

Theories make more specific proposals. The interpersonal theory emphasizes thwarted belonging and perceived burdensomeness, meaning the person's sense that they are a burden to others. The latter is a perception to understand, never a judgment to endorse.

But evidence for the theory's combinations is mixed. A large community follow up found stronger support for separate associations than for the central interaction, and a clinical study did not find support for the theory's combined prediction of later attempts. These limitations leave the importance of relationships intact while challenging a single formula. [1, 11, 60]

Being able to speak about suicidal thoughts is another distinct question. A large review found that many people did not disclose suicidal thoughts or behavior, with enormous variation between studies. Different outcomes and reporting methods were combined, including retrospective accounts after deaths. The pooled estimate cannot become a universal percentage of hidden risk. Nor does the review establish that disclosure itself causes survival. Its contribution here is to show why the absence of disclosure cannot be treated as a complete account of someone's experience. [62]

A review of professional help seeking identified barriers including strong self reliance, low perceived need for care, and stigma. Informal support was associated with professional help seeking. Yet intending to seek care, actually doing so, and having contact with services are different outcomes; severe distress could relate differently to each. A service may have been contacted without that fact telling us whether the person felt understood or received something they could use. [63]

Qualitative research brings the quality of the encounter into view. In accounts of professional care, listening, empathy, trust, and safety were described as helping people reconnect, while impersonal or hurtful encounters could obstruct that process. Such accounts explain what mattered to participants. They are not an experimental demonstration that one interpersonal ingredient prevents attempts, and they do not make relatives or clinicians individually responsible for controlling every outcome. [70]

Flow Hijacked calls attention to social reachability: the proposed gap between potential support and help that can be approached and received. That construct remains unvalidated. To investigate it, we would need to distinguish the expected response, the act of reaching out, and the response actually received. For our argument, it adds a question to every apparent option: whose participation does this step require, and is that participation available?

PART 4

Time Within the Crisis

CHAPTER 10

When the Present Fills the Horizon

There are several ways for the present to fill the horizon. A person might struggle to imagine next month. Another might imagine it vividly, yet expect today's pain to continue throughout it. Someone else might want that future but experience the next hour as impossible to bear. These are different possibilities, offered here as illustrations. Calling all of them a shortened future would conceal the differences we need to understand.

Accounts brought together with people who have lived through a suicide attempt describe changes in experienced time, agency, and connection to the world. Such accounts help us ask what a questionnaire might miss: whether waiting feels possible, whether tomorrow feels personally connected to today, and whether a future still seems open to change. They do not establish how often each experience occurs, or a single temporal mechanism shared by everyone. [71]

We therefore need to separate several questions. How far ahead is the imagined event? How long does the event itself last? Is it desirable? Does it seem likely? Can the person see a way to begin moving toward it? One study of adults found that imagined events were longer and less bounded among participants with suicidal thoughts. That is a finding about the duration of imagined events, not evidence that their future horizon was shorter. [21]

Nor can urgency simply be translated into a general preference for immediate rewards. Research across three adult samples compared a preference for receiving rewards sooner with inconsistency in how rewards were valued. The more consistent finding among people with a history of medically serious attempts concerned inconsistent valuation, rather than a universal preference for immediacy. A money choice task does not recreate a crisis; nevertheless, it challenges an explanation that reduces suicidal behavior to impatience. [27]

The future may also remain mentally present in an oppressive form. In a recent study sampling adolescents' experiences during everyday life, suicidal thoughts sometimes accompanied negative, repetitive, intrusive thoughts about a distant future. These were associations measured at the same moment, not proof that future thoughts caused a crisis. They matter because they contradict a simple picture of the future disappearing. Sometimes the difficulty may concern the kind of future that keeps appearing. [43]

Consider a hypothetical person who can describe a meaningful goal a year away, yet cannot identify a manageable action for this evening. The distance to the goal and the difficulty of the first step are separate problems. Asking for a brighter picture might leave the second untouched. This does not show which response will help. It clarifies why an account of future accessibility must include practical pathways, time, and resources, alongside imagination and desire.

For Flow Hijacked, the proposed question is therefore how a valued possibility becomes available for action under particular conditions. This remains a research question, not a new name for every suicidal experience. The title of this chapter describes one possible experience: today's demands occupying so much of the field that another course of action feels unavailable. Understanding whether that availability changes within a person requires us to look more closely at the hours between assessments.

CHAPTER 11

From Hour to Hour

If a person's experience can change, a single assessment cannot tell the whole story of that change. Researchers have addressed this by asking participants brief questions repeatedly during ordinary life. This approach, often called ecological momentary assessment, studies what happens between clinic visits. Two early studies found that suicidal thoughts could change substantially within hours. Loneliness, hopelessness, and feeling like a burden were related to thoughts at the same moment, but added little to predicting the next change. [34]

The distinction is easy to miss. Two experiences occurring together do not show which came first. Nor does a relationship between people necessarily describe a process within one person. If people who report more loneliness also report more suicidal thoughts, it does not automatically follow that each increase in loneliness predicts an increase in that particular person's thoughts. Research using personal statistical networks has found considerable differences between participants, without a network feature shared by most of them. [36]

A further study separated relationships at the same moment from those between successive reports. Hopelessness predicted later passive suicidal thoughts, and passive thoughts predicted later active thoughts in its model. These patterns generate questions about timing; they do not establish a fixed sequence that every person follows. The study was small, assessed selected experiences roughly four hours apart, and did not test suicide attempts. A statistical arrow is not yet a demonstrated cause. [38]

Ambivalence also deserves to be observed rather than resolved on someone's behalf. Studies have followed the wish to live and the wish to die as separate reports and examined how they change together. One exploratory analysis linked different patterns to the periods around reported attempts. But it used weekly, unevenly spaced measurements from 78 patients, with few events and no independent prospective validation. It opens a research question; it does not supply a reliable warning clock for an individual. [39, 40]

More measurements also bring practical and scientific responsibilities. A review of momentary assessment research found substantial variation in questions, schedules, and reporting quality. Missing responses can leave uncertainty about the very periods we most want to understand. The review found no consistent signal that repeated questions worsened suicidal thoughts, but reporting of adverse events was limited. Feasibility cannot be treated as proof of safety, and collecting data cannot be assumed to provide care. [35]

There is also important counterevidence to the appeal of fluctuation itself. A 2026 study followed adults who reported their thoughts daily for a week and were then followed for a year. Short trajectories did not significantly predict later attempts, and variability added very little beyond initial thought severity. This does not settle what happens over hours. It does mean that a changing line on a graph should not be mistaken for an established marker of danger. [42]

The humane implication is narrower and more useful than a promise of prediction: a person's earlier account should not imprison our understanding of their present experience. Repeated conversation can ask what has changed, while research tests whether particular patterns carry dependable information. Neither a calmer report nor a sharper fluctuation can interpret itself. To decide what a measurement can actually tell us, we must distinguish describing change from predicting an outcome.

