International Journal of Innovative Technologies in Social Science

e-ISSN: 2544-9435

Operating Publisher
SciFormat Publishing Inc.
ISNI: 0000 0005 1449 8214

2734 17 Avenue SW,
Calgary, Alberta, T3E0A7,
Canada
+15878858911
editorial-office@sciformat.ca

ARTICLE TITLE	DIGITAL MENTAL HEALTH INTERVENTIONS: EFFECTIVENESS, ACCESSIBILITY, AND SOCIETAL IMPACT - A NARRATIVE REVIEW
DOI	https://doi.org/10.31435/ijitss.1(49).2026.5164
RECEIVED	02 February 2026
ACCEPTED	18 March 2026
PUBLISHED	30 March 2026
LICENSE	The article is licensed under a **Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.**

DIGITAL MENTAL HEALTH INTERVENTIONS: EFFECTIVENESS, ACCESSIBILITY, AND SOCIETAL IMPACT - A NARRATIVE REVIEW

Marcel Pilarek *(Corresponding Author, Email: marcelpilarek@gmail.com)*
Medical University of Silesia in Katowice, Poland
ORCID ID: 0009-0004-4114-5078

Wiktoria Laskowska
Medical University of Silesia in Katowice, Poland
ORCID ID: 0009-0000-8116-0038

Klaudia Kwolek
Medical University of Silesia in Katowice, Poland
ORCID ID: 0009-0003-2145-7528

Hubert Bigajski
Medical University of Silesia in Katowice, Poland
ORCID ID: 0009-0007-0570-5367

Aleksandra Banaś
Medical University of Silesia in Katowice, Poland
ORCID ID: 0009-0009-5584-5944

Hubert Dacyl
Medical University of Silesia in Katowice, Poland
ORCID ID: 0009-0002-6417-6382

Szymon Janczarski
Medical University of Silesia in Katowice, Poland
ORCID ID: 0009-0004-0881-1083

Maciej Michalik
Medical University of Silesia in Katowice, Poland
ORCID ID: 0009-0007-9778-8736

Dominika Sarna
Medical University of Silesia in Katowice, Poland
ORCID ID: 0009-0001-4849-8093

Piotr Widera
Medical University of Silesia in Katowice, Poland
ORCID ID: 0009-0008-7518-2482

ABSTRACT

The escalating global mental health burden, affecting an estimated 165 million individuals annually within the European Union, necessitates a fundamental paradigm shift toward digitally-enhanced care models to alleviate systemic strain and limited provider availability. This narrative review provides a holistic socio-technical synthesis of the Digital Mental Health Interventions (DMHI) ecosystem, integrating heterogeneous evidence ranging from randomized controlled trials and meta-analyses to empirical technical software audits. Findings confirm the general non-inferiority of iCBT compared to traditional modalities, although therapeutic efficacy remains highly contingent upon human integration as defined by the Supportive Accountability model. While specialized tools like virtual reality demonstrate superior outcomes for PTSD, severe psychiatric conditions necessitate continued clinical oversight; crucially, a persistent engagement paradox exists wherein high initial adoption is frequently offset by significant long-term attrition. Structurally, the digital inverse care law and the digital divide reinforce systemic health disparities, excluding populations with infrastructure gaps or physical impairments. These systemic inequities are further compounded by an inverse data law, wherein algorithmic datasets remain biased toward healthy populations, leaving marginalized cohorts underrepresented. Furthermore, while digital platforms afford anonymity for managing stigmatized identities, they simultaneously expose vulnerable users to digital microaggressions and prejudice. Ultimately, rapid technological proliferation has outpaced regulatory governance, resulting in privacy vulnerabilities and profound regulatory fragmentation across jurisdictions. DMHI effectiveness is inextricably linked to socio-economic, cultural, and structural contexts, necessitating a transition toward regulated, clinically-led architectures to safeguard social equity and ensure genuine therapeutic value within the digital mental health transition.

