DEVELOPMENT OF A MENU OF POLICY OPTIONS AND COST-EFFECTIVE INTERVENTIONS TO PROMOTE MENTAL HEALTH AND WELL-BEING - FINLAND

Finland thanks for the opportunity to provide comments on the draft menu of policy options and cost-effective interventions on mental health and well-being. We welcome that the document recognizes the limits of assessing cost-effectiveness separately. We note the following:

- The three population based economic analyses differ in relevance to countries, for example a and b entail a prerequisite that children are enrolled in schools, and c may be more relevant in low / lower middle-income countries where pesticides are a more common method of suicide.
- There are no Nordic countries represented in the list of 10 upper-middle and high-income countries.
- The point “It should be emphasized that global analyses such as these should be accompanied by analyses in the local context. Other tools, such as the One Health Tool are available to help individual countries cost specific interventions in their national context” is very relevant. Despite grouping the 20 countries in two categories, it is important to recognize the difficulty of making global generalisations.
- All individual interventions are mainly medical. We would be supportive of including more preventive interventions. It would also address the question of which is the most cost-effective: primary, secondary or tertiary intervention.
- Interventions in the work place should be included, including preventive interventions, workplace accommodation in case of mental illness, and measures on return to work.
- Finland has good practices from school based interventions which we are pleased to share, including a) the Kiva koulu (”nice school”) anti-bullying intervention for schools and b) mental health skills being included in the curriculum of primary schools (promotion and prevention).