CHAPTER 12

What We Can Predict and What We Cannot Yet Conclude

Prediction begins with a precise question. Are we estimating thoughts tomorrow, an attempt over the next year, or death over a longer period? These are different outcomes, with different frequencies and different consequences for interpretation. A study that predicts one has not automatically predicted the others. Even a useful description of distress does not, by itself, establish who will experience a particular event. Reviews of risk scales and prediction models make these distinctions essential. [31, 32]

Rare outcomes create a difficulty that impressive sounding accuracy can conceal. Imagine a hypothetical system that almost always says an event will not happen. If the event is rare, the system can often be correct while offering little useful guidance. We need to know how many events it misses and, among the people it flags, how many experience the outcome. That second question is called positive predictive value. Its answer depends partly on how common the outcome is in the population. [32]

The major historical review of risk factors found limited average predictive performance across decades of research. Yet the studies largely examined individual, static factors over comparatively long periods. Interaction tests and some advanced methods for changing predictors were excluded from the synthesis. Its lesson is serious, but bounded: the approaches reviewed were limited. It does not establish that future prediction is impossible, or that asking about a person's current circumstances has no value. [30]

A later critical review identified some models with promising results when tested in independent data. It also found that external validation was uncommon, risk of bias was widespread, and calibration was rarely reported. Calibration asks whether estimated probabilities match observed outcomes: among people assigned a particular probability, does the event occur about that often? A model can separate higher from lower risk reasonably well while getting those probabilities wrong. Promising prediction still requires testing whether its use improves care. [33]

Shorter time scales do not remove these requirements. In young adults after an emergency department visit, repeated self reports predicted next day suicidal thoughts better than the wearable sensor information studied. Sensor data did not add to the self reports. This was an early prognostic study, without independent external validation, and its outcome was thoughts rather than attempts. The finding supports investigating particular information sources; it does not establish a device that can identify imminent action. [37]

The same discipline applies to dynamical language. Fluctuation means a measurement changes. A dynamical model proposes relationships governing that change. Demonstrating an attractor, a tipping point, or a specific amplification mechanism demands additional evidence. Exploratory analyses around attempts do not yet establish those mechanisms or provide validated prospective predictions. In particular, the selected evidence does not demonstrate the nonnormal amplification or high resolvent proposed in Flow Hijacked's mathematical framework: specific mathematical accounts of how disturbances might be amplified. Those ideas remain hypotheses, not findings about a person's brain. [40]

Uncertainty therefore changes how we speak, rather than relieving us of responsibility. A measurement can inform a conversation without becoming a verdict. A model's errors, population, time window, and intended use belong beside its reported success. The question of what support someone needs also remains meaningful when a particular outcome cannot be predicted confidently. To understand those needs, we now turn from measurements alone to the conditions in which the person is living.

PART 5

The Conditions Surrounding the Person

CHAPTER 13

Beyond a Single Diagnosis

A diagnosis can identify an important part of someone's difficulties without explaining the whole crisis. A large international survey found associations between several mental disorders and suicidal thoughts, while associations with the transition from thoughts to attempts were different and more limited. The study reconstructed timing from people's memories; it was not a prospective observation of crises. Its contribution is to complicate a single diagnosis explanation, not to replace assessment with another universal formula. [68]

This matters for the account we are developing. We cannot assign the past to depression, threat to anxiety, immediacy to addiction, and an inaccessible future to suicidal crisis as though these were separate territories. Such contrasts might help introduce a question, but they would not demonstrate exclusive mechanisms. The international survey also omitted some diagnostic groups and did not examine severity or chronicity. Its large size cannot supply answers to questions its design did not ask. [68]

Sleep illustrates why the time scale matters. A review of longitudinal studies linked sleep disturbance with later suicidal thoughts, attempts, and death. Yet most follow up periods were months or years. Very few studies examined attempts within a month, and none examined death within less than a year. This evidence supports attention to sleep as part of a broader clinical picture. It does not turn a difficult night into a validated warning of what a particular person will do in the next hours. [65]

Alcohol provides a different kind of temporal evidence. A meta analysis of controlled studies found an association between acute alcohol use, meaning consumption in the hours before an attempt, and suicide attempts. Some studies compared exposure periods within the same person, helping account for characteristics that remain stable. But changing mood, other substances, and circumstances could still matter. These were observational studies, not randomized experiments. The association is relevant to understanding an acute setting without establishing a single causal pathway or an individual's probability of an attempt. [64]

Earlier harm belongs in the picture without becoming a destiny. A broad review associated childhood maltreatment with suicidal thoughts and attempts in adulthood. That population association does not tell us how an earlier experience relates to this person's distress today. Nor does it establish that everyone with such a history shares the same pathway. The interval between history and crisis contains experiences, relationships, and circumstances that require their own inquiry rather than being filled in by assumption. [67]

The distinction we need is between a condition that has been present for years, a recent change, and the meaning that change has for the person. In a hypothetical example, longstanding sleep difficulties and a new conflict may occur together, but their coexistence does not reveal which is maintaining the current difficulty. An account that merely adds them to a list has described a collection. Understanding their relationship requires information about timing, context, and the person's own experience.

Future accessibility should be held to the same standard. It cannot become a master explanation that makes diagnoses, bodily conditions, or history disappear. Its possible contribution is to organize a question: under these particular conditions, what has become difficult to imagine, want, begin, or sustain? Sometimes the answer may concern an internal experience. Sometimes it will concern a resource or protection that is actually missing. That second possibility deserves more than a footnote.

CHAPTER 14

When the World Really Does Close Off Possibilities

An explanation centered on thought can become unfair if it quietly assumes that a workable path is already available. Consider a hypothetical appointment that someone cannot attend because they have no transport or cannot leave a dependent person alone. The appointment exists, but access does not follow from its existence. No change in description supplies the missing journey or care. This example illustrates a conceptual requirement: a theory of reachable futures must examine real conditions as well as perceptions.

That requirement does not license us to invent evidence. The literature reviewed here does not provide a comprehensive assessment of housing, debt, discrimination, violence, or the consequences of particular social policies. A prospective review did associate stressful life events with later suicidal outcomes, but the evidence concerned mainly

thoughts, involved few studies, and showed substantial differences between them. It cannot tell us that a specific material loss caused a particular crisis or quantify what removing that loss would achieve. [66]

Research on seeking professional help makes a related distinction. Believing help is needed, intending to seek it, reaching a service, and receiving useful care are different outcomes. A review identified possible barriers including stigma, a strong preference to manage alone, and not perceiving a need for treatment. Its heterogeneous studies do not justify attributing every failure to obtain help to a person's attitude. They prompt a more precise inquiry into where the route to help becomes difficult. [63]

The quality of the encounter belongs within that inquiry. In a qualitative synthesis, people described listening, empathy, trust, and safety as important in care; impersonal or hurtful encounters could obstruct their sense of connection. These accounts reveal what care can feel like from the receiving side. They are not a trial proving that one interaction prevents an attempt. Nevertheless, they challenge the adequacy of counting a service contact as though its meaning and content were already known. [70]

Social evidence also has boundaries of place and population. Much of the prospective research on loneliness came from individualistic societies, with gaps in representation. A large cross national study found differences across settings but did not represent every country, diagnosis, or clinical situation. We cannot assume that a framework developed from these sources has already been validated in Hebrew or in Israel. Language, institutions, and local resources must be examined rather than treated as interchangeable background. [59, 68]

Two errors are therefore possible. We may treat a blocked route as a mistaken belief, or assume that the existence of a real barrier tells us everything about a person's experience. In a hypothetical case, financial strain may be both a concrete restriction and something with personal meaning that cannot be inferred from an income figure. Understanding requires room for both. The question is what is unavailable, how that absence is experienced, and what would have to change to make an option workable.

This is a demand on the proposed framework, not evidence of its effectiveness. Future accessibility must include the possibility that the environment needs to change. It should not measure a person's ability to adapt to every demand as though that were the only relevant outcome. Nor should a theory assign relatives sole responsibility for making a life possible. The surrounding services and conditions remain part of the question, including whether support continues when circumstances change.

CHAPTER 15

When Continuity Breaks

A future can depend on arrangements so ordinary that we notice them most clearly when they change: a place to go, someone who knows the situation, an appointment that follows another appointment. Consider, as an illustration, a person leaving one care

setting with a referral to another. A referral records an intended connection. It does not by itself tell us whether the person can make contact, understands the next step, or receives a response. Continuity is a question about what actually connects.

