Saudi Journal of Medicine and Public Health

https://saudijmph.com/index.php/pub

https://doi.org/10.64483/202522439

Aggression: Health Security Risk Assessment, Prevention Strategies, and Incident Response in Healthcare and Community Settings

Yahya Idris Nasser Qadh [(1)] , Salman Fahad Alsharif [(2)] , Ali Abdullah Aljameeli [(3)] , Bader Eid Mohammed Aleutayaybi [(4)] , Badriah Sapeel Alrashidi [(5)] , Huda Sapeel Alrashidi [(5)] , Bander Sapeel Alrashidi [(6)] , Susan Abdulaziz Al-Rafdan [(7)] , Saleh Khaled Suleiman Al-Habib [(8)] , Anwar Nawaf Alrashidi [(9)] , Rawan Oqab Ghazi Bin Omirah [(10)] , Khalid Thamer Alruqi [(11)]

(1) Al-Hama Health Center In Jazan,Ministry of Health, Saudi Arabia,
(2) Albaha , Long Term Hospital,Ministry of Health, Saudi Arabia,
(3) Hafr Al-Batin Arada Hospital & Mental Health,Ministry of Health, Saudi Arabia,
(4) Mohammadiyah Health Center - Sager,Ministry of Health, Saudi Arabia,
(5) Remah Hospital,Ministry of Health, Saudi Arabia,
(6) Hospital Management Specialist,Ministry of Health, Saudi Arabia,
(7) King Khalid Hospital In Al-Kharj, Ministry Of Health, Saudi Arabia,
(8) Long Term Care Hospital Riyadh,Ministry of Health, Saudi Arabia,
(9) Hospital For Long-Term Care,Ministry of Health, Saudi Arabia,
(10) Hittin PHC,Ministry of Health, Saudi Arabia,
(11) Al-Bashayer General Hospital, Ministry of Health, Saudi Arabia

Abstract

Background: Aggression and violence in healthcare and community settings pose significant health security risks, impacting patient safety, staff wellbeing, and continuity of care. These behaviors often arise from complex interactions among biological, psychological, and social determinants.

Aim: To examine aggression as a multidimensional phenomenon, outline its etiologies, epidemiology, pathophysiology, and propose evidence-based strategies for assessment, prevention, and management.

Methods: A comprehensive review of clinical frameworks, epidemiologic data, and operational protocols was conducted, integrating psychiatric, neurologic, and sociocultural perspectives. The analysis emphasizes structured risk assessment, mental status examination, and interdisciplinary management approaches.

Results: Aggression is frequently linked to psychiatric disorders (e.g., psychosis, bipolar disorder), substance intoxication or withdrawal, neurocognitive decline, and environmental stressors. U.S. data indicate persistent violence burden, with over 1.2 million violent crimes annually and high firearm involvement. Neurobiological findings highlight dysregulation in prefrontal-limbic circuits, serotonergic and dopaminergic pathways, and hormonal influences. Effective management combines early recognition, de-escalation, pharmacologic intervention when indicated, and environmental modifications. Interprofessional collaboration and structured safety protocols significantly reduce escalation and improve outcomes.

Conclusion: Aggression is not a singular entity but a transdiagnostic risk state requiring integrated medical, psychiatric, and social interventions. Prevention and treatment strategies must prioritize dynamic risk factors, continuity of care, and staff training to mitigate harm and enhance safety culture.

Keywords: Aggression, violence, health security, risk assessment, de-escalation, neurobiology, psychiatric disorders, substance use.

Introduction

Aggression and violence constitute persistent challenges at the intersection of clinical care, public health, and health security, affecting the safety of patients, healthcare workers, and communities. Recognizing the breadth of this problem, the World Health Assembly in 1996 declared violence a major public health issue.[1] In practical clinical environments, aggression is not an abstract concept but a recurrent presentation that demands immediate assessment, risk management, and coordinated response. Clinicians across emergency, inpatient, outpatient, and community settings are routinely required to evaluate patients who display agitation, hostility, threatening behavior, or overt violence.[2] Consequently, aggression must be understood not only as a symptom requiring diagnosis and treatment, but also as a safety-critical event with implications for workplace security, continuity of care, and community protection. Within

*Corresponding author e-mail: Yqadh@Moh.Gov.Sa (Yahya Idris Nasser Qadh).
Receive Date: 01 December 2025, Revise Date: 28 December 2025, Accept Date: 31 December 2025

clinical education and practice, it is often necessary to consider aggression and violence together because they frequently overlap in presentation, escalation pathways, and mitigation strategies. Aggression can be defined as any behavior—including verbal threats—that involves attacking another person, animal, or object with the intent to harm the target. Violence represents a related but more physically enacted construct, involving the intentional use of physical force to injure, damage, or kill someone or something. These definitions underscore that aggression is not limited to physical acts; verbal intimidation, menacing gestures, and destructive behaviors may represent early indicators of escalating risk. For health security specialists, this continuum is particularly important: early recognition of pre-violent warning signs allows for timely de-escalation, safer environmental controls, and mobilization of appropriate resources before harm occurs [1][2]. Effective management begins with accurate clinical characterization. Aggressive behavior may arise from diverse etiologies, including acute psychiatric conditions, substance intoxication or withdrawal, delirium and other neurocognitive syndromes, medication effects, pain, metabolic or neurologic illness, and psychosocial stressors. The central clinical task is therefore to integrate a comprehensive history with targeted physical and mental status examinations to identify contributory factors, determine the degree of imminent risk, and formulate an appropriate differential diagnosis. This structured approach is essential because the management plan—ranging from verbal de-escalation and environmental modification to urgent medical treatment and, when necessary, pharmacologic sedation—depends on the underlying cause. Ultimately, accurate diagnosis and timely intervention improve patient outcomes while simultaneously protecting staff, other patients, and the surrounding community [1][2][3].

Etiology

The etiology of aggression is multifactorial and best understood through an integrated framework that accounts for biological vulnerability, psychological states and disorders, and the socioeconomic environments in which individuals live and interact. In clinical and health-security settings, this multidimensional perspective is essential because aggressive behavior is rarely attributable to a single cause; rather, it commonly emerges from the interaction of predisposing factors that shape baseline risk, precipitating triggers that initiate escalation, and perpetuating conditions that sustain dysregulation over time. Accordingly, a comprehensive etiologic formulation supports both accurate diagnosis and practical risk mitigation. Biological influences encompass inherited predispositions, acute and chronic medical illness, neuropsychiatric pathology, and physiologic mechanisms that modulate impulse control and threat responsiveness. Genetic factors can confer a baseline susceptibility to heightened reactivity or impaired behavioral inhibition, particularly when combined with adverse developmental exposures. Medical and psychiatric diseases may directly provoke aggression via altered cognition, perception, and arousal, as seen in delirium, traumatic brain injury, neurodegenerative disorders, or psychotic syndromes. Neurotransmitter systems and hormonal influences are also relevant, as dysregulation in pathways governing serotonin, dopamine, and stress hormones can affect irritability, impulsivity, and affective volatility. Substance use is a prominent biologic and behavioral driver, with intoxication and withdrawal states altering judgment, lowering inhibition, and amplifying threat perception. Medications can contribute as well, either through adverse effects such as akathisia and agitation or through interactions that destabilize mood and sleep. Psychological contributors include a broad spectrum of DSM–5 diagnoses associated with agitation, impaired reality testing, affective instability, or maladaptive coping. These include, but are not limited to, bipolar affective disorder, schizophrenia, major depression, generalized anxiety disorder, and antisocial personality disorder.[3] Importantly, aggression may reflect not only the presence of a formal psychiatric disorder but also acute psychological stress, trauma-related hyperarousal, or learned behavioral responses to perceived threat or loss of control. Psychological factors frequently determine the immediate meaning of an encounter to the patient—whether it is experienced as humiliating, threatening, or coercive—thereby shaping escalation dynamics. Socioeconomic determinants operate at multiple levels, including interpersonal relationships, family systems, social networks, group norms, neighborhood stability, economic insecurity, and cultural expectations. These conditions may increase exposure to violence, normalize aggressive responses, restrict access to supportive services, or intensify chronic stressors that reduce tolerance for frustration.[4][5] In many real-world cases, biological, psychological, and socioeconomic factors act concomitantly, producing a cumulative risk profile in which aggression becomes more likely, more severe, or more difficult to de-escalate without coordinated clinical and security-informed intervention [2][3][4][5].

Epidemiology

Violence remains a pervasive phenomenon in the United States, exerting a sustained burden on population health and public safety, even as certain aggregate indicators suggest a modest downward trend in recent years. National surveillance illustrates this pattern: the Federal Bureau of Investigation documented approximately 1.2 million violent crimes in 2023, representing a slight decline from roughly 1.23 million incidents reported in 2022. Although year-to-year reductions may reflect favorable changes in specific contexts, the overall volume underscores that violence continues to constitute a high-frequency

societal exposure with clinically meaningful consequences. Importantly, the distribution of violence is not uniform across populations. The Centers for Disease Control emphasizes that youth and young adults between 10 and 34 years of age—particularly those from Black or Latino communities—experience a disproportionate share of community violence, highlighting persistent structural and social inequities that shape risk, exposure, and downstream health outcomes.[6] Patterns of weapon involvement further clarify the lethality and clinical complexity of violent events. Data describing weapon use in violent crime indicate that firearms are prominently implicated across multiple offense categories, being used in 69% of murders, 40% of robberies, and 21.6% of aggravated assaults. These figures illustrate not only the prevalence of firearms in interpersonal violence but also their role in amplifying injury severity, case fatality, and demand for acute care resources. Alongside community and weapon-related violence, interpersonal and sexual violence represent a parallel and substantial epidemiologic domain. Reported rates of intimate partner violence demonstrate a striking frequency of physical abuse, with incidents affecting individuals at a pace that translates into more than 12 million women and men experiencing physical abuse each year. Such data reflect the recurrent nature of violence within domestic and relational contexts, where episodes are often repetitive, underreported, and associated with cumulative physical and psychological harm [4][5][6].