KEYWORDS

Digital Mental Health Interventions, Internet-Based Cognitive Behavioral Therapy, Digital Divide, Supportive Accountability, Digital Inverse Care Law, Algorithmic Bias

CITATION

Marcel Pilarek, Wiktoria Laskowska, Klaudia Kwolek, Hubert Bigajski, Aleksandra Banaś, Hubert Dacyl, Szymon Janczarski, Maciej Michalik, Dominika Sarna, Piotr Widera. (2026) Digital Mental Health Interventions: Effectiveness, Accessibility, and Societal Impact - a Narrative Review. *International Journal of Innovative Technologies in Social Science*. 1(49). doi: 10.31435/ijitss.1(49).2026.5164

1. Introduction

The burden of mental disorders represents a profound global public health challenge, affecting an estimated 165 million individuals annually in the European Union alone (Trautmann et al., 2016). The authors note that in 2010, mental and substance use disorders constituted 10.4% of the global burden of disease and served as the leading cause of years lived with disability among all disease groups. Despite the high prevalence of conditions such as depression, anxiety, and post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD), conventional mental health systems face severe strain, characterized by high costs, limited provider availability, and low treatment adherence (Bisson et al., 2023; Goharinejad et al., 2026). This unmet need has necessitated a paradigm shift toward community-based and digitally-enhanced models of care designed to bridge the gap between clinical requirements and available resources (Patel et al., 2023; van den Broek-Altenburg & Atherly, 2025).

Digital Mental Health Interventions (DMHIs) have emerged as scalable solutions that leverage technology to provide affordable and efficient support (Cameron et al., 2025; Venkatesan et al., 2020). These interventions encompass a diverse range of modalities, including cognitive behavioral therapy (CBT) delivered in internet-based formats (iCBT), mobile health (mHealth) applications, conversational artificial intelligence (AI) or chatbots, and immersive technologies such as virtual reality (VR) and augmented reality (AR) (Carlbring et al., 2018; Goharinejad et al., 2026; Rahsepar Meadi et al., 2025). The evolution of these tools has progressed from basic self-help modules to sophisticated generative AI systems and agentic architectures capable of autonomous clinical support (Abou Ali et al., 2025; Torous & Cipriani, 2025). While these technologies promise to democratize access to psychiatric services, their rapid deployment often occurs

without the guidance of clear theoretical models or manualized human support protocols, which are essential for sustaining user engagement (Mohr et al., 2011).

The potential for DMHIs to achieve robust therapeutic impacts is supported by evidence indicating that digital modalities, particularly iCBT, are generally non-inferior to traditional face-to-face therapy across various psychiatric and somatic disorders (Carlbring et al., 2018; Karyotaki et al., 2021). Furthermore, immersive environments provided by VR and therapeutic video games offer novel opportunities for exposure-based treatments that may surpass the efficacy of traditional methods in specific contexts, such as PTSD (Goharinejad et al., 2026). However, the clinical effectiveness of these tools is frequently challenged by an "engagement paradox," wherein high initial adoption is followed by significant attrition, particularly in unguided or standalone interventions (Linardon et al., 2025; Mohr et al., 2011). This highlights a critical need to understand the mechanisms of "Supportive Accountability," where human presence - even if digitally mediated - is required to sustain adherence and clinical benefit (Mohr et al., 2011).

The implementation of digital care does not occur in a vacuum but is deeply influenced by structural and social conditions that define the "digital divide." Digital inclusion is now recognized as a critical social determinant of health, as significant portions of the population lack the broadband infrastructure, financial resources, or hardware necessary to engage with mHealth technologies (Chidambaram et al., 2024; Sieck et al., 2021). This has given rise to the "digital inverse care law," a systemic pattern where those most in need of mental health support - such as individuals experiencing social deprivation or older adults with physical impairments - are often the least likely to access or benefit from digital platforms (Alami et al., 2022; Davies et al., 2021; Lange et al., 2025). Furthermore, social perception and stigma continue to shape help-seeking behaviors, with digital environments offering unique affordances for anonymity and concealable identity management, while also exposing vulnerable populations to digital microaggressions and prejudice (Ahmedani, 2011; Chaudoir et al., 2013; McInroy et al., 2025).

Parallel to these clinical and social dimensions, the rapid proliferation of DMHIs has created significant ethical, regulatory, and commercial tensions. There is an increasing mHealth schism between the consumer-driven "mHealth capitalism" of app stores and the rigorous science of clinical mHealth (Istepanian, 2022). Empirical investigations have revealed critical vulnerabilities in data privacy and security, where sensitive patient information is shared with third parties without transparent consent (Iwaya et al., 2023). Moreover, an "inverse data law" suggests that the datasets used to train AI and digital tools are often least representative of the complex and marginalized patients who stand to benefit most from intervention (Ameen et al., 2023). Regulatory governance remains highly fragmented, with state-level legislatures in the United States acting as isolated laboratories for policy in the absence of cohesive federal standards for AI-enabled mental health devices (Joshi, 2025; Shumate et al., 2025).