Life events can change several parts of that connection, but the evidence requires care. A review of prospective studies found an association between stressful events and later suicidal outcomes, mainly thoughts. Its small and heterogeneous evidence base could not establish that any one event inevitably produces crisis. The same outward event should therefore not be assigned a fixed inner meaning. What happened, what it changed, and what support remained available are distinct questions. [66]

Age also changes what needs to be investigated. A systematic review of leading suicide theories in adolescents found mixed support for their components and few studies testing complete models. Adult theories cannot simply be transferred to younger people without developmental testing. This does not supply a ready explanation for every school, family, or care transition. It identifies an obligation to ask how the relevant relationships and available actions are organized at that stage of life. [13]

Research at transitions between services offers evidence about particular arrangements, not a universal effect of continuity. In adults discharged from emergency departments, a comparative study associated collaborative safety planning combined with follow up with fewer recorded suicidal behaviors and greater engagement in care. It was not randomized, and the contributions of planning and follow up could not be separated. The result belongs to that package, population, and outcome; it cannot be converted into a promise that any contact will prevent an attempt. [44]

A later emergency department study evaluated a package of changes to service processes. Its combined outcome improved in the maintenance phase, but the outcome was dominated by acute care visits, including visits related to thoughts. The study could not establish a separate reduction in suicide deaths. What it adds here is a reason to investigate the organization of care as an intervention in its own right, while keeping the measured outcome and the wider hope for benefit distinct. [47]

Continuity also has a meaning beyond service scheduling. Qualitative work describes recovery through connection, renewed meaning, and ways of living with difficulty; a recent review includes accounts in which suicidal thoughts can return. These accounts do not prescribe one recovery sequence. They do suggest that an account focused only on the absence of another event can miss what a person considers important about living. A return of distress should not, by definition, erase every change that preceded it. [69, 71]

For the present argument, continuity means keeping open the question of how one moment can lead to another workable step. This is an interpretive proposal, not a validated measure. It asks what carries across a change of setting: information, practical access, a relationship, or responsibility for the next contact. The next part will examine specific interventions. Before asking which ones help, we need this distinction between an offer written down and help that becomes part of a person's actual life.

PART 6**Expanding What Is Possible Again****CHAPTER 16****What Actually Helps**

After asking how a crisis can narrow a person's world, we arrive at a question with immediate human weight: what can change that situation? An answer needs to identify the change it promises. Less intense suicidal thinking, fewer episodes of harmful behavior, a sustained connection with care, and fewer deaths are different achievements. Each matters. A finding about one cannot silently stand in for the others. That distinction protects people from inflated promises while allowing us to recognize benefits that a single headline would miss. [48, 50, 55]

Consider two patterns in the evidence. In a small trial of suicide focused cognitive behavioral therapy delivered by video, both treatment groups reported improvement in suicidal thoughts. The additional benefit appeared in repeated behavioral events, broadly defined to include attempts that were interrupted or abandoned. The number of people with any such event was similar. Conversely, a synthesis of collaborative assessment and management found an advantage in suicidal thoughts and treatment acceptability, without establishing a difference in attempts. Treatment can therefore change different aspects of the crisis, on different measures. [48, 50]

The next question is what the treatment was compared with. A benefit over usual care answers a different question from a benefit over another structured therapy. In one small military trial, crisis response planning performed better than a contract promising safety. That is useful evidence about a specific comparison; it does not establish superiority over every alternative. The video therapy trial used an active treatment focused on present difficulties. Comparison groups are part of the result, because improvement occurring in both groups cannot all be credited to one treatment's distinctive ingredients. [48, 56]

Age also changes what we can conclude. A trial involving adolescents at high risk found that comprehensive dialectical behavior therapy reduced attempts and other self harm outcomes relative to supportive therapy during treatment. Its advantage on attempts was no longer statistically clear during the subsequent follow up. Meanwhile, the corrected review of safety planning used as a standalone intervention in young people did not establish benefit. Its uncertainty does not prove that collaborative planning is useless within care. It prevents adult findings from becoming an automatic promise to younger people. [45, 49]

Across brief interventions after an attempt, a recent review found a favorable overall estimate for repeat attempts. A sensitivity analysis addressing possible publication bias also allowed for no effect. That analysis has limitations of its own, and the review contains unresolved reporting differences between its abstract and main text. The appropriate conclusion is neither dismissal nor certainty: these interventions deserve

attention, while the strength and consistency of their benefit remain qualified. Their varied combinations of therapeutic work and continued contact should not be reduced to a single reassuring message. [46]

Medication research makes the importance of time and outcome especially visible. A hospital trial of ketamine found greater relief of severe suicidal thoughts after three days, but no clear between group advantage at six weeks. It did not establish prevention of attempts or deaths. A recent synthesis of randomized lithium trials also left uncertainty about attempts and mortality. These findings concern specific clinical populations and treatment conditions. They are not instructions about anyone's medication, and short term relief should not be described as proof that the longer course of a crisis has been resolved. [54, 55]

What emerges is a more accountable kind of hope. Care can help, and meaningful effects need not take the same form for everyone. We should ask what changed, for whom, compared with what, and for how long. That discipline also creates room for a person's own account of improvement: being heard, reconnecting, or finding life more manageable, without mistaking those accounts for controlled evidence of effectiveness. The practical question now becomes how an intervention supported under particular conditions can become help that a person can actually use. [69, 70]

CHAPTER 17

Turning Help into a Step Someone Can Take

Imagine, as an illustration, a person leaving an appointment with the name of a service and an instruction to make contact. The service exists. The person understands the instruction. Yet making that first call may still involve explaining the crisis again, anticipating a difficult response, or finding time and privacy that are unavailable. This example separates an offered resource from a usable next step. It does not tell us why any particular person has not called. It asks whether the route to help has been considered as carefully as the destination.

Safety planning with follow up offers one way to examine that distinction. In an adult emergency department study, a collaborative plan combined with continuing contact was associated with fewer recorded suicidal behaviors and greater attendance at mental health care. The study compared sites without randomly assigning individuals, largely involved men who were military veterans, and excluded people requiring admission. It supports a combined process in that setting. It does not show that handing someone a worksheet reproduces the benefit, or that the written plan alone caused the outcome. [44]

A usable plan and a promise also do different work. A promise describes what someone intends to avoid; planning can consider what support and responses are available when circumstances change. The small military trial comparing crisis response planning with a safety contract favored planning. Its limited sample and specific comparator make the size of the effect uncertain. The broader practical distinction is still intelligible: agreement is not the same as a workable route. Respecting a person's commitment includes taking seriously the conditions under which they are being asked to carry it out. [56]

Those conditions include the organization providing care. In ED-SAFE 2, departments introduced a package of changes to routine practice, with collaborative safety planning among its central elements. A combined outcome improved during the maintenance phase. Most recorded events were acute care visits, including visits for thoughts alone; the study could not establish a separate mortality benefit. Departments changed at assigned times, but wider changes over time could still influence the result. This is evidence about implementing a system of care, with its routines and continuity, rather than isolating one clinician's conversation. [47]

Usability also has a relational dimension. Research on seeking help identifies possible barriers such as stigma, strong expectations of self reliance, and not perceiving treatment as needed. Qualitative accounts of professional care describe the importance of listening, trust, and feeling treated as a person. These are different kinds of evidence: the accounts illuminate what receiving care can mean, without proving which ingredient prevents an attempt. Together they encourage a careful inquiry into the encounter itself. An unanswered offer should not automatically be interpreted as indifference toward living or an unwillingness to cooperate. [63, 70]

A younger person's circumstances require their own consideration. The uncertain evidence for standalone safety planning in children and adolescents cannot be repaired by citing an adult study more confidently. Nor does it justify removing planning from a broader therapeutic relationship. The youth dialectical behavior therapy trial studied substantial, organized treatment, not an isolated form. For educational purposes, the lesson is to keep the scale of the intervention visible. A small tool may belong inside a larger response, but evidence for the whole response does not establish that the tool is sufficient. [45, 49]

Finally, some help changes the surrounding environment. A review of population measures found that certain reductions in access to lethal means were associated with fewer suicide deaths, although evidence quality and results varied considerably. This reminds us that prevention need not wait for a person to generate a new perspective. [53] In the practical interpretation offered here, responsibility is shared across professional care, institutions, relationships, and material conditions. No relative should be made the sole guarantor of another person's survival. Making a next step possible is a collective task whose demands should be visible, rather than transferred silently to the person in crisis.