Sexual violence constitutes a major public health concern. Lifetime prevalence estimates indicate that one in five women and one in 71 men in the United States have experienced rape, and a substantial proportion of victims—nearly half of women (46.7%) and men (44.9%)—report knowing the perpetrator. These observations reinforce that sexual violence frequently arises within familiar or trusted social networks rather than solely through stranger assault, which has implications for prevention strategies, forensic evaluation pathways, and trauma-informed care. Children are also affected both directly and indirectly; approximately one in 15 children is exposed annually to intimate partner violence, and the large majority of these children (about 90%) witness the violence, placing them at elevated risk for adverse developmental, behavioral, and long-term health sequelae. From a clinical systems perspective, violence generates a substantial volume of fatal and nonfatal injury. Estimates indicate more than 16,000 homicides each year and approximately 1.6 million nonfatal assault-related injuries requiring emergency department treatment annually.[7] In comparative terms, the United States experiences a markedly higher homicide burden than peer high-income nations, with an overall homicide rate estimated to be 7.5 times higher than the combined rate in other high-income countries—a disparity largely attributed to a firearm homicide rate reported to be approximately 25 times higher.[8] Collectively, these epidemiologic patterns underscore violence as a persistent driver of preventable morbidity and mortality, demanding coordinated prevention, clinical readiness, and evidence-informed policy responses [5][6][7][8].

Pathophysiology

The pathophysiology of aggression reflects a dynamic convergence of biologic predispositions, psychological processes, and sociocultural determinants that collectively shape the probability, form, and intensity of violent behavior. Although the operational definition of aggression is conceptually straightforward, the mechanisms that generate aggressive states and translate them into harmful actions are complex, context-dependent, and frequently characterized by interacting pathways that can appear contradictory at first glance. Contemporary models therefore conceptualize aggression not as a unitary phenomenon, but as an emergent behavioral outcome arising from dysregulation of neural circuits responsible for threat appraisal, emotional arousal, impulse control, and social cognition, all embedded within environmental conditions that can amplify stress and reduce adaptive coping capacity. Within this framework, biologic factors often influence baseline vulnerability and reactivity, psychological factors influence perception and interpretation of threat, and social determinants govern exposure to stressors, access to protective resources, and the normalization or reinforcement of aggressive responses. From a neurobiological perspective, aggressive behavior is closely linked to the integrity of fronto-limbic systems. The prefrontal cortex, particularly medial and orbitofrontal regions, is central to executive functioning, inhibitory control, and moral reasoning. Diminished activity or structural compromise in these areas is repeatedly associated with impulsive or reactive aggression, as the capacity to suppress maladaptive impulses and evaluate consequences becomes attenuated. In contrast, limbic structures—especially the amygdala—mediate rapid detection of salient stimuli, threat learning, and the orchestration of autonomic arousal. A pattern of heightened amygdala responsiveness coupled with reduced prefrontal regulatory activity is frequently described as a neurofunctional signature of increased violence risk, because threat signals are amplified while top-down control is weakened. Neurodegenerative and acquired brain conditions can reproduce this imbalance. Lesions, traumatic brain injury, and the neuronal changes seen in disorders such as Alzheimer disease may erode inhibitory pathways and executive judgment, allowing aggressive impulses to manifest with fewer internal restraints. These observations emphasize that aggression is often less a deliberate

moral choice than an expression of impaired regulatory capacity interacting with provocation, distress, or misperceived threat [8][9].

Genetic contributions to aggression are best understood as probabilistic rather than deterministic influences that alter susceptibility through neurochemical and developmental pathways.[9] Sex differences provide a prominent epidemiologic and biological signal; male gender is consistently associated with higher perpetration rates of serious violence. This association is plausibly mediated through both androgenic effects on neural development and arousal, and through socialization processes that shape norms of dominance and behavioral expression, making biologic and sociocultural mechanisms difficult to separate. Certain genetic variants, including allelic differences affecting monoamine metabolism, have been implicated in aggression by altering neurotransmitter tone and stress responsivity. A well-cited example involves variants influencing monoamine oxidase (MAO) activity, which affects serotonin metabolism. In such contexts, the relationship between serotonin levels and aggression is not linear; both excess and deficiency have been associated with aggressive behavior, suggesting that dysregulation and impaired modulation—rather than absolute direction of change—may be the critical pathogenic feature. Where impaired MAO activity contributes to altered serotonin handling, aggression appears particularly likely when compounded by adverse psychosocial stressors, illustrating gene–environment interaction as a core mechanism rather than an ancillary detail. Neurotransmitter systems constitute another foundational domain of the biologic substrate of aggression. Serotonin has been linked to impulsivity and affective instability, with low serotonergic tone associated with depression, suicidality, and violence.[11] Conversely, excessive serotonergic activity has also been described in association with aggression in specific biologic contexts, particularly when metabolism is impaired.[10] Dopaminergic excess is likewise associated with heightened salience attribution, paranoia, and behavioral disorganization, which can elevate violence risk when threat misinterpretation or command phenomena occur. Clinically, such mechanisms are observed in psychotic disorders where dopaminergic dysregulation is a central feature, and in Parkinson disease when dopamine-enhancing therapies increase dopaminergic tone, occasionally precipitating paranoia, agitation, or aggressive behavior.[12] These neurochemical pathways do not operate in isolation; they interact with cortical-limbic circuitry and with stress systems that modulate arousal thresholds and reactivity [8][9][10][11][12].

Hormonal influences provide an additional layer of biologic explanation. Testosterone is widely implicated in aggression, not only in men but also in women exposed to exogenous androgen therapy, suggesting that androgenic effects can influence dominance-related behaviors, irritability, and risk-taking.[13] Stress hormones, particularly glucocorticoids, also appear relevant. Low basal glucocorticoid states have been correlated with aggressive behavior, potentially reflecting diminished physiologic braking of arousal or altered fear conditioning, whereas iatrogenic exposure to high-dose glucocorticoids can precipitate mood dysregulation, agitation, and, in some cases, violent behavior. Importantly, these hormonal associations do not imply inevitability; rather, they identify biologic conditions that can shift the reactivity landscape, making aggression more likely when provocation, intoxication, or psychiatric symptoms are present. Medical illness contributes to aggression through multiple mechanisms, including direct neurocognitive disruption, physiologic distress, and untreated symptom burden. Epilepsy, particularly when seizure activity involves temporal or frontal networks, has been associated with behavioral changes that may include aggression. Severe respiratory distress, as may occur in asthma or chronic obstructive pulmonary disease, can precipitate agitation and aggressive responses in moments of perceived suffocation, in which panic physiology intensifies defensive behavior. Among medical precipitants, pain occupies a central role because it is both common and powerfully dysregulating. Severe pain can narrow attentional focus, heighten irritability, and reduce the capacity for self-regulation, leading individuals to "strike out" as an expression of intolerable discomfort. Clinically, this reinforces a critical principle: aggression may signal unmet medical needs, and effective de-escalation often requires prompt recognition and treatment of underlying physiologic drivers rather than exclusively behavioral containment [12][13].

Substance use represents one of the most clinically salient and operationally important precipitants of aggression, because intoxication and withdrawal can acutely alter perception, judgment, and impulse control.[14][15] Alcohol is particularly prominent due to its prevalence and its capacity to reduce inhibitory control and disinhibit previously regulated affect, including rage.[16][17][18] Stimulants such as cocaine and amphetamines can elevate arousal, paranoia, and impulsivity, thereby increasing the risk of violent behavior.[19] Hallucinogens, including lysergic acid diethylamide (LSD) and related compounds, may precipitate frightening perceptual distortions or command-like experiences that facilitate defensive or retaliatory violence. Phencyclidine (PCP) is classically associated with profound behavioral dysregulation, diminished pain perception, and perceptions of invulnerability, which can translate into severe aggression; reports of homicide associated with PCP intoxication underscore its potential lethality. Anabolic-androgenic steroids, often used for

performance or physique enhancement, have also been associated with rage-like aggression, plausibly mediated through androgenic effects on mood and arousal. These substance-related mechanisms are clinically significant for health security teams because they are often accompanied by unpredictable escalation, reduced responsiveness to verbal de-escalation, and heightened risk of injury to staff and bystanders. Iatrogenic factors, including prescribed medications, must also be considered. Certain antidepressants have been associated with emergent suicidal and, more rarely, homicidal ideation, particularly in pediatric populations, underscoring the importance of close monitoring during initiation and dose changes.[20] Dopaminergic therapies for Parkinson disease, such as carbidopa-levodopa, can precipitate paranoia and agitation in susceptible individuals, which may in turn promote aggression. Corticosteroids such as dexamethasone are well known to produce neuropsychiatric effects, including irritability, insomnia, mood lability, and, in some cases, behavioral dyscontrol with violent episodes. These medication-related pathways highlight that aggression can be a treatment-emergent adverse effect and must be evaluated through careful medication reconciliation and temporal correlation rather than assumed to reflect purely psychiatric pathology [16][17][18][19][20].