This narrative review identifies a critical fragmentation between these domains, where clinical research often fails to account for the structural determinants of health and the regulatory gaps that define the real-world application of DMHIs. The separation between clinical efficacy, digital inequality, and ethical governance creates a conceptual gap that obscures the full societal impact of digital transformation in mental health. Therefore, the purpose of this review is to synthesize the current evidence to provide a holistic understanding of the digital mental health ecosystem. The review is organized around four primary thematic domains and a cross-domain integrative synthesis: the clinical effectiveness and engagement dynamics of digital interventions; the structural implications of the digital divide and health equity; the role of digital platforms in stigma reduction and social perception; and the ethical, regulatory, and commercial challenges that define the governance of digital mental health technologies.

2. Methodology

2.1 Study Design

The present study adopts a comprehensive narrative review methodology to examine the multifaceted landscape of DMHIs. Given the rapid evolution of digital health technologies and the convergence of disparate fields such as clinical psychiatry, software engineering, and sociology, a narrative design is uniquely appropriate. Unlike a formal meta-analysis which prioritizes statistical aggregation of homogenous data, this narrative approach facilitates an integrative socio-technical synthesis of heterogeneous evidence. It allows for the exploration of overarching conceptual tensions that define the current digital transition in mental health care, specifically the intersections between clinical effectiveness, engagement dynamics, accessibility, social identity, and regulatory governance.

The choice of a narrative review design is further justified by the need to address the systemic fragmentation identified in contemporary mental health research. By moving beyond isolated clinical outcomes, this methodology enables a holistic interpretation of how structural determinants, such as the digital divide, interact with therapeutic efficacy. The study aims to provide a conceptual mapping of the field that acknowledges the interdependencies between technical feasibility and social reality. This interpretive framework is essential for understanding the "wicked nature" of digital transformation, where the success of an intervention is contingent upon socio-economic and regulatory contexts that are not easily captured by purely quantitative measures.

2.2 Evidentiary Corpus and Scope

The evidentiary corpus for this review consists of a curated selection of peer-reviewed academic materials and technical reports that reflect the interdisciplinary breadth of the DMHI ecosystem. This corpus encompasses a wide range of study designs, including randomized controlled trials (RCTs), individual patient data network meta-analyses, cross-sectional surveys, empirical software audits, and legislative reviews. This methodological heterogeneity is intentional, as it ensures that findings regarding clinical potency are balanced against technical security assessments and policy-focused critiques. The scope of the review is particularly concentrated on contemporary digital modalities, including iCBT, mHealth applications, conversational AI, and immersive technologies such as VR and AR.

The temporal concentration of the literature included in this corpus reflects the accelerated pace of digital innovation in the 2020s, with several key analyses and systematic reviews reaching into 2025 and 2026. This focus on contemporary literature allows for the examination of advanced agentic AI architectures and generative models that have only recently begun to influence psychiatric practice. Rather than aiming for an exhaustive database coverage that might prioritize quantity over thematic relevance, the selection logic for this corpus emphasized high-level evidence and authoritative frameworks that address systemic impacts. Consequently, the review integrates established theoretical models, such as Supportive Accountability, with emerging empirical findings concerning algorithmic bias and the digital inverse care law.

2.3 Analytical and Thematic Framework

The synthesis of the evidentiary corpus was conducted using an iterative thematic analytical approach. This process involved the initial identification of recurring concepts across the interdisciplinary literature, which were then organized into four core domains: clinical effectiveness and engagement, accessibility and the digital divide, stigma and identity management, and ethical and regulatory challenges. These domains serve as the structural pillars of the manuscript, ensuring that the findings are presented in a logically cohesive narrative. The framework is inherently socio-technical, treating the digital intervention not as a neutral tool but as an active participant in a complex social system.

Traceability was a primary concern throughout the thematic organization phase. Every major claim within the results and subsequent discussion is directly linked to the empirical findings or theoretical propositions found in the original source materials. This ensures that the interpretative layers of the review remain grounded in documented evidence. The analytical framework also prioritized the identification of cross-domain interdependencies, such as how regulatory fragmentation in governance directly impacts the privacy protections available to marginalized populations. By employing this thematic strategy, the review captures the nuanced realities of DMHIs beyond simple binary assessments of effectiveness or failure.