CHAPTER 18

Working with Pain, Flexibility, and Problem Solving

Once help becomes reachable, what might the work involve? A useful starting point is a difficulty the person recognizes, rather than an assumption that their reasoning needs correction. Pain, an unresolved conflict, and difficulty organizing a response can coexist. Taking pain seriously does not require treating every conclusion reached in pain as fixed. Equally, exploring another response should not imply that the original difficulty was imaginary. This is the stance proposed here: understanding what makes a situation hard while asking whether anything within or around it can change.

Research provides clues, but they are not yet a complete causal explanation. A study of autobiographical memory found that more general recall was associated with poorer interpersonal problem solving among people who had attempted suicide. It did not show that training memory would prevent another attempt. A later adolescent study linked cognitive inflexibility more strongly to suicidal thoughts under chronic stress, but did not find the corresponding prospective relationships. The possible importance of flexibility therefore remains distinct from proof that changing a flexibility score changes the course of a crisis. [25, 26]

An everyday illustration makes the distinction easier to hold. Someone misses an appointment and concludes that returning is no longer possible. A conversation might establish that the service allows another appointment, or that transport was the obstacle, or that the previous encounter felt humiliating. These possibilities require different responses. The illustration is not a treatment experiment. It shows why producing more options is not enough: an option has to address the actual obstacle, and someone must be in a position to help make it workable.

Suicide focused cognitive behavioral treatment is relevant because it has been tested against another active therapy, not merely observed before and after treatment. In the small video based trial, it reduced recurrent events under a definition that included actual, interrupted, and abandoned attempts. Suicidal thoughts improved in both groups. This supports a particular treatment comparison; it does not identify the successful ingredient or establish that cognitive flexibility mediated the effect. A treatment package can have evidence behind it while the explanation of how it works remains open. [48]

Dialectical behavior therapy offers another example of the difference between a comprehensive treatment and a single skill. The adolescent trial found benefits during treatment compared with supportive therapy, but the later advantage in attempts was not statistically clear. A broader review in usual care found a benefit in controlled studies for self directed harmful behavior, but no statistically clear advantage for suicidal thoughts or crisis service use. That broad behavioral category also includes acts without intent to die. Skills, relationships, and organized treatment cannot simply be separated by looking at the overall result, nor can all forms of self harm be counted as suicide attempts. [49, 58]

Understanding the person's account of the crisis may also matter. A review of cognitive behavioral trials found better attempt outcomes in studies that included a narrative assessment, an exploration of the personal account. However, participants were not randomly assigned to the presence or absence of that component; the study groups also differed in age and other features. The finding suggests a question worth testing: does understanding the particular sequence into a crisis help tailor the response? It does not establish that telling the story is the active ingredient, or validate the explanation developed in this lecture. [57]

Independent replication keeps that question honest. An early trial of a brief narrative intervention with continued contact, known as ASSIP, reported a substantial reduction in repeat attempts. A later independent trial did not reproduce its advantage. Both were relatively small, so the later result neither settles every question nor proves harm. It

does mean that the original striking result cannot carry an unrestricted promise. Listening carefully to someone's story retains human importance; a claim that a particular narrative treatment prevents attempts must still earn its support in comparative research. [51, 52]

CHAPTER 19

A Future We Can Begin Moving Toward

We can now return to the future without making it a demand. Someone should not have to describe a convincing, hopeful life in order for their present suffering to deserve care. Nor should improvement be measured only by how persuasively they can talk about tomorrow. The question guiding this lecture is more modest and more exacting: under what conditions does another possibility become something a person can begin to approach? That question leaves room for uncertainty, ambivalence, and a future whose shape is still unknown.

Accounts of recovery offer a different perspective from a treatment outcome table. Qualitative syntheses describe relationships, turning points, meaning, self acceptance, and learning to live with difficulty. The recent review developed with people who have attempted suicide includes accounts of living while suicidal thoughts can return. These descriptions do not establish how common any pathway is, and they do not prove a shared recovery mechanism. They broaden what we might need to hear: change can concern the relationship to a life, not only the disappearance of a measured symptom. [69, 71]

That is one reason to resist prescribing an imagined bright future as the answer. In a prospective study after an attempt, more positive future thoughts focused on the self were associated with subsequent repeat attempts leading to hospital treatment or death. This does not show that positive thinking caused harm; the suggested role of unattainable expectations was not directly tested. A small laboratory study also did not establish a direct link between positive future thinking and suicidal thoughts. Together, these findings challenge a simple rule that more positive images must always mean more protection. [19, 23]

Imagine instead an ordinary, explicitly hypothetical change. A person remains unsure about the coming year but knows how a difficult appointment tomorrow will be arranged, who has agreed to accompany them, and what unresolved concern can be raised there. This is not a forecast of recovery or a substitute for clinical care. It illustrates a difference between describing an attractive outcome and having some supported participation in what happens next. The future in this example has not become certain or entirely positive. One part of it has become more concrete.

Concrete should not mean small according to an observer's convenience. A step that looks simple from outside may involve money, permission, transport, a safer place to stay, or a response from another institution. These are examples of conditions to examine, not assumptions about everyone's situation. The practical principle proposed here is to judge

feasibility with the person, including what others must do. If the missing condition is outside their control, repeating an instruction more firmly does not supply it. An account of possibility needs room for actual resources and actual constraints.

This also changes the questions we ask about progress. Attendance at care, reduced suicidal thinking, and feeling understood describe different dimensions. Adult safety planning research examined engagement and behavior; collaborative management research found an advantage in thoughts without establishing one in attempts; qualitative accounts emphasize the experience of connection. We should preserve those distinctions when listening to an individual, rather than assuming one improvement guarantees the others. [44, 50, 70] As an educational proposal, we can ask what has become easier to seek, say, receive, or do, while leaving assessment and treatment decisions to the appropriate clinical relationship.

Here the Flow Hijacked synthesis begins, and its status must remain explicit. We propose examining the distance between a possibility someone can describe and a path they can experience as available, valuable, and practicable. The intervention studies do not prove that reducing this distance explains their benefits. People may improve through other processes, and the proposed distinction may overlap with ideas already studied. Its value will depend on whether it clarifies experience and survives direct tests. Before asking it to explain a crisis, we must ask what would count as evidence against it.

PART 7

The Flow Hijacked Synthesis and How to Test It

CHAPTER 20

Future Accessibility Through the Flow Hijacked Lens

The Flow Hijacked synthesis begins where naming a possible future leaves a question unanswered: can this person, in these circumstances, begin moving toward it? We propose studying future accessibility as the relationship between representation, value, perceived possibility, available action and usable support. The proposal draws these questions together without claiming they are one proven mechanism. Its purpose is to locate a difficulty more precisely, including when the limiting condition lies outside the person.

A state space is a mathematical way of describing combinations of conditions. Imagine a map whose coordinates record pain, arousal, perceived options and access to support, rather than streets. A person's measured state would occupy a position; successive measurements would trace movement. This is a deliberately simplified model, not a portrait of the whole person. Choosing coordinates already makes assumptions about what matters, and an omitted material obstacle can make the map misleading.