Psychological mechanisms provide the interpretive and experiential substrate through which biologic vulnerability translates into behavior. Several DSM–5 diagnoses explicitly include risk of harm to others as part of their clinical picture, including bipolar disorder, schizophrenia, major neurocognitive disorders, post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD), and acute stress disorder. In bipolar disorder, manic states can produce heightened psychomotor activity, decreased need for sleep, irritability, and grandiosity. Grandiose delusions may amplify entitlement and conflict escalation, particularly when the individual perceives others as disrespectful or obstructive, thereby increasing the probability of combative behavior. In schizophrenia, aggression may occur in the context of paranoid delusions, misinterpretation of benign stimuli as threatening, or command hallucinations that instruct the patient to harm others. Major neurocognitive disorders, including Alzheimer disease, illustrate a different pathway: as executive functioning declines, inhibitory control weakens and judgment becomes impaired, allowing impulsive or defensive aggression to emerge, particularly in overstimulating environments such as long-term care facilities or inpatient units treating traumatic brain injury. Stress-related disorders emphasize the role of threat conditioning and hyperarousal. PTSD is characterized by hypervigilance, intrusive re-experiencing, nightmares, and exaggerated startle responses, all of which can prime individuals for defensive aggression when triggered by cues reminiscent of prior trauma. In acute stress disorder, similar mechanisms may occur in the immediate aftermath of traumatic exposure. The “fight-or-flight” physiology that accompanies overwhelming stress can narrow cognitive flexibility, heighten autonomic arousal, and bias interpretation toward threat, increasing the likelihood of aggression in situations perceived as coercive, unpredictable, or humiliating. Childhood and adolescent disorders also contribute meaningfully. Conduct disorder and attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder (ADHD) are associated with impulsivity, rule-breaking, and difficulty with behavioral inhibition, while autism spectrum disorders may be associated with aggression under conditions of sensory overload, communication barriers, low frustration tolerance, or abrupt changes in routine.[21] These patterns underscore that aggression in youth may reflect developmental vulnerabilities interacting with environmental demands rather than simple volitional misconduct [19][20][21].

Intellectual disability can further increase risk when individuals face tasks or social situations that exceed their adaptive capacity, as aggression may become a maladaptive coping mechanism in response to confusion, perceived threat, or inability to communicate distress.[22] Personality pathology also contributes via enduring patterns of interpersonal dysfunction and affect regulation difficulties. Antisocial personality traits may include diminished empathy and heightened instrumental aggression driven by egocentric goals, whereas borderline personality disorder may involve intense affective reactivity, abandonment fears, and boundary instability, which can culminate in aggressive outbursts when the individual feels overwhelmed. Intermittent explosive disorder centers aggression as a primary symptom, reflecting recurrent episodes of behavioral dyscontrol disproportionate to provocation. Beyond diagnostic categories, a critical clinical insight is that aggression can arise in ordinary psychological states: fear, shame, disorientation, frustration, and perceived loss of control can all precipitate aggressive behavior, particularly when combined with intoxication, sleep deprivation, or environmental overstimulation. Sociocultural and economic determinants operate as upstream drivers that shape exposure to violence, chronic stress, and the availability of protective buffers. The environment influences aggression across multiple levels—interpersonal, social, group, neighborhood, economic, and cultural—creating conditions that can increase the likelihood of violent events and sustain cycles of retaliatory harm. At the interpersonal level, domestic violence is a prominent and devastating manifestation, often driven by jealousy, fear of abandonment, domination, and coercive control dynamics.[23][24][25] Such relationships can

escalate to lethal outcomes, including homicide or suicide, and can also encompass child abuse and elder abuse. Institutional environments may similarly concentrate interpersonal stress and conflict. Geriatric units and long-term care facilities may generate emotionally charged encounters related to dependency, cognitive impairment, and loss of autonomy, contributing to aggression.[26] Psychiatric inpatient units, where patients may experience acute agitation, psychosis, or perceived coercion, are likewise settings in which violence can emerge.[27] Carceral settings such as prisons and jails, characterized by crowding, hierarchy, and limited autonomy, often exhibit elevated baseline violence risk.[28] Bullying represents both a form of aggression and a precursor to escalation, with potential to generate victimization, retaliation, and broader social harm.[18][29]

At the social level, chronic frustration and perceived injustice can accumulate over time, a process sometimes conceptualized as an "incubation period" in which stressors build until a threshold is crossed. Sociological constructs such as "relative deprivation" describe how partial gains by an oppressed group may paradoxically increase anger by highlighting what remains inaccessible, potentially intensifying collective agitation and increasing the risk of aggressive mobilization. For individuals, repeated daily stressors—economic insecurity, discrimination, unstable housing, and limited access to healthcare—can erode coping reserves and increase irritability, lowering the threshold for aggression during interpersonal conflict. In such contexts, aggression may be less about innate predisposition and more about chronic physiologic stress, reduced opportunities for self-regulation, and exposure to violence as a normalized problem-solving strategy. Group-level factors further influence aggressive behavior through crowd dynamics and social contagion. When large numbers of people assemble, the probability of aggression may rise due to heightened arousal, perceived anonymity, rapid spread of emotion, and the amplification of group norms. Under such conditions, individual inhibitory controls can weaken, and aggressive acts may be reinforced by perceived group approval or by reactive responses to perceived provocation. These mechanisms are especially relevant for health security specialists, as mass gatherings, high-stress institutional settings, and high-acuity clinical environments can all function as catalysts for crowd-driven escalation. Taken together, the pathophysiology of aggression can be conceptualized as a multi-layered process in which biologic predispositions and neurochemical states shape reactivity; psychological processes shape perception, meaning, and impulse control; and sociocultural conditions shape exposure, reinforcement, and escalation pathways. Because these domains frequently interact, the same proximal event—such as a perceived insult, a painful procedure, or an unexpected restriction—may yield markedly different behavioral outcomes depending on the individual's neurobiological regulation capacity, psychiatric status, substance exposure, and environmental stress load. This integrative understanding supports a clinically and operationally useful conclusion: effective prevention and management of aggression requires simultaneous attention to medical drivers (pain, delirium, intoxication), psychiatric syndromes (psychosis, mania, trauma-related hyperarousal), and contextual determinants (coercive environments, crowding, interpersonal conflict), rather than an exclusive focus on any single explanatory axis [24][25][26][27][28][29].

History and Physical

A comprehensive history and physical examination—anchored by a structured mental status examination (MSE)—is foundational to the diagnostic evaluation of aggressive or violent patients and directly informs immediate safety measures and longitudinal treatment planning.[30] Although the MSE historically emerged as psychiatry's analogue to the physical examination, its contemporary use is broader: it is a disciplined clinical method to identify, diagnose, and monitor disturbances in cognition, perception, mood, thought, and behavior. In the context of aggression, the clinician must integrate MSE findings with the broader medical assessment, including the patient's history, a focused review of systems, vital signs, and an expanded or targeted physical examination. This integration is essential because aggressive behavior may arise from primary psychiatric illness, intoxication or withdrawal states, delirium, neurologic injury, or severe physiologic distress. Consequently, evaluation must proceed with a dual focus: diagnosing the underlying drivers of aggression while simultaneously assessing imminent risk to the patient, staff, and the public. History-taking in aggressive presentations is both a diagnostic exercise and a risk assessment. A clinically useful approach begins with developmental and psychosocial factors that correlate with later violence risk. Early childhood history should explore attachment and relational stability, exposure to trauma, and a history of abuse or neglect, because chronic adversity can shape threat sensitivity, emotional regulation, and coping strategies. A detailed behavioral and legal history is similarly informative. Prior legal problems, truancy, cruelty to animals, and fire setting may indicate longstanding patterns of impulse dyscontrol, conduct pathology, or antisocial traits and can help differentiate situational aggression from a more pervasive behavioral phenotype. The clinician should elicit a personal and family history of violence, including intimate partner violence, assaults, weapon-related incidents, restraining orders, and prior arrests, because these variables frequently predict recurrence and escalation [28][29][30].

Substance history requires particular rigor, as intoxication and withdrawal can rapidly transform agitation into violence. Clinicians should identify the substances used, patterns of use, most recent consumption, withdrawal symptoms, and prior substance-related behavioral crises, including emergency department visits or arrests. Access to weapons is a critical safety domain and should be assessed explicitly, including the type of weapon, location, and whether firearms are loaded, unlocked, or otherwise readily accessible. This inquiry is not merely administrative; it can directly alter the urgency and structure of safety planning. Medication review is equally important and should include prescribed agents, over-the-counter drugs, supplements, and recent changes in dosing, because medication effects or interactions can contribute to agitation, insomnia, paranoia, or disinhibition. Medical history must address neurologic risk factors, especially head trauma, seizure disorders, and neurocognitive decline, given their association with impaired impulse control and reduced executive function. Military history can be clinically salient, particularly if the patient has experienced combat or other life-threatening events, as such exposures may contribute to trauma-related hyperarousal, irritability, and defensive aggression; type of discharge may also provide contextual information about functional impairment or disciplinary events. Throughout history-taking, the clinician should note the patient's stated intent, precipitants, and subjective experience of anger, fear, humiliation, or perceived threat, because these affective states often precede aggression and may reveal modifiable triggers. The physical examination in aggressive patients begins with immediate physiologic screening, prioritizing vital signs and a rapid assessment for medical instability. Tachycardia, fever, hypoxia, hypertension, or altered level of consciousness may suggest intoxication, withdrawal, infection, hypoglycemia, metabolic derangements, or delirium, each of which requires specific treatment and may render purely psychiatric interpretation incomplete. A targeted neurologic examination is particularly important when there is altered mental status, new confusion, focal deficits, or a history of head injury. At the same time, clinicians must maintain a situational awareness posture: environment, exits, staffing, and the patient's proximity to potentially dangerous objects are part of the "physical exam" in safety terms, even if not charted as such [30].