2.4 Data Extraction and Synthesis Strategy

Data extraction was performed with an emphasis on preserving the empirical density of the source materials. Key quantitative findings, including effect sizes (e.g., Hedges' g), non-inferiority margins, attrition rates, and hazard ratios, were meticulously extracted from meta-analyses and randomized trials. This quantitative data provides a rigorous foundation for the subsequent narrative synthesis. While no independent statistical meta-analysis was performed by the authors of this review, the extracted figures serve as benchmark indicators that inform the interpretative integration of qualitative evidence. This dual focus ensures that the narrative synthesis is both empirically robust and conceptually rich.

The synthesis strategy focused on the identification and exploration of systemic tensions that characterize the digital mental health market. These include the "engagement paradox," where high initial adoption is offset by rapid attrition, and the "value-privacy paradox," which defines the user’s trade-off between therapeutic benefit and data exploitation. The synthesis also integrated high-level conceptual

frameworks, such as the "inverse care law" and "inverse data law," to interpret findings regarding health equity and algorithmic representation. By synthesizing qualitative insights on user perception with technical audits of security vulnerabilities, the strategy provides a multi-layered view of the risks and opportunities inherent in DMHIs.

2.5 Methodological Limitations

Several methodological limitations inherent to the narrative review design must be acknowledged to maintain transparency. First, the use of a curated evidentiary corpus, while ensuring interdisciplinary relevance, may introduce a degree of selection bias compared to the protocol-driven search characteristic of a formal systematic review. Second, the extreme heterogeneity of the study designs - ranging from software-side server tests to longitudinal psychiatric trials - complicates the ability to draw direct, comparable conclusions across the entire corpus. This variance necessitated an interpretative approach that may be subject to the authors' thematic prioritization.

Furthermore, the review identifies a structural overrepresentation of evidence from high-income settings, particularly the United States and European contexts. This geographic concentration limits the generalizability of findings regarding accessibility and digital equity to low- and middle-income countries (LMICs). Additionally, as identified in the engagement results, the existing literature may be influenced by a survival bias, as participants who complete digital trials often possess higher levels of motivation or digital literacy than the general clinical population. Finally, it should be noted that no formal risk-of-bias tools, such as the Cochrane Risk of Bias or PRISMA extension for scoping reviews, were independently applied to the curated corpus, as the primary objective was narrative integration rather than systematic quality appraisal.

2.6 Ethical Considerations

The methodology of this review relies exclusively on the analysis of published secondary data. No primary research involving human subjects, animal models, or the collection of original patient data was conducted by the authors during the preparation of this manuscript. All included studies cited in this review were conducted under the oversight of their respective institutional review boards and ethical committees, as documented in their primary publications. For example, clinical trials and qualitative surveys integrated into the results reported their own adherence to informed consent and data protection protocols. Consequently, this narrative review did not require independent ethical approval or institutional review board clearance. The synthesis was performed in strict accordance with academic integrity standards, ensuring the accurate attribution of intellectual property through systematic citation.

3. Results

3.1 Clinical Effectiveness

The clinical effectiveness of DMHIs is extensively documented across various psychiatric conditions, with evidence primarily centered on the non-inferiority of iCBT compared to traditional face-to-face modalities. In an updated systematic review and meta-analysis of 20 RCTs involving 1,418 participants, Carlbring et al. (2018) demonstrated that iCBT is generally non-inferior to traditional therapy, yielding a pooled effect size at post-treatment of Hedges' g = 0.05 (95% CI, -0.09 to 0.20). These findings indicate equivalent overall outcomes for a diverse range of conditions, including depression, social anxiety disorder, and panic disorder. This non-inferiority is further supported by Karyotaki et al. (2021), whose individual patient data network meta-analysis of 39 studies comprising 9,751 participants established that depression symptom severity can be effectively reduced through both guided and unguided iCBT. Notably, however, Karyotaki et al. (2021) emphasize that guided iCBT yields significantly higher effectiveness than unguided formats, reporting a mean difference in post-treatment PHQ-9 scores of -0.80 (95% CI, -1.4 to -0.2), which underscores the critical role of human support in achieving superior post-treatment outcomes.

The role of human guidance in enhancing digital efficacy is theoretically grounded in the Supportive Accountability model. Mohr et al. (2011) posit that human support improves adherence and outcomes by fostering accountability toward a coach who is perceived as benevolent, trustworthy, and possessing relevant expertise. This model suggests that the social presence of a professional mitigates the limitations of fully automated systems by providing a motivational framework that sustains user engagement. Empirical support for this in academic settings is provided by Rashid et al. (2025), who conducted a large-scale meta-analysis of 20 studies involving 30,639 college and university students. They reported substantial effect sizes, with Hedges' g ranging from 0.80 to 0.88, for digital interventions targeting anxiety, depression, and overall

psychological well-being. These findings demonstrate that digital platforms can achieve robust therapeutic impacts in specific high-need populations when implemented as part of a structured support system.