Feedback describes a change returning to influence what helped produce it. As a hypothetical example, difficulty asking for help might leave a problem unresolved, increasing distress and making another request harder. A different response might

interrupt that sequence. The arrows in this illustration are proposed causal relationships, not results established by drawing them. Research on individualized patterns suggests considerable differences between people; it does not authorize one feedback diagram for every crisis. [36]

Within a local linear approximation, which represents small changes through fixed relationships, non-normality concerns how directions of change combine. The modes need not be mutually perpendicular: their combined effects can temporarily reinforce even when the fitted model eventually settles. Such growth is possible, not guaranteed. This mathematical property says nothing about a person being abnormal and is not another word for instability. Applying it here requires estimating the interactions and testing the amplification they predict. [M1]

A resolvent describes how that stable linear model responds to continuing input at a given frequency, or rate of repetition. A large resolvent norm measures potentially large amplification for suitably directed input, within the linear approximation. Equally strong input entering differently need not produce that response. Non-normal coupling can contribute, but the two ideas are not equivalent. The FH hypothesis therefore concerns timing and direction as well as size. An intense reaction alone does not demonstrate either property. [M1]

There is a beginning, not a completed bridge, between dynamics and data. One exploratory study modeled changing relationships between the wish to live and the wish to die using weekly observations in a small clinical sample. It did not demonstrate non-normality, a high resolvent or validated prediction of an individual's next attempt. A larger study also found limited added predictive value in short-term variability. Changing states alone therefore cannot certify the proposed machinery. [40, 42]

The resulting hypothesis is conditional: under some configurations, interacting constraints may make valued possibilities less accessible, while changing an interaction or a surrounding condition may reopen a workable step. Other configurations may not follow this pattern. The framework earns a place only if it adds something beyond pain, hopelessness, entrapment and material circumstances, and if its predictions survive independent tests. The next chapter turns that obligation into questions that can receive an unwelcome answer.

CHAPTER 21

How Would We Know Whether the Framework Holds?

A compassionate explanation can still be wrong. Its emotional usefulness and its scientific validity are different questions. The strongest way to protect this framework from becoming a story that confirms itself is to specify what would count against it. Future accessibility should first be treated as a candidate construct: a proposed way of organizing measurable differences. Naming it gives us no entitlement to assume that those differences form a coherent new variable.

The first study would separate what ordinary language easily blends together. Can someone imagine a specific future? Do they value it? Does it seem possible for them? Can they identify a feasible first action, and can help actually be obtained? Questions would need development with people who have lived through crises, with attention to language and context. If the resulting answers merely reproduce existing measures of hopelessness or entrapment, the claim of a distinct construct would weaken.

Time supplies a second test. Repeated observation should establish whether a change in accessibility precedes another change, follows it or occurs alongside a common cause. Sampling must fit the claim: weekly measurements cannot settle an account of interactions unfolding within hours. Missing responses also require scrutiny rather than convenient interpretation. Existing studies demonstrate both the possibilities of repeated measurement and substantial methodological limitations; a changing graph by itself is not a causal explanation. [35, 40]

Competing explanations should be specified before inspecting the answers. A simpler account based on distress, hopelessness, entrapment or actual resource constraints might perform just as well. Models should be compared on data not used to construct them, with uncertainty and subgroup differences reported. A more complicated model has to justify its additional machinery. Current reviews of prediction research make external testing and calibration especially important: looking accurate in development does not establish useful estimates elsewhere. [33]

The mathematical claims need their own tests. Researchers would estimate how measured conditions influence subsequent change, then ask whether non-normal interactions predict temporary amplification better than simpler alternatives. A high-resolvent claim would require predictions about responses to specified patterns of input over time. Those patterns would be observed or studied within safe, ethically approved conditions, never created by provoking crisis. If results depend on arbitrary measurement scales, unstable estimates or selected episodes, the mathematical interpretation loses credibility.

An intervention study could examine whether helping make a feasible action or a supportive contact available changes accessibility before an outcome changes. Everyone would retain appropriate established care. The study would need to distinguish that proposed pathway from attention, treatment engagement and other explanations. Improvement after a package of care cannot identify its active ingredient by itself; even encouraging trial results require independent tests, as contrasting findings for a brief post-attempt intervention illustrate. [44, 51, 52]

Finally, researchers must look for the people the framework does not explain: crises with accessible futures, restricted futures without suicidal thinking, and recovery without the predicted sequence. These are not inconvenient exceptions to discard. They may reveal a limited domain, a mistaken definition or a better explanation. A useful outcome could be a narrower framework, or the decision to abandon it. The goal is knowledge that improves understanding without turning an unvalidated idea into a personal risk score.

CHAPTER 22

Restoring Possibility Without Promising Certainty

We return to the person who could describe possibilities but could not find a workable step. The illustration has not become a diagnosis. We still do not know what combination of suffering, circumstances, relationships and illness might be present. What has changed is the question. Instead of counting the doors visible to an observer, we can ask what makes approaching one of them possible for them.

There is evidence that care can change some outcomes, but its meaning depends on what was delivered and measured. Safety planning combined with follow-up was associated with less suicidal behavior in an adult emergency-care comparison; that study was not randomized and did not isolate a worksheet from the continuing contact. Evidence for safety planning as a standalone intervention in young people remains uncertain. Respect for hope includes preserving these distinctions rather than borrowing certainty across age groups. [44, 45]

The same discipline applies when an intervention initially looks promising. A small trial of a brief program after an attempt reported a substantial benefit, while a later independent trial did not reproduce its advantage. That disagreement deserves a place in an honest account of help. It does not establish that the intervention harms people, nor that listening to someone's story is unimportant. It shows why a compelling rationale and an early result cannot carry a universal promise. [51, 52]

The surrounding world also belongs in the account. Research on environmental prevention indicates that some changes limiting access to lethal means can reduce deaths, although the underlying evidence varies across interventions and settings. Protection therefore need not wait for every thought or feeling to change. This finding does not validate the future-accessibility framework. It gives a more basic reminder: the conditions around a person can be part of prevention, rather than responsibility resting entirely on the person's capacity to think differently. [53]

Accounts of recovery add something outcome counts cannot supply. People describe relationships, recognition, meaning and ways of living with difficulty; some describe living differently even when thoughts recur. These accounts do not offer a guaranteed sequence or prove that connection is a sufficient treatment. They ask us to understand recovery as more than an empty space where symptoms used to be. A life also contains participation, preferences, ordinary obligations and the ability to receive something from another person. [69, 70, 71]

For that reason, we should resist making relatives the sole keepers of possibility. The ethical direction of this lecture is shared, appropriately supported responsibility: services that can be reached, care that attends to the person, and practical conditions that make participation less burdensome. This is a commitment about how support should be organized, not a claim that any arrangement guarantees safety. Human care does not become meaningless when its outcome cannot be promised, and uncertainty does not remove the obligation to respond.

The Flow Hijacked contribution remains an invitation to examine a gap: between knowing a future could exist and finding a way to begin within it. Its scientific value will depend on tests, correction and comparison. Its human value should never depend on a reader accepting the model. Someone may need support that changes the conditions of the next hour before they can discuss the next year. We can take that need seriously without claiming to know the whole path, or asking them to promise that they already see it.

How to read the evidence

A theory can organize an important question without having established every proposed pathway. An association can be useful without revealing its direction of causation. A difference between groups can be real without predicting what one person will do. These distinctions apply throughout the lecture.

The research corpus contains 71 distinct publications, not necessarily 71 independent samples. Reviews overlap with their primary studies, and some publications reuse participants. Selection considered relevance, design, directness, replication, transparency and counterevidence. No new formal GRADE assessment or risk-of-bias rating was completed for every paper. Access ranged from relevant full-text sections to abstracts; the original annotated review documents those limits.

The outcome must remain visible: suicidal thoughts, self-harm with different intentions, attempts, emergency service use and deaths are not interchangeable. Follow-up duration, age, setting and comparator also affect what can be inferred. Medication findings in this lecture illustrate evidential distinctions; they do not recommend a treatment or medication change for an individual.

Future accessibility, interacting constraints, and the use of state-space or non-normal dynamics are presented as Flow Hijacked synthesis or research hypotheses. The selected literature does not establish them as a common mechanism, clinical diagnosis or validated risk score. A useful metaphor has to earn its scientific status through definitions, competing explanations and independent tests.