The mental status examination is central to determining the nature and acuity of risk. It begins with appearance and general behavior, including gait, posture, level of hygiene, appropriateness of dress, and any features that suggest affiliation, identity, or threat signaling. Tattoos, while common and not inherently pathologic, may be noted when they explicitly depict violence or convey threatening messages, as these may contextualize identity narratives or risk posturing. The clinician should document attitude and interpersonal stance during the interview, including cooperativeness, hostility, guardedness, and rapport. Psychomotor activity provides valuable clues: pacing, clenched fists, restless shifting, abrupt movements, intrusive proximity, and scanning eye movements can indicate escalating arousal. Eye contact may be intense and confrontational, absent, or suspiciously avoidant; each pattern can be meaningful when interpreted alongside other findings. Even the initial handshake, if culturally appropriate, may provide information about impulsivity, hostility, or the capacity for reciprocal social engagement. Speech characteristics often track arousal and psychiatric syndrome. Rate, volume, tone, latency, and coherence should be documented. Pressured, rapid speech with increased volume may suggest mania or stimulant intoxication; halting or impoverished speech may indicate depression, psychosis, or neurocognitive impairment; and hostile or profane speech can signal imminent escalation, especially when paired with threatening content. Emotional assessment requires differentiation between mood and affect. Mood is the patient's subjective report of internal emotional state and should be recorded in the patient's own words when possible. Affect is the examiner's observed emotional expression, including range, intensity, stability, and congruence with stated mood. Irritable, labile, or expansive affect may indicate increased risk, particularly when paired with impulsivity or paranoia [30].

Thought content and perceptual disturbances are high-yield domains in aggressive presentations because they can directly generate violent action. Hallucinations are false sensory perceptions occurring without external stimuli and can involve smell (olfactory), taste (gustatory), touch (tactile), vision (visual), or hearing (auditory). Auditory hallucinations are particularly important when they are command in nature, as a patient may report hearing voices or a perceived authority instructing them to harm others. Delusions are fixed false beliefs that persist despite evidence and are not consistent with cultural norms. Grandiose delusions may inflate entitlement and provoke conflict when others do not validate the patient's perceived status. Paranoid delusions can be especially dangerous when they involve ideas of persecution and "preemptive" self-defense, such as believing that authorities or neighbors intend harm, prompting retaliatory violence. Illusions, distinct from hallucinations, involve misinterpretation of a real stimulus; for example, perceiving a shadow as a pursuing attacker. In states of hypervigilance, intoxication, or delirium, illusions can intensify fear-based aggression. Risk assessment within the MSE must explicitly evaluate suicidal and homicidal ideation. The clinician should

determine whether the patient has thoughts of harming self or others, the specificity of any plan, access to means, intent, rehearsal behaviors, and prior attempts or violent acts. These findings guide immediate containment strategies and determine the need for emergency psychiatric intervention or involuntary measures where legally applicable. Beyond ideation, cognition and executive functioning shape the capacity for self-control. The clinician should estimate intellect through language, abstraction, and problem solving, recognizing that this is not a formal IQ test but a functional appraisal. Judgment reflects decision-making capacity and the ability to anticipate consequences; willingness to use violence in the face of safer alternatives typically indicates impaired judgment, whether from psychiatric illness, intoxication, neurocognitive disorder, or entrenched antisocial values. Cognitive testing—orientation to person, place, and time; immediate, recent, and remote memory; and attention tasks such as serial 7s—can identify delirium, intoxication, or major neurocognitive impairment that may underpin aggression. Tests of abstraction, such as proverb interpretation, further probe executive functioning; concretism may suggest neurocognitive deficits, psychosis, or limited educational exposure, and should be interpreted with cultural sensitivity [30].

Finally, evaluation of aggressive behavior is strengthened by collateral information, because the patient's self-report may be limited by poor insight, fear, intoxication, or intentional minimization. Collateral sources can include family members, friends, coworkers, law enforcement, emergency personnel, and other clinicians who observed the behavior leading to presentation. However, collateral data must be weighed against potential bias, interpersonal conflict, and the source's reliability. The clinician should therefore document who provided collateral information, their relationship to the patient, the circumstances of observation, and any reasons reliability may be compromised. When integrated thoughtfully, collateral history can clarify the timeline of escalation, identify precipitants, confirm weapon access, and distinguish chronic patterns from acute decompensation—thereby enabling a more accurate diagnosis, safer immediate management, and a more durable treatment plan.[30]

Evaluation

A comprehensive evaluation of the aggressive patient should be undertaken as a medical priority, not solely as a behavioral assessment, because agitation and violent behavior may represent the presenting manifestation of reversible physiologic disease, intoxication or withdrawal, or decompensation of a chronic neuropsychiatric condition. The initial phase of the workup emphasizes safety and stabilization while simultaneously identifying time-sensitive etiologies. Clinicians should begin with targeted triage that includes vital signs, point-of-care glucose when indicated, oxygenation assessment, and a focused neurologic screening to detect delirium, head injury, hypoxia, or other acute threats that may amplify aggressive behavior. The diagnostic interview and mental status examination then guide whether the pattern of symptoms is more consistent with primary psychiatric illness, substance-related states, neurocognitive decline, or systemic medical illness. When the history or examination suggests a medical cause—such as dementia, delirium, central nervous system infection, or inflammatory disease—further investigations are warranted. In suspected delirium, laboratories commonly include a complete blood count, metabolic and hepatic panels, renal function, thyroid testing where appropriate, and additional studies tailored to the suspected source of infection, metabolic disturbance, or medication toxicity. If there is concern for intracranial pathology, seizure-related phenomena, focal neurologic deficits, or rapidly evolving cognitive changes, neuroimaging becomes clinically salient. Magnetic resonance imaging can be particularly informative when structural lesions, encephalitis, neurodegenerative syndromes, or subacute vascular processes are considered. In scenarios where meningitis, encephalitis, or other central nervous system infections are plausible—especially with fever, neck stiffness, altered consciousness, or immunocompromise—lumbar puncture may be indicated to evaluate cerebrospinal fluid parameters and guide antimicrobial therapy. Because substances frequently precipitate aggression through intoxication, withdrawal, paranoia, or disinhibition, toxicologic evaluation is often a key component of risk stratification. Urine toxicology testing can support detection of commonly misused substances, while blood alcohol concentration can clarify acute intoxication severity and inform monitoring needs. Medication reconciliation is equally essential, as prescribed agents may contribute to agitation or confusion, and abrupt discontinuation can produce withdrawal syndromes that mimic psychiatric illness. Interprofessional consultation strengthens both diagnostic accuracy and disposition planning. Psychiatry and addiction specialists can help differentiate primary psychiatric syndromes from secondary medical causes, assess dangerousness, and recommend pharmacologic and behavioral strategies aligned with the underlying diagnosis. Social work involvement is frequently indispensable, particularly when aggression is shaped by social determinants of health such as housing insecurity, exposure to violence, food scarcity, or lack of access to ongoing care. Addressing these destabilizing factors can reduce recurrence risk, facilitate safe discharge planning, and connect the patient to supportive services that mitigate future crises [30][31].

Treatment / Management

The management of aggression and violence must be etiologically driven and grounded in structured risk appraisal, because effective intervention depends less on the outward intensity of agitation than on the mechanisms sustaining it. Clinical decision-making should integrate both static risk factors, such as prior violence, early-onset conduct problems, and longstanding antisocial traits, and dynamic factors that fluctuate over hours to weeks, including intoxication or withdrawal, active psychosis, sleep deprivation, untreated pain, medication nonadherence, or escalating psychosocial stressors. This framework clarifies why diagnosis is not merely descriptive but determinative: when a mental disorder is a substantial contributor, targeted treatment of that disorder is central to risk reduction rather than an optional adjunct.[31] In parallel, clinicians should explicitly account for the well-established association between violence risk and substance use disorders, antisocial behavior patterns, treatment nonadherence, and recidivism, which can undermine otherwise appropriate therapeutic plans if left unaddressed.[32] Initial management prioritizes immediate safety and de-escalation while preserving patient dignity and therapeutic alliance. Environmental modification, clear limit setting, calm verbal engagement, and minimization of stimulation can reduce arousal and avert escalation, particularly when fear, confusion, or perceived threat drives behavior. When behavioral techniques are insufficient or the patient poses imminent danger, pharmacologic calming may be required, selected according to the suspected cause, medical comorbidities, and physiologic status. This acute stabilization phase should proceed alongside continued assessment to avoid masking evolving neurologic or toxicologic emergencies [31][32].