Specialized interventions for complex conditions like PTSD and bipolar disorder have also undergone rigorous evaluation. Bisson et al. (2023) conducted the RAPID trial, a pragmatic randomized controlled trial comparing guided self-help to individual trauma-focused CBT for PTSD, utilizing a non-inferiority margin of 5 points on the 80-point CAPS-5 scale. The study established the non-inferiority of guided self-help at the 16-week primary endpoint, observing a mean difference of 1.01 (one-sided 95% CI, -∞ to 3.90; $p = 0.012$). These results position self-help as a viable alternative that maintains high engagement, as evidenced by an 82% participant retention rate. Furthermore, Goharinejad et al. (2026) identified that immersive technologies offer distinct advantages, with VR-based treatments yielding a pooled effect size of Hedges' $g = -0.35$ (95% CI, -0.57 to -0.13), significantly improving PTSD symptoms through immersive exposure. In contrast, the LiveWell trial for bipolar disorder I (Goulding et al., 2023) found that while a smartphone-based self-management intervention decreased depressive symptom severity (mean difference = -0.80; $p = 0.02$) and improved relational quality of life, it did not significantly reduce the overall risk of relapse compared to usual care (hazard ratio [HR] = 0.65; 95% CI, 0.39 to 1.09; $p = 0.08$). However, a more targeted benefit was observed for individuals in asymptomatic recovery, where the intervention was associated with a significant reduction in relapse risk (HR = 0.32; 95% CI, 0.12 to 0.88; $p = 0.02$).

The "engagement paradox" in digital mental health highlights a critical discrepancy between the theoretical scalability of digital tools and their real-world utilization, particularly among high-need populations. From an epidemiological perspective, while remotely delivered treatments are designed to overcome access barriers, only 10% to 40% of individuals with depression receive timely intervention, and approximately 70% of those expressing interest in psychological treatment continue to report significant barriers such as cost and stigma (Nicholas et al., 2021). Even when treatment is initiated, retention remains a substantial systemic challenge, with only about two-thirds (approximately 66%) of individuals completing the full course. This paradox is further reflected in the performance differences between specific delivery formats. While guided internet-based cognitive behavioral therapy (iCBT) demonstrates greater efficacy and higher retention than self-guided versions, its retention is generally considered equivalent to traditional face-to-face psychotherapy. In controlled trial findings, Nicholas et al. (2021) demonstrated that iCBT was non-inferior to telephone-delivered CBT (tCBT) for depression, reporting a negligible effect size difference (d = 0.004; 90% CI, -0.19 to 0.19) and no significant difference in dropout rates (p = 0.114). These empirical findings suggest that while digital interventions are efficacious, the "paradox" lies in the persistent difficulty of achieving sustained engagement and completion among the broader population they are intended to serve.

3.2 Accessibility and Health Equity

Accessibility in the digital mental health landscape is deeply influenced by the digital divide, a multifaceted barrier encompassing infrastructure, costs, and hardware constraints. On a global scale, only 55% of households possess an internet connection, with significant disparities across economic contexts: connection rates are as high as 87% in high-income countries but fall to 47% in transitional countries and only 19% in low-income nations. Sieck et al. (2021) identify digital inclusion as a crucial social determinant of health, noting that between 15% and 24% of Americans lack a broadband connection. This discrepancy is notably more acute among lower-income cohorts, where 38% of households with annual earnings below $20,000 lack access to broadband. Newman et al. (2024) highlight that these inequities contribute directly to heightened levels of anxiety and stress in marginalized communities, specifically within African American populations, where limited access to digital resources impedes professional and social participation.

The "digital inverse care law" refers to a systemic failure in which individuals with the greatest requirement for mental health support are frequently the least likely to utilize or benefit from digital interventions. Alami et al. (2022) and Davies et al. (2021) argue that while digital technology has the potential to mitigate inequalities, it frequently exacerbates them by favoring individuals with existing high digital literacy and reliable infrastructure. This law suggests that the shift toward virtual care may leave behind populations experiencing social deprivation or older age. Goldberg et al. (2025) support this through a systematic review of digital patient portals, finding that usage is consistently lower among individuals with lower educational attainment and older age, though the relationship with income remained inconsistent across the analyzed studies.