The bibliography includes the complete selected corpus, including sources used as background rather than cited in every chapter. Original publication titles are retained in both editions. Official guidance and corrections are listed separately and are not counted as additional core studies.

Selected research bibliography · 71 publications

[1] The interpersonal theory of suicide

Van Orden KA, Witte TK, Cukrowicz KC, Braithwaite SR, Selby EA, Joiner TE (2010). Psychological review.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/a0018697>

[2] The integrated motivational-volitional model of suicidal behaviour

O'Connor RC, Kirtley OJ (2018). Philosophical transactions of the Royal Society of London. Series B, Biological sciences.
<https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2017.0268>

[3] The Three-Step Theory (3ST): A New Theory of Suicide Rooted in the "Ideation-to-Action" Framework

Klonsky ED; May AM (2015). International Journal of Cognitive Therapy.
<https://doi.org/10.1521/ijct.2015.8.2.114>

[4] The interpersonal theory of suicide: A systematic review and meta-analysis of a decade of cross-national research

Chu C, Buchman-Schmitt JM, Stanley IH, Hom MA, Tucker RP, Hagan CR, Rogers ML, Podlogar MC, Chiurliza B, Ringer FB, Michaels MS, Patros CHG, Joiner TE (2017). Psychological bulletin.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/bul0000123>

[5] An Empirical Test of the Three-Step Theory of Suicide in U.K. University Students

Dhingra K, Klonsky ED, Tapola V (2019). Suicide & life-threatening behavior.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/sltb.12437>

[6] What Distinguishes Suicide Attempters From Suicide Ideators? A Meta-Analysis of Potential Factors

May AM; Klonsky ED (2016). Clinical Psychology: Science and Practice.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/cpsp.12136>

[7] A meta-analysis of perceptions of defeat and entrapment in depression, anxiety problems, posttraumatic stress disorder, and suicidality

Siddaway AP, Taylor PJ, Wood AM, Schulz J (2015). Journal of affective disorders.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jad.2015.05.046>

[8] Entrapment as a mediator of suicide crises

Li S, Yaseen ZS, Kim HJ, Briggs J, Duffy M, Frechette-Hagan A, Cohen LJ, Galynker II (2018). BMC psychiatry.
<https://doi.org/10.1186/s12888-018-1587-0>

[9] Psychological Pain in Suicidality: A Meta-Analysis

Ducasse D, Holden RR, Boyer L, Artéro S, Calati R, Guillaume S, Courtet P, Olié E (2018). The Journal of clinical psychiatry.
<https://doi.org/10.4088/jcp.16r10732>

[10] Predictive Validity of Proposed Diagnostic Criteria for the Suicide Crisis Syndrome: An Acute Presuicidal State

Yaseen ZS, Hawes M, Barzilay S, Galynker I (2019). Suicide & life-threatening behavior.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/sltb.12495>

[11] Interpersonal theory of suicide: prospective examination

Forkmann T, Glaesmer H, Paashaus L, Rath D, Schönfelder A, Stengler K, Juckel G, Assion HJ, Teismann T (2020). BJPsych open.
<https://doi.org/10.1192/bjo.2020.93>

[12] A systematic review of the studies testing the integrated motivational-volitional model of suicidal behaviour

Souza K, Sosu EM, Thomson S, Rasmussen S (2024). Health psychology review.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/17437199.2024.2336013>

[13] Why do adolescents attempt suicide? Insights from leading ideation-to-action suicide theories: a systematic review

Kirshenbaum JS, Pagliaccio D, Bitran A, Xu E, Auerbach RP (2024). Translational psychiatry.
<https://doi.org/10.1038/s41398-024-02914-y>

[14] Suicide Crisis Syndrome: examining supporting evidence and barriers to diagnostic validity

Galynker I, Cohen L, Prekas AS, Bloch-Elkouby S, King M, Apter Levy Y (2025). Frontiers in psychiatry.
<https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsy.2025.1627463>

[15] Hopelessness and eventual suicide: a 10-year prospective study of patients hospitalized with suicidal ideation

Beck AT; Steer RA; Kovacs M; Garrison B (1985). American Journal of Psychiatry, 142(5), 559–563.
<https://doi.org/10.1176/ajp.142.5.559>

[16] Depression and hopelessness as risk factors for suicide ideation, attempts and death: meta-analysis of longitudinal studies

Ribeiro JD; Huang X; Fox KR; Franklin JC (2018). *British Journal of Psychiatry*, 212(5), 279–286.
<https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.2018.27>

[17] Parasuicide, depression and the anticipation of positive and negative future experiences

MacLeod AK; Pankhania B; Lee M; Mitchell D (1997). *Psychological Medicine*, 27(4), 973–977.
<https://doi.org/10.1017/S003329179600459X>

[18] A comparison of specific positive future expectancies and global hopelessness as predictors of suicidal ideation in a prospective study of repeat self-harmers

O'Connor RC; Fraser L; Whyte MC; MacHale S; Masterton G (2008). *Journal of Affective Disorders*, 110(3), 207–214.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jad.2008.01.008>

[19] Intrapersonal positive future thinking predicts repeat suicide attempts in hospital-treated suicide attempters

O'Connor RC; Smyth R; Williams JMG (2015). *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 83(1), 169–176.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/a0037846>

[20] Defeat, Entrapment, and Positive Future Thinking: Examining Key Theoretical Predictors of Suicidal Ideation Among Adolescents

Pollak OH; Guzmán EM; Shin KE; Cha CB (2021). *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12, 590388.
<https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.590388>

[21] Examining multiple features of episodic future thinking and episodic memory among suicidal adults

Cha CB; Robinaugh DJ; Schacter DL; Altheimer G; Marx BP; Keane TM; Kearns JC; Nock MK (2022). *Suicide and Life-Threatening Behavior*, 52(3), 356–372.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/sltb.12826>

[22] An Examination of Episodic Future Thinking and Episodic Memory Among Suicidal and Nonsuicidal Adolescents

Cha CB; Nam RJ; Bell KA; Goger P; Parvez N; Pollak OH; Robinaugh DJ; Sanghvi D; Schacter DL (2024). *Journal of Clinical Child & Adolescent Psychology*, 53(6), 908–921.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/15374416.2024.2384038>

[23] The relationship between positive future thinking, entrapment, defeat and death-related mental imagery in individuals with and without a suicidal history: an experimental study

Köse G; Evans JJ; O'Connor RC (2025). *Frontiers in Psychology*, 16, 1574315.
<https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2025.1574315>

[24] Suicidal behaviour and memory: A systematic review and meta-analysis

Richard-Devantoy S; Berlim MT; Jollant F (2015). *World Journal of Biological Psychiatry*, 16(8), 544–566.
<https://doi.org/10.3109/15622975.2014.925584>

[25] Effective Problem Solving in Suicide Attempters Depends on Specific Autobiographical Recall

Pollock LR; Williams JMG (2001). *Suicide and Life-Threatening Behavior*, 31(4), 386–396.
<https://doi.org/10.1521/suli.31.4.386.22041>

[26] Cognitive inflexibility and suicidal ideation among adolescents following hospitalization: The moderating role of life stress

Cheek SM; Kudinova AY; Kuzyk EG; Goldston DB; Liu RT (2023). *Journal of Affective Disorders*, 339, 698–705.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jad.2023.07.075>

[27] Delay discounting in suicidal behavior: Myopic preference or inconsistent valuation?

Tsypes A; Szanto K; Bridge JA; Brown VM; Keilp JG; Dombrovski AY (2022). *Journal of Psychopathology and Clinical Science*, 131(1), 34–44.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/abn0000717>

[28] Exploration-Exploitation and Suicidal Behavior in Borderline Personality Disorder and Depression

Tsypes A; Hallquist MN; Ianni A; Kaurin A; Wright AGC; Dombrovski AY (2024). JAMA Psychiatry, 81(10), 1010-1019.