Disposition and definitive treatment should reflect diagnostic specificity and the principle of the least restrictive setting. When aggression occurs in the context of schizophrenia, bipolar disorder, acute psychosis, or severe mood instability, hospitalization should be strongly considered, because symptom containment and rapid initiation or optimization of antipsychotic or mood-stabilizing therapy often cannot be safely achieved in the community. Admission may be voluntary or involuntary depending on capacity, imminence of risk, and legal criteria. Conversely, if the patient can reliably commit to safety, demonstrates adequate insight, and has prompt outpatient follow-up with supports, intensive outpatient referral with a crisis plan may be appropriate, provided risk is manageable and protective factors are robust. A full medical evaluation remains indispensable, as delirium, hypoxia, infection, metabolic derangements, intoxication, withdrawal, and uncontrolled pain can precipitate aggression and require immediate medical treatment rather than primarily psychiatric containment. When no treatable medical or psychiatric condition is identified, and violent behavior is best explained by entrenched antisocial pathology with persistent intent to harm, protective containment through the criminal justice system may be necessary to safeguard potential victims, while still ensuring access to appropriate clinical assessment and humane care [31][32].

Differential Diagnosis

The differential diagnosis of aggression is necessarily broad because aggressive behavior represents a final common pathway of multiple neurodevelopmental, psychiatric, neurologic, medical, toxicologic, and psychosocial processes. In children and adolescents, clinicians should maintain heightened consideration for disruptive behavior and neurodevelopmental conditions in which irritability, impulsivity, poor frustration tolerance, and impaired executive control predispose to confrontational or assaultive behaviors. Attention deficit hyperactivity disorder (ADHD) may present with reactive aggression linked to hyperactivity, impulsivity, and difficulty regulating affect, particularly under environmental stressors or academic and interpersonal demands.[33] Oppositional defiant disorder is distinguished by persistent patterns of angry or irritable mood and argumentative behavior that can escalate into threats or physical outbursts, especially when limit setting is perceived as unfair or humiliating.[34] Conduct disorder occupies a more severe end of this spectrum, characterized by repetitive violation of social norms and the rights of others, often accompanied by deceitfulness, cruelty, or weapon-related behaviors that directly heighten risk to others.[35] In adults, personality pathology and major psychiatric syndromes must be evaluated carefully. Antisocial personality disorder should be considered when aggression appears instrumental, remorseless, or embedded within a longstanding pattern of rule-breaking, deception, and disregard for others.[36] Mood disorders are also critical to assess; bipolar disorder may manifest with agitation, grandiosity, insomnia, and disinhibition during manic or mixed states, with aggression emerging in response to perceived obstruction or paranoid misinterpretation.[37] Psychotic disorders constitute another major diagnostic domain: schizophrenia, broader psychosis syndromes, and acute psychotic episodes can precipitate violence when persecutory delusions, command hallucinations, or severe thought disorganization impair judgment and amplify perceived threat.[38][39]

Neurologic and neurocognitive disorders frequently underlie aggression, particularly when executive function deteriorates. Alzheimer's disease may produce irritability or aggression as cognition declines, routines are disrupted, or misidentification delusions emerge.[40] Delirium is a high-priority

diagnosis because it reflects acute brain dysfunction from medical illness or substances and can present with fluctuating consciousness, inattention, and agitation that requires urgent medical management.[41] Traumatic brain injury may contribute through impaired impulse control, emotional lability, or frontal lobe dysfunction, sometimes with delayed behavioral sequelae.[45] Parkinson's disease can be associated with aggression through neuropsychiatric complications, medication effects, or comorbid depression and cognitive change.[49] Substance-related etiologies must be approached as common and potentially rapidly reversible contributors. Alcohol intoxication and withdrawal can both provoke aggression through disinhibition, autonomic instability, and perceptual disturbances.[42] Hallucination-inducing substances and other illicit drugs may trigger paranoia, panic, or delirious states that escalate into violent behavior.[43][44][51] Prescribed medications likewise warrant scrutiny, as adverse neuropsychiatric reactions, drug interactions, or withdrawal states may precipitate agitation and aggression.[50] Finally, trauma-related and affective disorders—including post-traumatic stress disorder with hyperarousal and threat reactivity, and major depression with irritability or comorbid substance use—should remain integral to assessment.[46][48] Intellectual deficiency also merits consideration, as communication limitations, environmental overwhelm, and reduced coping capacity can culminate in aggression as a maladaptive expression of distress.[52]

Pertinent Studies and Ongoing Trials

Contemporary scholarship on aggression has increasingly emphasized that "aggression" is not a single disease entity but a transdiagnostic clinical phenotype that can emerge from neurodevelopmental conditions, severe psychiatric illness, neurocognitive disorders, substance-related states, and sociocontextual adversity. Recent publications examining aggression among adults on the autism spectrum underscore the clinical challenge of managing "severe challenging behaviors" in a population in which standard pharmacologic options are limited and frequently constrained by adverse metabolic or neurologic effects [53]. In parallel, renewed interest in neuromodulation has advanced the literature on deep brain stimulation (DBS) for refractory, severe aggression, particularly in carefully selected patients with intellectual disability and debilitating, treatment-resistant behavioral dyscontrol [54]. Although this field remains highly specialized, systematic syntheses indicate that posterior hypothalamic region DBS has emerged over the past two decades as a potential intervention when educational, psychological, and pharmacologic approaches have failed, while also emphasizing the ethical imperatives of stringent consent processes, multidisciplinary oversight, and conservative patient selection to avoid overextension of an invasive therapy for a behaviorally defined outcome [54]. Within inpatient psychiatry, investigations of aggression have increasingly focused on systems-level interventions—such as structured de-escalation protocols, staff training, and restraint-reduction strategies—rather than exclusively on patient-level predictors, reflecting a shift toward safety culture and preventability [55]. Reviews of de-escalation approaches suggest that the evidence base is still heterogeneous, with variable intervention fidelity and outcome definitions (e.g., incidents, seclusion/restraint utilization, staff injury, or patient harm), which limits definitive conclusions and reinforces the need for more rigorous, comparative evaluation designs [55]. Across these domains, most studies converge on a shared theme: the field requires stronger prospective methodologies, clearer phenotyping of aggression subtypes, and harmonized outcome metrics to distinguish transient agitation from persistent violent risk states [53][54][55]. Importantly, ongoing clinical trials—particularly in autism and severe aggression—also reflect the broader trend of exploring repurposed agents and nonpharmacologic safety interventions, aiming to reduce reliance on coercive measures while preserving patient dignity and staff safety [53][55].

Treatment Planning

Treatment planning for aggression should be conceptualized as a structured, risk-informed clinical process rather than a purely symptomatic response. A defensible plan begins by translating the presenting behavior into a formulation that specifies probable drivers, modifiable precipitants, and the immediate likelihood of harm, thereby prioritizing interventions that reduce dynamic risk factors in real time. Because aggression is often episodic and context-dependent, a robust plan integrates medical, psychiatric, and addiction diagnostics with environmental controls and relational strategies, ensuring that treatment intensity matches the acuity and the patient's capacity to collaborate [31]. When aggression is linked to treatable neuropsychiatric states—such as mania, psychosis, delirium, intoxication, or withdrawal—planning must specify the acute stabilization pathway (e.g., rapid symptom containment, monitoring, and targeted pharmacotherapy) as well as the step-down strategy that prevents rebound agitation after the crisis resolves [32]. Equally important, treatment planning should formalize safety measures that protect patients, staff, and bystanders without defaulting to unnecessarily restrictive practices. This includes clarifying thresholds for voluntary versus involuntary hospitalization, determining when constant observation is indicated, and defining the role of behavioral agreements that are realistic, measurable, and revisable as the patient's condition changes. Because nonadherence, recidivism, and substance use disorders amplify violent risk, effective plans typically incorporate continuity mechanisms—

such as addiction linkage, rapid outpatient follow-up, medication access, and case management—rather than assuming that crisis resolution alone produces durable safety [32]. When credible threats, weapon access, or escalating intimidation are present, planning may require coordinated legal referrals or law enforcement engagement; however, such steps should be framed as safety interventions anchored in documented risk and local statutes, not as substitutes for clinical care when treatable illness is evident. Finally, because aggression can be reinforced by chaotic milieus, treatment planning should include environmental modifications—noise reduction, reduced crowding, clear communication, and consistent staffing—so that the care setting does not inadvertently magnify hyperarousal. In short, an effective plan operationalizes both clinical treatment and situational safety, anticipating relapse scenarios and specifying who does what, when, and why, to reduce the probability of future harm [31][32].