Barriers related to specific physical and cognitive constraints further complicate health equity. Lange et al. (2025) conducted a cross-sectional study of older adults in Poland - where smartphone adoption among

individuals over 65 years is limited to just 33.4% - finding that those with near visual impairment were significantly less likely to use digital technologies (odds ratio [OR] = 0.62 to 0.65) compared to their peers without such impairments. This research emphasizes that sociodemographic factors, such as rural residence and lower education, interact with physical disabilities to compound digital exclusion. Camacho and Torous (2023) suggest that digital literacy training, such as the Digital Outreach for Obtaining Resources and Skills (DOORS) program, is a necessary intervention to bridge this gap for people with serious mental illness, improving functional skills even if immediate symptom reduction is not always observed.

Systemic inequities are also visible in the "inverse data law" described by Ameen et al. (2023). This concept posits that the data available to train AI and digital tools is often inversely proportional to the complexity and severity of the patient's needs. Consequently, digital tools are frequently optimized for "wellness" among relatively healthy populations, while the needs of marginalized or complex patients remain underrepresented in the datasets that drive algorithmic development. This data scarcity for specific groups results in a lack of tailored, effective interventions for those at the highest risk.

3.3 Stigma Reduction and Social Perception

Digital mental health platforms offer unique opportunities for stigma reduction through anonymity and identity management. Ahmedani (2011) outlines the various dimensions of mental health stigma - public, self, and professional - as significant barriers to help-seeking. Digital environments can mitigate these barriers by allowing users to engage in concealable identity management. Chaudoir et al. (2013) apply Goffman's theory to differentiate between the "discredited" (those with visible stigma) and the "discreditable" (those with concealable stigma), suggesting that the ability to control disclosure in digital spaces can lead to smoother social interactions and lower psychological costs.

The use of anonymous "throwaway" accounts on social media platforms like Reddit serves as a primary mechanism for managing socially stigmatized conditions (Pavalanathan & De Choudhury, 2015). Research by the authors demonstrates that the use of throwaway accounts is six times more frequent within mental health communities compared to other types of social forums. These accounts facilitate a disinhibited discourse characterized by increased self-disclosure and cognitive focus on personal distress, allowing individuals to seek support without the fear of social or professional repercussions. This form of digital engagement is particularly vital for populations facing high levels of cultural stigma.

The influence of cultural norms on help-seeking behavior is further investigated by Ntumi et al. (2025) within the context of a Ghanaian university; through Structural Equation modeling involving 1,067 students. They found that cultural norms significantly increase mental health stigma ($\beta = 0.420$), which consequently hinders help-seeking behavior. However, digital engagement was found to moderate this relationship, potentially providing a gateway for help-seeking that bypasses traditional cultural barriers. Similarly, Kim et al. (2023) and Wani et al. (2024) found that in LMICs, digital interventions are increasingly viewed as a viable means to provide adolescent mental health care in contexts where traditional services are either unavailable or highly stigmatized.

Despite these benefits, digital environments are not free from prejudice. McInroy et al. (2025) investigate the impact of digital microaggressions on LGBTQ+ youth, noting that exposure to online discrimination and exclusion negatively affects their mental well-being and stress levels. Furthermore, Haimson et al. (2025) report that marginalized populations in the United States, including transgender and disabled individuals, hold significantly more negative attitudes toward AI in mental health. These attitudes reflect a lack of trust in systems that may not account for their specific needs or may replicate historical biases.

3.4 Ethical, Regulatory, and Commercial Challenges

The rapid proliferation of DMHIs has outpaced regulatory oversight, leading to significant vulnerabilities in data privacy and security. In an empirical investigation of 27 top-ranked mental health apps available on the Google Play Store, Iwaya et al. (2023) highlighted the prevalence of critical privacy risks, noting that 74% of the analyzed apps were at critical security risk and 15% were at high risk. Their analysis revealed extensive data sharing behaviors, with 81.7% of the servers communicated with being owned by third parties, often facilitating user profiling and targeted advertising through SDKs such as Facebook and AppsFlyer. User awareness is further hindered by inadequate transparency; 89% of app privacy policies were found to require at least a college-level education to understand, and only 11% of developers reported conducting a Privacy Impact Assessment (PIA). Furthermore, security testing identified that 79% of the apps stored personal information in plain-text, while 68% of those dynamically analyzed leaked API keys, creating

significant vulnerabilities that could compromise the highly sensitive personal health information of vulnerable users.