<https://doi.org/10.1001/jamapsychiatry.2024.1796>

[29] How Teens Imagine Tomorrow: Hopelessness and Suicidality Across Latent Classes of Episodic Future Thinking

Nam RJ; Cha CB (2026). Research on Child and Adolescent Psychopathology, 54, article 73.

<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10802-026-01466-7>

[30] Risk factors for suicidal thoughts and behaviors: A meta-analysis of 50 years of research

Franklin JC, Ribeiro JD, Fox KR, Bentley KH, Kleiman EM, Huang X, Musacchio KM, Jaroszewski AC, Chang BP, Nock MK (2017). Psychological Bulletin, 143(2), 187-232.

<https://doi.org/10.1037/bul0000084>

[31] Predicting suicidal behaviours using clinical instruments: systematic review and meta-analysis of positive predictive values for risk scales

Carter G, Milner A, McGill K, Pirkis J, Kapur N, Spittal MJ (2017). The British Journal of Psychiatry, 210(6), 387-395.

<https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.bp.116.182717>

[32] Prediction Models for Suicide Attempts and Deaths: A Systematic Review and Simulation

Belsher BE, Smolenski DJ, Pruitt LD, Bush NE, Beech EH, Workman DE, Morgan RL, Evatt DP, Tucker J, Skopp NA (2019). JAMA Psychiatry, 76(6), 642-651.

<https://doi.org/10.1001/jamapsychiatry.2019.0174>

[33] Prediction models for self-harm and suicide: a systematic review and critical appraisal

Seyedsalehi A, Bailey J, Ogonah MGT, Fanshawe TR, Fazel S (2025). BMC Medicine, 23(1), 549.

<https://doi.org/10.1186/s12916-025-04367-6>

[34] Examination of real-time fluctuations in suicidal ideation and its risk factors: Results from two ecological momentary assessment studies

Kleiman EM, Turner BJ, Fedor S, Beale EE, Huffman JC, Nock MK (2017). Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 126(6), 726-738.

<https://doi.org/10.1037/abn0000273>

[35] Don't Miss the Moment: A Systematic Review of Ecological Momentary Assessment in Suicide Research

Kivelä L, van der Does WAJ, Riese H, Antypa N (2022). Frontiers in Digital Health, 4, 876595.

<https://doi.org/10.3389/fdgth.2022.876595>

[36] Integrating a functional view on suicide risk into idiographic statistical models

Kaurin A, Dombrovski AY, Hallquist MN, Wright AGC (2022). Behaviour Research and Therapy, 150, 104012.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.brat.2021.104012>

[37] Ecological Momentary Assessments and Passive Sensing in the Prediction of Short-Term Suicidal Ideation in Young Adults

Czyz EK, King CA, Al-Dajani N, Zimmermann L, Hong V, Nahum-Shani I (2023). JAMA Network Open, 6(8), e2328005.

<https://doi.org/10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2023.28005>

[38] Examining contemporaneous and temporal associations of real-time suicidal ideation using network analysis

Kivelä LMM, Fried EI, van der Does W, Antypa N (2024). Psychological Medicine, 54(12), 3357-3365.

<https://doi.org/10.1017/s003329172400151x>

[39] Temporal dynamics of the wish to live and wish to die signal near-term increases in suicidal thinking in a veteran sample

Bryan CJ, Daruwala SE, Bozzay ML (2025). *Journal of Psychiatric Research*, 189, 471-478.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpsychires.2025.06.039>

[40] Changing temporal patterns in patient-reported wish to live and wish to die signal the imminent emergence and aftermath of suicide attempts: a dynamical systems analysis

Bryan CJ, Bozzay ML, Hay J, Starkey A, Tabares JV, Baker JC (2025). *BMC Psychiatry*, 25(1), 884.
<https://doi.org/10.1186/s12888-025-07295-0>

[41] Risk factors of transition from suicidal ideation to suicide attempt: A one-year longitudinal study among hospital-based in- and outpatients

Nobile B, Gourguechon-Buot E, Olié E, Courtet P (2025). *Journal of Affective Disorders*, 390, 119854.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jad.2025.119854>

[42] The association of short-term variability in suicidal ideation with subsequent suicidal thoughts and behaviours: Longitudinal cohort study

Batterham PJ, O'Dea B, Borschmann R, Caelear AL, Farrer LM, Han J, Gendi M, Heffernan C, Christensen H (2026). *Behaviour Research and Therapy*, 202, 105049.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.brat.2026.105049>

[43] Experience Sampling of Future Thinking and Suicidal Ideation Among Adolescents

Cha CB, Shin KEK, Parvez N, Nam R, Bassing M (2026). *Archives of Suicide Research*, advance online publication, 1–19.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/13811118.2026.2670722>

[44] Comparison of the Safety Planning Intervention With Follow-up vs Usual Care of Suicidal Patients Treated in the Emergency Department

Stanley B; Brown GK; Brenner LA; Galfalvy HC; Currier GW; Knox KL; Chaudhury SR; Bush AL; Green KL (2018). *JAMA Psychiatry*.
<https://doi.org/10.1001/jamapsychiatry.2018.1776>

[45] Safety Planning Interventions for Suicide Prevention in Children and Adolescents: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis

Albaum C; Irwin SH; Muha J; Schumacher A; Clarissa S; Finkelstein Y; Bridge JA; Korczak DJ (2025). *JAMA Pediatrics*.
<https://doi.org/10.1001/jamapediatrics.2025.1012>

[46] Effectiveness of brief interventions and contacts after suicide attempt: a systematic review and meta-analysis

Homan S; Marciniak MA; Michel S; Bertram AM; Rühlmann C; Pethő A; Kirchhofer L; Biele L; Segerer R; Homan P; Olbrich S; O'Connor RC; Kleim B (2026). *eClinicalMedicine*.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eclinm.2026.103824>

[47] Effect of an Emergency Department Process Improvement Package on Suicide Prevention: The ED-SAFE 2 Cluster Randomized Clinical Trial

Boudreaux ED; Larkin C; Sefair AV; Ma Y; Li YF; Ibrahim AF; Zeger W; Brown GK; Pelletier L; Miller I; ED-SAFE 2 Investigators (2023). *JAMA Psychiatry*.
<https://doi.org/10.1001/jamapsychiatry.2023.1304>

[48] Telehealth Brief Cognitive Behavioral Therapy for Suicide Prevention: A Randomized Clinical Trial

Baker JC; Starkey A; Ammendola E; Bauder CR; Daruwala SE; Hiser J; Khazem LR; Rademacher K; Hay J; Bryan AO; Bryan CJ (2024). *JAMA Network Open*.
<https://doi.org/10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2024.45913>

[49] Efficacy of Dialectical Behavior Therapy for Adolescents at High Risk for Suicide: A Randomized Clinical Trial

McCauley E; Berk MS; Asarnow JR; Adrian M; Cohen J; Korslund K; Avina C; Hughes J; Harned M; Gallop R; Linehan MM (2018). JAMA Psychiatry.
<https://doi.org/10.1001/jamapsychiatry.2018.1109>

[50] The effectiveness of the Collaborative Assessment and Management of Suicidality (CAMS) compared to alternative treatment conditions: A meta-analysis

Swift JK; Trusty WT; Penix EA (2021). Suicide and Life-Threatening Behavior.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/sltb.12765>

[51] A Novel Brief Therapy for Patients Who Attempt Suicide: A 24-months Follow-Up Randomized Controlled Study of the Attempted Suicide Short Intervention Program (ASSIP)

Gysin-Maillart A; Schwab S; Soravia L; Megert M; Michel K (2016). PLOS Medicine.
<https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pmed.1001968>

[52] Randomized controlled trial for the Attempted Suicide Short Intervention Program (ASSIP): An independent non-replication study