Prognosis

The prognosis of aggressive behavior is best understood as diagnosis-contingent and trajectory-dependent rather than uniformly pessimistic or uniformly optimistic. When aggression is driven by acute, reversible states—such as intoxication, withdrawal, delirium, untreated psychosis, or manic excitation—the outlook can be favorable if the precipitating condition is rapidly identified and treated, and if the patient is subsequently engaged in sustained follow-up care [56]. In many such cases, aggression diminishes as neurobiological dysregulation resolves and insight improves, particularly when treatment continuity reduces future relapse risk. Aggression associated with mood disorders or schizophrenia is often responsive to evidence-based pharmacotherapy and psychosocial stabilization, though the risk of recurrence increases when comorbid substance use, poor adherence, or unstable housing disrupts recovery supports [32]. In contrast, aggression embedded within longstanding antisocial traits, severe personality pathology, or entrenched criminogenic contexts can be more resistant to change, especially when reinforcement contingencies favor intimidation or violence. Even here, prognosis is not categorically hopeless; rather, improvement often depends on sustained motivation, consistent engagement with structured interventions, and the presence of external accountability systems that limit access to high-risk situations. Early intervention remains one of the most influential modifiers of long-term risk in antisocial behavior patterns, yet high-quality evidence supporting specific early strategies is still limited, and generalization across settings is challenging [56]. Prognosis is also shaped by contextual "load": repeated trauma exposure, chronic deprivation, and ongoing access to weapons can maintain a high-risk baseline even when symptoms partially improve. From a clinical standpoint, prognosis should therefore be communicated probabilistically, anchored to observable factors such as prior violence, escalation speed, substance involvement, response to initial treatment, and the stability of the patient's post-discharge environment. A realistic prognostic statement does not merely predict recurrence; it identifies what must change to improve the odds—such as abstinence support, medication adherence, trauma-focused care, and structured social services. In doing so, prognosis becomes part of treatment: a transparent risk narrative that helps patients and families recognize warning signs early, seek help sooner, and reduce opportunities for violent outcomes [56].

Complications

Complications of unmanaged or poorly managed aggression extend beyond the immediate possibility of physical injury and include cascading clinical, operational, and psychosocial harms. At the most direct level, escalation can culminate in assault, serious bodily injury, or homicide, with consequences for victims, the patient, and the broader community. However, even when no severe physical injury occurs, recurrent aggressive incidents can produce pervasive fear and anticipatory anxiety among staff and other patients, eroding therapeutic alliance and degrading the care environment. This climate effect is not trivial: units with frequent violence often experience higher staff turnover, increased burnout, and reduced capacity to deliver consistent, trauma-informed care, which can further destabilize high-risk patients and perpetuate a cycle of crisis-driven management. Aggression also complicates diagnostic accuracy. In chaotic, high-arousal encounters, clinicians may prematurely attribute aggression to "psychiatric causes" and overlook delirium, intoxication/withdrawal syndromes, neurologic disease, hypoxia, or severe pain states. Such misattribution can lead to delayed medical treatment, inappropriate medication choices, and avoidable iatrogenic harm. Similarly, repeated coercive interventions—when not tightly indicated—carry their own complications, including psychological trauma, distrust of healthcare systems, and, in some cases, physical risks associated with restraint or rapid tranquilization. These downstream effects can increase future avoidance of care, thereby worsen untreated illness and elevating long-term risk. From a systems perspective, aggressive incidents can trigger sentinel event investigations, legal exposure, and reputational harm to facilities, particularly when documentation is incomplete or when safety protocols are inconsistently applied. Importantly, the moral injury experienced by staff following assaults can persist, influencing clinical judgment, empathy, and willingness to engage therapeutically with future high-risk patients. In short, complications are multidimensional: they include potential lethality,

clinical missteps, coercion-related harm, staff and patient morale deterioration, and institutional destabilization—making prevention and early intervention central, not optional, to safe, ethical care [55][56].

Consultations

Consultation planning in aggression should be proactive and interdisciplinary, reflecting that no single discipline "owns" violent risk. Psychiatric consultation is often central when psychosis, mania, severe depression with agitation, personality pathology, or neurocognitive disorders are plausible contributors, because diagnostic clarification directly shapes pharmacologic and psychosocial strategies. Addiction consultation is similarly critical when intoxication, withdrawal, stimulant-associated paranoia, or polysubstance use increases impulsivity and threat perception, since violence risk frequently decreases when withdrawal syndromes are treated and relapse prevention is initiated [59]. Medical consultation—such as internal medicine, neurology, or critical care—may be necessary when delirium, head trauma, seizures, hypoxia, metabolic derangements, or medication toxicity could be driving agitation, ensuring that "behavior" is not substituted for "diagnosis." Legal consultation can be indispensable when there are credible threats, weapon access, protective-order issues, mandated reporting requirements, or questions regarding involuntary treatment thresholds. In such cases, legal input helps the team align patient rights, staff safety, and public protection with statutory frameworks. Security consultation is not merely a "backup" resource; when integrated appropriately, trained security staff can reduce injury risk by supporting safe positioning, controlled room entry, and rapid response procedures that minimize escalation. Social work consultation is often equally high-yield, particularly when aggression is intertwined with homelessness, food insecurity, family conflict, interpersonal violence exposure, or barriers to outpatient care—factors that can be as determinative of recurrence risk as symptom severity. Because consultations can themselves increase fragmentation if poorly coordinated, the care team should explicitly designate who synthesizes recommendations into one coherent plan. That integrative function—often led by the primary medical team in collaboration with psychiatry—prevents contradictory messaging, reduces delays, and ensures that risk mitigation measures are consistently implemented. When done well, consultations do not simply "add opinions"; they create a unified safety architecture that addresses medical causes, psychiatric drivers, substance-related contributors, legal constraints, and social determinants in one clinically actionable pathway [59].

Patient Education

Deterrence and patient education in aggression should be framed as skills-based risk reduction rather than moralizing or purely punitive messaging. For patients and families, education begins with helping them recognize the difference between anger as an emotion and aggression as a behavior, then identifying the patient's specific triggers, warning signs, and escalation sequence. Teaching alternatives to aggression requires more than advising a patient to "calm down"; it involves rehearsing concrete strategies such as stimulus reduction, time-outs, grounding techniques, and help-seeking behaviors that can be executed during physiologic arousal. When substance use is relevant, education should explicitly link intoxication and withdrawal states to impaired impulse control and threat misinterpretation, emphasizing that abstinence support and relapse prevention are violence-prevention interventions, not merely "lifestyle advice" [59][60]. Family-focused education is particularly important for adolescents, where digital contexts can amplify conflict. Evidence highlighting the protective role of parental relationships and communication in adolescent cyber aggression supports integrating caregivers into prevention planning, including boundary-setting around online behavior, monitoring of escalating interpersonal conflicts, and early intervention when harassment or threats emerge [57]. In healthcare settings, education must also address staff as both potential victims and active agents of prevention. Emergency department nurses, for example, have been studied in relation to workplace aggression and assault, and findings emphasize that structured institutional support after assaults can improve staff wellbeing and functional capacity, thereby preserving both safety and care quality [58]. Deterrence also includes environmental measures communicated to patients transparently: expectations for respectful communication, clear consequences for threats, and the availability of support resources when distress escalates. For many patients, especially those with trauma histories, respectful clarity reduces perceived unpredictability and can lower defensive aggression. Finally, patient education should include practical safety steps—such as reducing weapon access during crises and identifying crisis lines or urgent-care pathways—while maintaining a therapeutic stance that emphasizes collaboration, dignity, and shared responsibility for safety [57][58].

Other Issues

Several clinical "pearls" recur across the aggression literature, but they retain practical value precisely because they are frequently neglected during high-stress encounters. First, while mental health explanations for aggression are commonly foregrounded in public discourse and clinical shorthand, the contribution of substance use disorders should be consistently assessed rather than treated as secondary [59]. Intoxication can lower inhibition and increase misinterpretation of threat, while withdrawal syndromes can produce irritability, sleep disruption,

and heightened reactivity that destabilize behavior. Cannabis withdrawal, for example, has been associated with prominent irritability and anger-related symptoms in systematic analyses of withdrawal presentations, underscoring that cessation can transiently increase agitation risk in some individuals [60]. Second, "modern" aggression pathways extend into digital environments. Alcohol has been studied in relation to cyber aggression, and evidence suggests that substance use can interact with impulsivity, disinhibition, and social cue misreading in online contexts, potentially increasing the likelihood of aggressive digital behaviors [61]. Third, psychological capacities that buffer emotional reactivity—such as mindfulness—may be clinically relevant targets in selected populations. In men with alcohol use disorder, a deficit in mindfulness has been associated with aggression in at least one study, supporting the rationale for integrating skills-based interventions that enhance self-regulation into relapse prevention and violence risk reduction [62]. Finally, documentation and contextual interpretation matter. Aggression is not merely an "episode" to record; it is a signal requiring formulation. Accurate notes should distinguish verbal threats from physical acts, clarify precipitants and substance involvement, and document what de-escalated the situation, because this information is often the most actionable prevention tool for future encounters. In short, the enduring pearls are pragmatic: do not underweight substances, do not ignore cyber contexts, consider self-regulation capacities as modifiable targets, and document the behavioral ecology of the event as carefully as the event itself [59][60][61][62].