Regulatory fragmentation is a primary challenge in governing AI-enabled mental health devices. Shumate et al. (2025) performed a 50-state legislative review in the United States, finding that federal authority is fragmented, leaving states to act as "laboratories for policy". This has resulted in a patchwork of regulations concerning algorithmic transparency and safety standards, often excluding clinical expertise from the legislative process. Joshi (2025) proposes a multi-layered regulatory framework for generative AI digital mental health devices, emphasizing the need for safety architectures and post-market oversight to address the unique risks of stochastic generation and harmful clinical advice.

The commercialization of mental health apps often leads to the "value-privacy paradox". Zhang et al. (2021) identify this paradox as the tension between the benefits of data-driven monitoring and the user's concern over data exploitation. This challenge is compounded by the commercial strategies employed by developers. Eagle et al. (2022) examined the negative consequences of the "freemium" model in mental health apps, where essential therapeutic features or crisis support are paywalled. This model can create financial pressure for individuals in distress and lead to abrupt termination of support when trial periods expire, raising significant ethical concerns regarding the duty of care in a commercialized health market.

Additional ethical concerns involve the potential for "attentional harms" and algorithmic bias. Hartford and Stein (2022) discuss how persuasive technologies and mechanisms designed to sustain user attention can erode an individual's agency and focus, constituting a new form of digital inequality. The lack of algorithmic transparency and the reliance on biased datasets can further marginalize specific groups. Torous and Cipriani (2025) argue that the shift from "wellness" apps to regulated generative AI clinical tools requires a new generation of clinical investigation to ensure these technologies provide genuine therapeutic value rather than merely "simulated empathy" that might bypass safety standards. Martinez-Martin and Kreitmair (2018) emphasize that direct-to-consumer digital psychotherapy often lacks clear lines of professional accountability, complicating the ethical landscape of digital care.

3.5 Cross-Domain Interdependencies in Digital Mental Health

The findings synthesized across the preceding domains indicate that the reported clinical effectiveness of DMHIs is associated with structural, psychological, and regulatory factors that shape implementation and engagement. Evidence supporting the non-inferiority of iCBT compared with face-to-face modalities (Carlbring et al., 2018; Karyotaki et al., 2021) suggests scalability potential; however, uptake and sustained engagement vary across intervention formats. High attrition rates in unguided interventions (Linardon et al., 2025) demonstrate that treatment outcomes are closely linked to engagement dynamics, which have been conceptually framed in relation to Supportive Accountability mechanisms (Mohr et al., 2011).

Engagement patterns intersect with structural determinants of access. Studies document that broadband limitations (Sieck et al., 2021) and sociodemographic disparities (Lange et al., 2025; Newman et al., 2024) are associated with differential utilization of digital services, consistent with the notion of a digitally mediated inverse care pattern (Alami et al., 2022; Davies et al., 2021). These access gradients interact with data representation issues in algorithmic systems. The "inverse data law" (Ameen et al., 2023) describes how underrepresentation of marginalized populations in training datasets may limit model generalizability, particularly for individuals with complex or comorbid presentations.

Digital platforms also introduce distinct psychosocial affordances and risks. Research indicates that anonymity and the use of alternative or temporary accounts can facilitate stigma management and identity concealment (Chaudoir et al., 2013; Pavalanathan & De Choudhury, 2015). At the same time, users may encounter digital microaggressions (McInroy et al., 2025) and express trust concerns regarding AI-enabled systems (Haimson et al., 2025). Tensions between perceived value and privacy concerns have been described as a “value-privacy paradox” (Zhang et al., 2021), operating within regulatory environments characterized by fragmentation and jurisdictional variability (Shumate et al., 2025). Commercial strategies, including freemium service models (Eagle et al., 2022), further structure access conditions for higher-intensity or crisis-related support.

Across these domains, the literature documents interactions between clinical efficacy evidence, engagement patterns, infrastructural access, data governance, and commercialization models. Collectively, these findings illustrate that effectiveness, accessibility, and societal impact are empirically interlinked dimensions within digital mental health systems.

4. Discussion

The synthesized results illustrate that DMHIs represent a multifaceted socio-technical phenomenon that cannot be reduced solely to clinical outcomes. While the evidence confirms the technical feasibility and therapeutic non-inferiority of these tools, the findings simultaneously reveal a complex landscape of structural barriers, psychological paradoxes, and ethical vulnerabilities. The core insight emerging from this research is that the transition from traditional to digital care models is not merely a change in delivery medium but a fundamental reshaping of help-seeking dynamics, social identity management, and the distribution of health resources. As such, the effectiveness of DMHIs is inextricably linked to the socio-economic and regulatory contexts in which they are deployed.