Monn A; Villar de Araujo T; Rüesch A; Kronenberg G; Hörmann C; Adank A; Roman Z; Schoretsanitis G; Rufer M; Seifritz E; Kleim B; Olbrich S (2025). Journal of Affective Disorders.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jad.2025.04.023>

[53] Effectiveness of suicide means restriction: an overview of systematic reviews

Steege S; Ledden S; Marzano L; Dutta R; Quinlivan L; Kapur N; John A; Webb RT (2025). BMJ Mental Health.
<https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjment-2025-302069>

[54] The efficacy of lithium in the treatment of suicidal ideation, behavior and suicide: An updated systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials

Wang JX; Le GH; Wong S; Teopiz KM; Kwan ATH; Rosenblat JD; Rhee TG; Ho R; Lo HKY; Goldberg JF; Vinberg M; Grande I; Mansur R; Meyer JM; McIntyre RS (2025). Journal of Affective Disorders.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jad.2025.119487>

[55] Ketamine for the acute treatment of severe suicidal ideation: double blind, randomised placebo controlled trial

Abbar M; Demattei C; El-Hage W; Llorca PM; Samalin L; Demaricourt P; Gaillard R; Courtet P; Vaiva G; Gorwood P; Fabbro P; Jollant F (2022). BMJ.
<https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj-2021-067194>

[56] Effect of crisis response planning vs. contracts for safety on suicide risk in U.S. Army Soldiers: A randomized clinical trial

Bryan CJ; Mintz J; Clemans TA; Leeson B; Burch TS; Williams SR; Maney E; Rudd MD (2017). Journal of Affective Disorders.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jad.2017.01.028>

[57] Cognitive Behavior Therapy With and Without Narrative Assessment and Suicide Attempts: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis

Janssen WC; Mérelle SYM; van Ballegooijen W; Gilissen R; Bockting CLH (2025). JAMA Network Open.
<https://doi.org/10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2025.44632>

[58] The Effectiveness of Dialectical Behavior Therapy in Reducing Self-Directed Violence and Suicidality in Usual Care Settings: A Meta-Analysis

Maxwell CA; Holland KE; Young L; Chen EY; Olino T; Kendall PC (2026). Journal of Clinical Psychology.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/jclp.70195>

[59] Loneliness as a predictor of suicidal ideation and behaviour: a systematic review and meta-analysis of prospective studies

McClelland H; Evans JJ; Nowland R; Ferguson E; O'Connor RC (2020). Journal of Affective Disorders, 274, 880–896.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jad.2020.05.004>

[60] A longitudinal test of the predictions of the interpersonal-psychological theory of suicidal behaviour for passive and active suicidal ideation in a large community-based cohort

Batterham PJ; Walker J; Leach LS; Ma J; Caelear AL; Christensen H (2018). *Journal of Affective Disorders*, 227, 97–102.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jad.2017.10.005>

[61] Does social support prevent suicidal ideation in women and men? Gender-sensitive analyses of an important protective factor within prospective community cohorts

Otten D; Ernst M; Tibubos AN; Brähler E; Fleischer T; Schomerus G; Wild PS; Zöller D; Binder H; Kruse J; Johar H; Atasoy S; Grabe HJ; Ladwig KH; Münzel T; Völzke H; König J; Beutel ME (2022). *Journal of Affective Disorders*, 306, 157–166.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jad.2022.03.031>

[62] Disclosure of suicidal ideation and behaviours: A systematic review and meta-analysis of prevalence

Hallford DJ; Rusanov D; Winestone B; Kaplan R; Fuller-Tyszkiewicz M; Melvin G (2023). *Clinical Psychology Review*, 101, 102272.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cpr.2023.102272>

[63] Factors Influencing Professional Help-Seeking for Suicidality

Han J; Batterham PJ; Caelear AL; Randall R (2018). *Crisis*, 39(3), 175–196.

<https://doi.org/10.1027/0227-5910/a000485>

[64] A meta-analysis of acute use of alcohol and the risk of suicide attempt

Borges G; Bagge CL; Cherpitel CJ; Conner KR; Orozco R; Rossow I (2017). *Psychological Medicine*, 47(5), 949–957.

<https://doi.org/10.1017/S0033291716002841>

[65] Sleep and suicide: A systematic review and meta-analysis of longitudinal studies

Liu RT; Steele SJ; Hamilton JL; Do QBP; Furbish K; Burke TA; Martinez AP; Gerlus N (2020). *Clinical Psychology Review*, 81, 101895.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cpr.2020.101895>

[66] Are stressful life events prospectively associated with increased suicidal ideation and behaviour? A systematic review and meta-analysis

Howarth EJ; O'Connor DB; Panagioti M; Hodkinson A; Wilding S; Johnson J (2020). *Journal of Affective Disorders*, 266, 731–742.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jad.2020.01.171>

[67] Childhood maltreatment and adult suicidality: a comprehensive systematic review with meta-analysis

Angelakis I; Gillespie EL; Panagioti M (2019). *Psychological Medicine*, 49(7), 1057–1078.

<https://doi.org/10.1017/S0033291718003823>

[68] Cross-national analysis of the associations among mental disorders and suicidal behavior: findings from the WHO World Mental Health Surveys

Nock MK; Hwang I; Sampson N; Kessler RC; Angermeyer M; Beautrais A; Borges G; Bromet E; Bruffaerts R; de Girolamo G; de Graaf R; Florescu S; Gureje O; Haro JM; Hu C; Huang Y; Karam EG; Kawakami N; Kovess V; Levinson D; Posada-Villa J; Sagar R; Tomov T; Viana MC; Williams DR (2009). *PLoS Medicine*, 6(8), e1000123.

<https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pmed.1000123>

[69] How people live with or get over being suicidal: a review of qualitative studies

Lakeman R; FitzGerald M (2008). *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 64(2), 114–126.

<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2648.2008.04773.x>

[70] Professional Care Experiences of Persons With Suicidal Ideation and Behavior: Model Development Based on a Qualitative Meta-Synthesis

Hechinger M; Fringer A (2021). *JMIR Formative Research*, 5(10), e27676.

<https://doi.org/10.2196/27676>

[71] The lived experience of persons who attempt suicide: a bottom-up review co-designed, co-produced and co-written by experts by experience and academics

Fusar-Poli P; Esposito CM; Estradé A; Rosfort R; Mancini M; Jackman M; Sugianto A; Berk E; Prawira B; Wangui LN; Agaba A; Cullen J; O'Connor RR; Marsh I; Shamsaei F; Bonoldi I; Stefana A; Damiani S; Basadonne I; Singh A; Fontana S; Curti I; Massari L; Legittimo A; Cortese S; Yon DK; Shin JI; Madeira L; Stanghellini G; Rossi Monti M; Ratcliffe M; Pompili M; Maj M (2026). *World Psychiatry*, 25(1), 34–49.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/wps.70003>

Mathematical background

[M1] Trefethen, L. N., & Embree, M. (2005). *Spectra and Pseudospectra: The Behavior of Nonnormal Matrices and Operators*. Princeton University Press. Mathematical background, outside the 71-publication clinical corpus.

Author's book listing · Oxford Pseudospectra Gateway: introduction to non-normality, resolvent norms and transient behavior.

Official guidance and source corrections

NICE NG225: Self-harm: assessment, management and preventing recurrence (2022), recommendations 1.6 and 1.11.

<https://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/ng225/chapter/recommendations>

WHO: Preventing suicide: a resource for media professionals, update 2023.

<https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/9789240076846>

Correction to Albaum et al., Safety Planning Interventions for Suicide Prevention in Children and Adolescents (2026).

<https://doi.org/10.1001/jamapediatrics.2026.2781>

Correction to Pollak et al., Defeat, Entrapment, and Positive Future Thinking (2021).

<https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.741504>

ERAN: Emotional support and current service hours.

<https://www.eran.org.il/online-emotional-help/>

Magen David Adom: Contacting emergency medical services, 101.

<https://www.mdais.org/101/howto-ambulance>