Enhancing Healthcare Team Outcomes

Optimizing outcomes in aggression management depends on treating violence risk as a shared clinical and operational responsibility, implemented through coordinated interprofessional practice rather than isolated decision-making. The diagnosis and management of aggression are by an interprofessional team that may include a mental health nurse, psychiatrist, primary care and emergency providers, psychologist, pharmacist, and social worker, with the understanding that treatment selection is contingent on cause and that relapse risk remains substantial even after apparent stabilization [63][64]. In high-acuity environments such as emergency departments and inpatient psychiatric units, specialty nurses often function as the most continuous observers of risk-relevant change, detecting subtle shifts in affect, motor activity, and cooperation that precede escalation. Their timely communication can determine whether a situation resolves through de-escalation or progresses to coercive intervention. Pharmacists enhance safety by identifying medication interactions, anticipating adverse effects that can worsen agitation (e.g., akathisia), and reinforcing patient and family education regarding adherence and substance-related risks. Team performance is strengthened when organizations invest in standardized de-escalation training, predictable response protocols, and post-incident support systems that address both physical safety and moral injury. Social workers contribute not only by arranging resources, but by reducing structural drivers of recurrence—linking patients to housing support, financial assistance, domestic violence resources, or outpatient behavioral health—thereby lowering the "contextual load" that fuels repeated crises. Where legal issues are salient, collaboration with risk management and legal counsel helps teams respond consistently to threats and protect patient rights while ensuring staff protection. Finally, enhancing outcomes requires a culture in which reporting is encouraged and nonpunitive: staff must feel empowered to document threats, communicate concerns, and request backup early. Because a history of violence increases future risk, coordinated care should explicitly incorporate prevention strategies and continuity planning, including outpatient linkage and—where indicated—public health approaches oriented toward reducing access to lethal means among individuals with documented violent behavior [63][64].

Conclusion:

Aggression in healthcare and community contexts represents a critical intersection of clinical care and public safety. Its emergence is rarely attributable to a single cause; rather, it reflects a convergence of neurobiological vulnerabilities, psychiatric syndromes, substance-related states, and sociocultural stressors. This complexity underscores the need for a multidimensional approach that moves beyond symptom containment toward comprehensive risk mitigation. Timely recognition of medical precipitants—such as delirium, pain, or intoxication—alongside psychiatric drivers like psychosis or mania is essential to prevent misattribution and ensure appropriate treatment. Structured mental status examinations, collateral history, and toxicologic screening remain indispensable tools for accurate diagnosis and safety planning. Management strategies should prioritize least-restrictive interventions, beginning with verbal de-escalation and environmental control, escalating to pharmacologic measures only when necessary. Interprofessional collaboration—integrating psychiatry, medicine, addiction services, social work, and security—forms the backbone of effective care, while organizational investments in staff training and post-incident support foster resilience and reduce recurrence. Prognosis varies widely, but early intervention, continuity of care, and addressing social determinants significantly improve outcomes. Ultimately, aggression must be reframed as a preventable health security risk, demanding coordinated clinical, operational, and policy

responses to safeguard patients, staff, and communities.

References:

1. Krug EG, Mercy JA, Dahlberg LL, Zwi AB. The world report on violence and health. Lancet (London, England). 2002 Oct 5:360(9339):1083-8
2. Irwin A, Laing C, Mearns K. The impact of patient aggression on community pharmacists: a critical incident study. The International journal of pharmacy practice. 2013 Feb:21(1):20-7. doi: 10.1111/j.2042-7174.2012.00222.x.
3. Alnıak İ, Erkıran M, Mutlu E. Substance use is a risk factor for violent behavior in male patients with bipolar disorder. Journal of affective disorders. 2016 Mar 15:193():89-93. doi: 10.1016/j.jad.2015.12.059.
4. Kennett MR. Domestic violence. JONA'S healthcare law, ethics and regulation. 2000 Sep:2(3):93-101
5. Chilton MM, Rabinowich JR, Woolf NH. Very low food security in the USA is linked with exposure to violence. Public health nutrition. 2014 Jan:17(1):73-82. doi: 10.1017/S1368980013000281.
6. Sheats KJ, Irving SM, Mercy JA, Simon TR, Crosby AE, Ford DC, Merrick MT, Annor FB, Morgan RE. Violence-Related Disparities Experienced by Black Youth and Young Adults: Opportunities for Prevention. American journal of preventive medicine. 2018 Oct:55(4):462-469. doi: 10.1016/j.amepre.2018.05.017.
7. Sumner SA, Mercy JA, Dahlberg LL, Hillis SD, Klevens J, Houry D. Violence in the United States: Status, Challenges, and Opportunities. JAMA. 2015 Aug 4:314(5):478-88. doi: 10.1001/jama.2015.8371.
8. Grinshteyn E, Hemenway D. Violent death rates in the US compared to those of the other high-income countries, 2015. Preventive medicine. 2019 Jun:123():20-26. doi: 10.1016/j.ypmed.2019.02.026.
9. Fernàndez-Castillo N, Cormand B. Aggressive behavior in humans: Genes and pathways identified through association studies. American journal of medical genetics. Part B, Neuropsychiatric genetics : the official publication of the International Society of Psychiatric Genetics. 2016 Jul:171(5):676-96. doi: 10.1002/ajmg.b.32419.
10. Godar SC, Fite PJ, McFarlin KM, Bortolato M. The role of monoamine oxidase A in aggression: Current translational developments and future challenges. Progress in neuro-psychopharmacology & biological psychiatry. 2016 Aug 1:69():90-100. doi: 10.1016/j.pnpbp.2016.01.001.
11. da Cunha-Bang S, Mc Mahon B, Fisher PM, Jensen PS, Svarer C, Knudsen GM. High trait aggression in men is associated with low 5-HT levels, as indexed by 5-HT4 receptor binding. Social cognitive and affective neuroscience. 2016 Apr:11(4):548-55. doi: 10.1093/scan/nsv140.
12. Bruno V, Mancini D, Ghoche R, Arshinoff R, Miyasaki JM. High prevalence of physical and sexual aggression to caregivers in advanced Parkinson's disease. Experience in the Palliative Care Program. Parkinsonism & related disorders. 2016 Mar:24():141-2. doi: 10.1016/j.parkreldis.2016.01.010.
13. Turner D, Basdekis-Jozsa R, Briken P. Prescription of testosterone-lowering medications for sex offender treatment in German forensic-psychiatric institutions. The journal of sexual medicine. 2013 Feb:10(2):570-8. doi: 10.1111/j.1743-6109.2012.02958.x.
14. Ganson KT, Cadet TJ. Exploring Anabolic-Androgenic Steroid Use and Teen Dating Violence Among Adolescent Males. Substance use & misuse. 2019:54(5):779-786. doi: 10.1080/10826084.2018.1536723.
15. Thiessen MS, Walsh Z, Bird BM, Lafrance A. Psychedelic use and intimate partner violence: The role of emotion regulation. Journal of psychopharmacology (Oxford, England). 2018 Jul:32(7):749-755. doi: 10.1177/0269881118771782.
16. Kirwan M, Lanni DJ, Warnke A, Pickett SM, Parkhill MR. Emotion Regulation Moderates the Relationship Between Alcohol Consumption and the Perpetration of Sexual Aggression. Violence against women. 2019 Jul:25(9):1053-1073. doi: 10.1177/1077801218808396.
17. Khemiri L, Jokinen J, Runeson B, Jayaram-Lindström N. Suicide Risk Associated with Experience of Violence and Impulsivity in Alcohol Dependent Patients. Scientific reports. 2016 Jan 19:6():19373. doi: 10.1038/srep19373.
18. Maniglio R. Bullying and Other Forms of Peer Victimization in Adolescence and Alcohol Use. Trauma, violence & abuse. 2017 Oct:18(4):457-473. doi: 10.1177/1524838016631127.
19. Taflaj B, La Maida N, Tittarelli R, Di Trana A, D'Acquarica I. New Psychoactive Substances Toxicity: A Systematic Review of Acute and Chronic Psychiatric Effects. International journal of molecular sciences. 2024 Aug 31:25(17):. doi: 10.3390/ijms25179484.
20. Wise J. Antidepressants may double risk of suicide and aggression in children, study finds. BMJ (Clinical research ed.). 2016 Jan 28:352():i545. doi: 10.1136/bmj.i545.
21. Saylor KE, Amann BH. Impulsive Aggression as a Comorbidity of Attention-Deficit/Hyperactivity Disorder in Children and Adolescents. Journal of child and adolescent psychopharmacology. 2016 Feb:26(1):19-25. doi: 10.1089/cap.2015.0126.
22. Prior D, Win S, Hassiotis A, Hall I, Martiello MA, Ali AK. Behavioural and cognitive-

behavioural interventions for outwardly directed aggressive behaviour in people with intellectual disabilities. The Cochrane database of systematic reviews. 2023 Feb 6:2(2):CD003406. doi: 10.1002/14651858.CD003406.pub5.
23. Foshee VA, McNaughton Reyes HL, Chen MS, Ennett ST, Basile KC, DeGue S, Vivolo-Kantor AM, Moracco KE, Bowling JM. Shared Risk Factors for the Perpetration of Physical Dating Violence, Bullying, and Sexual Harassment Among Adolescents Exposed to Domestic Violence. Journal of youth and adolescence. 2016 Apr:45(4):672-86. doi: 10.1007/s10964-015-0404-z.
24. Cunha OS, Goncalves RA. Severe and Less Severe Intimate Partner Violence: From Characterization to Prediction. Violence and victims. 2016:31(2):235-50. doi: 10.1891/0886-6708.VV-D-14-00033.
25. Lehtonen TK, Svensson PA, Wong BB. The influence of recent social experience and physical environment on courtship and male aggression. BMC evolutionary biology. 2016 Jan 21:16():18. doi: 10.1186/s12862-016-0584-5.
26. Lanza M. Patient Aggression in Real Time on Geriatric Inpatient Units. Issues in mental health nursing. 2016 Jan:37(1):53-8. doi: 10.3109/01612840.2015.1086910.
27. Renwick L, Stewart D, Richardson M, Lavelle M, James K, Hardy C, Price O, Bowers L. Aggression on inpatient units: Clinical characteristics and consequences. International journal of mental health nursing. 2016 Aug:25(4):308-18. doi: 10.1111/inm.12191.
28. Heynen E, van der Helm P, Cima M, Stams GJ, Korebrits A. The Relation Between Living Group Climate, Aggression, and Callous-Unemotional Traits in Delinquent Boys in Detention. International journal of offender therapy and comparative criminology. 2017 Nov:61(15):1701-1718. doi: 10.1177/0306624X16630543.
29. Mudrak G, Kumar Semwal S. Modeling Aggression and Bullying: A Complex Systems Approach. Studies in health technology and informatics. 2015:219():187-91
30. Voss RM, M Das J. Mental Status Examination. StatPearls. 2024 Jan
31. Gurnani T, Ivanov I, Newcorn JH. Pharmacotherapy of Aggression in Child and Adolescent Psychiatric Disorders. Journal of child and adolescent psychopharmacology. 2016 Feb:26(1):65-73. doi: 10.1089/cap.2015.0167.
32. Strassnig MT, Nascimento V, Deckler E, Harvey PD. Pharmacological treatment of violence in schizophrenia. CNS spectrums. 2020 Apr:25(2):207-215. doi: 10.1017/S1092852919001226.
33. Arrondo G, Osorio A, Magallón S, Lopez-Del Burgo C, Cortese S. Attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder as a risk factor for being involved in intimate partner violence and sexual violence: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Psychological medicine. 2023 Dec:53(16):7883-7892. doi: 10.1017/S0033291723001976.
34. Loeber R, Burke JD, Pardini DA. Development and etiology of disruptive and delinquent behavior. Annual review of clinical psychology. 2009:5():291-310. doi: 10.1146/annurev.clinpsy.032408.153631.
35. Murray J, Farrington DP. Risk factors for conduct disorder and delinquency: key findings from longitudinal studies. Canadian journal of psychiatry. Revue canadienne de psychiatrie. 2010 Oct:55(10):633-42
36. Filov I. Antisocial Personality Traits as a Risk Factor of Violence between Individuals with Mental Disorders. Open access Macedonian journal of medical sciences. 2019 Feb 28:7(4):657-662. doi: 10.3889/oamjms.2019.146.
37. Volavka J. Violence in schizophrenia and bipolar disorder. Psychiatria Danubina. 2013 Mar:25(1):24-33
38. Fazel S, Gulati G, Linsell L, Geddes JR, Grann M. Schizophrenia and violence: systematic review and meta-analysis. PLoS medicine. 2009 Aug:6(8):e1000120. doi: 10.1371/journal.pmed.1000120.
39. Nielssen OB, Malhi GS, McGorry PD, Large MM. Overview of violence to self and others during the first episode of psychosis. The Journal of clinical psychiatry. 2012 May:73(5):e580-7. doi: 10.4088/JCP.11r07036.
40. Paveza GJ, Cohen D, Eisdorfer C, Freels S, Semla T, Ashford JW, Gorelick P, Hirschman R, Luchins D, Levy P. Severe family violence and Alzheimer's disease: prevalence and risk factors. The Gerontologist. 1992 Aug:32(4):493-7
41. Tachibana M, Inada T, Ichida M, Ozaki N. Risk factors for inducing violence in patients with delirium. Brain and behavior. 2021 Aug:11(8):e2276. doi: 10.1002/brb3.2276.
42. Miczek KA, DeBold JF, Hwa LS, Newman EL, de Almeida RM. Alcohol and violence: neuropeptidergic modulation of monoamine systems. Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences. 2015 Sep:1349(1):96-118. doi: 10.1111/nyas.12862.
43. Baldridge EB, Bessen HA. Phencyclidine. Emergency medicine clinics of North America. 1990 Aug:8(3):541-50
44. Daldegan-Bueno D, Lindner SR, Fischer B. Conceptualizing and considering Cannabis-Related "Harm-to-Others": The Role of Cannabis-Related Violence. Substance use &

misuse. 2022:57(9):1488-1491. doi: 10.1080/10826084.2022.2086698.
45. Mäntykoski T, Iverson GL, Renko J, Kataja A, Öhman J, Luoto TM. Violence-related traumatic brain injury. Brain injury. 2019:33(8):1045-1049. doi: 10.1080/02699052.2019.1606442.
46. Jones MS, Peck BM, Sharp SF, McLeod DA. Childhood Adversity and Intimate Partner Violence in Adulthood: The Mediating Influence of PTSD in a Sample of Women Prisoners. Journal of interpersonal violence. 2021 Aug:36(15-16):NP8590-NP8614. doi: 10.1177/0886260519844277.
47. Wymbs BT, Dawson AE, Egan TE, Sacchetti GM. Rates of Intimate Partner Violence Perpetration and Victimization Among Adults With ADHD. Journal of attention disorders. 2019 Jul:23(9):949-958. doi: 10.1177/1087054716653215.
48. Beydoun HA, Beydoun MA, Kaufman JS, Lo B, Zonderman AB. Intimate partner violence against adult women and its association with major depressive disorder, depressive symptoms and postpartum depression: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Social science & medicine (1982). 2012 Sep:75(6):959-75. doi: 10.1016/j.socscimed.2012.04.025.
49. Jones MB, Gibson L, Gimenez-Zapiola M, Guerra A, Bhatti G, Broadway D, Tea J, Prasad A, Gates R, Hinton E, Jorge RE, Marsh L. Physical Violence and Aggression in Parkinson's Disease: A Systematic Review. Journal of the Academy of Consultation-Liaison Psychiatry. 2024 Jul-Aug:65(4):366-378. doi: 10.1016/j.jaclp.2024.01.007.
50. Medication-induced violence others towards. Prescrire international. 2014 Jun:23(150):153-5
51. StepjanoviĆ D, Hall W, Leung J. Illicit drug use and violence. Handbook of clinical neurology. 2023:197():121-145. doi: 10.1016/B978-0-12-821375-9.00010-4.
52. Hodgins S. Mental disorder, intellectual deficiency, and crime. Evidence from a birth cohort. Archives of general psychiatry. 1992 Jun:49(6):476-83
53. Im DS. Treatment of Aggression in Adults with Autism Spectrum Disorder: A Review. Harvard review of psychiatry. 2021 Jan-Feb 01:29(1):35-80. doi: 10.1097/HRP.0000000000000282.
54. Rizzi M, Gambini O, Marras CE. Posterior hypothalamus as a target in the treatment of aggression: From lesioning to deep brain stimulation. Handbook of clinical neurology. 2021:182():95-106. doi: 10.1016/B978-0-12-819973-2.00007-1.
55. Weltens I, Bak M, Verhagen S, Vandenberk E, Domen P, van Amelsvoort T, Drukker M. Aggression on the psychiatric ward: Prevalence and risk factors. A systematic review of the literature. PloS one. 2021:16(10):e0258346. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0258346.
56. Gibbon S, Khalifa NR, Cheung NH, Völlm BA, McCarthy L. Psychological interventions for antisocial personality disorder. The Cochrane database of systematic reviews. 2020 Sep 3:9(9):CD007668. doi: 10.1002/14651858.CD007668.pub3.
57. Bullo A, Schulz PJ. Parent-child Communication, Social Norms, and the Development of Cyber Aggression in Early Adolescence. Journal of youth and adolescence. 2022 Sep:51(9):1774-1786. doi: 10.1007/s10964-022-01625-1.
58. Gillespie GL, Berry P. Qualitative Analysis of Workplace Assault Outcomes from the Perspectives of Emergency Nurses. Journal of emergency nursing. 2023 May:49(3):450-460. doi: 10.1016/j.jen.2022.09.015.
59. Ghossoub E, Adib SM, Maalouf FT, Fuleihan GE, Tamim H, Nahas Z. Association between substance use disorders and self- and other-directed aggression: An integrated model approach. Aggressive behavior. 2019 Nov:45(6):652-661. doi: 10.1002/ab.21859.
60. Connor JP, Stjepanović D, Budney AJ, Le Foll B, Hall WD. Clinical management of cannabis withdrawal. Addiction (Abingdon, England). 2022 Jul:117(7):2075-2095. doi: 10.1111/add.15743.
61. Crane CA, Wiernik BM, Berbary CM, Crawford M, Schlauch RC, Easton CJ. A meta-analytic review of the relationship between cyber aggression and substance use. Drug and alcohol dependence. 2021 Apr 1:221():108510. doi: 10.1016/j.drugalcdep.2021.108510.
62. Garner AR, Shorey RC, Anderson S, Stuart GL. Alcohol Use and Aggression among Men in Residential Treatment for Substance Use Disorders: The Moderating Role of Mindfulness Facets. Mindfulness. 2021 Nov:12(11):2681-2692. doi: 10.1007/s12671-021-01730-5.
63. Kendrick JG, Goldman RD, Carr RR. Pharmacologic Management of Agitation and Aggression in a Pediatric Emergency Department - A Retrospective Cohort Study. The journal of pediatric pharmacology and therapeutics : JPPT : the official journal of PPAG. 2018 Nov-Dec:23(6):455-459. doi: 10.5863/1551-6776-23.6.455.
64. Sommovigo V, Setti I, Argentero P, O'Shea D. The impact of customer incivility and verbal aggression on service providers: A systematic review. Work (Reading, Mass.). 2019:62(1):59-86. doi: 10.3233/WOR-182842