4.1 Clinical Effectiveness and the Human-Digital Hybrid

The documented non-inferiority of iCBT compared to traditional modalities (Carlbring et al., 2018; Karyotaki et al., 2021) establishes a baseline legitimacy for digital interventions. However, the interpretation of these findings suggests that digital efficacy is highly contingent upon the degree of human integration. The emphasis on guided iCBT yielding significantly higher effect sizes and more durable outcomes (Karyotaki et al., 2021) underscores the validity of the Supportive Accountability model. As Mohr et al. (2011) argue, the social presence of a professional provides a motivational framework that automated systems currently fail to replicate. This suggests that the "digital" success of these interventions is, paradoxically, grounded in "human" accountability and the perceived trustworthiness of a coach.

The results also highlight a thematic tension between specialized clinical success and broader engagement challenges. While immersive technologies like VR and AR demonstrate superior outcomes in treating PTSD by providing environments traditional methods may lack (Goharinejad et al., 2026), the "engagement paradox" remains a significant barrier. The high initial uptake followed by significant attrition (Linardon et al., 2025) indicates that while digital platforms lower the barrier to entry, they struggle to sustain long-term commitment. This attrition is particularly pronounced in unguided interventions, reinforcing the interpretation that autonomous digital self-management, while cost-effective (Bisson et al., 2023), may lack the clinical oversight necessary for sustained recovery in severe or complex conditions (Goulding et al., 2023).

4.2 Structural Inequities and the Digital Inverse Care Law

The findings regarding accessibility suggest that DMHIs may inadvertently reinforce the very disparities they aim to solve. By identifying digital inclusion as a social determinant of health, the research highlights that a lack of broadband - particularly among lower-income and marginalized communities (Newman et al., 2024; Sieck et al., 2021) - acts as a structural exclusion mechanism. This is articulated through the "digital inverse care law" (Alami et al., 2022; Davies et al., 2021), which posits that populations with the highest mental health needs are the least likely to access digital tools due to limited infrastructure and digital literacy. This systemic failure is not only a matter of cost but also of physical and cognitive barriers, as seen in the exclusion of older adults with visual impairments (Lange et al., 2025).

Furthermore, the "inverse data law" (Ameen et al., 2023) introduces a critical analytical dimension to the discussion of health equity. The optimization of digital tools for "wellness" among healthy populations results in a data scarcity that prevents the development of tailored interventions for high-risk, complex cases. This interpretation suggests that the current trajectory of DMHI development is biased toward majority groups, leaving marginalized populations underrepresented in the datasets that drive algorithmic innovation. Consequently, while digital literacy training (Camacho & Torous, 2023) is a necessary step toward bridging the functional gap, it cannot alone resolve the systemic data inequities that define the digital mental health market.

4.3 Stigma, Identity, and the Ambivalence of Anonymity

The results concerning social perception illustrate that digital environments offer a double-edged sword for marginalized groups. On one hand, the affordance of anonymity through "throwaway" accounts allows individuals to manage "discreditable" identities (Chaudoir et al., 2013; Pavalanathan & De Choudhury, 2015) and bypass cultural stigma that would otherwise prevent help-seeking (Ntumi et al., 2025). This digital disinhibition facilitates a form of cognitive focus and self-disclosure that is vital in contexts where traditional services are unavailable or highly stigmatized (Kim et al., 2023; Wani et al., 2024).

On the other hand, the results indicate that digital spaces are not immune to the social prejudices of the physical world. The impact of digital microaggressions on LGBTQ+ youth (McInroy et al., 2025) and the

negative attitudes toward AI reported by transgender and disabled individuals (Haimson et al., 2025) suggest a profound lack of trust in digital systems. This trust deficit is logically linked to the fear that algorithms will replicate historical biases or fail to account for specific lived experiences. This creates a conceptual tension: digital platforms provide the anonymity required to seek help, yet the interaction within those platforms can subject users to the same discriminatory dynamics they sought to avoid.

4.4 Ethical Vulnerabilities and Regulatory Fragmentation

The interpretative analysis of ethical and regulatory challenges reveals a landscape where technological proliferation has significantly outpaced governance. The empirical identification of privacy risks in top-ranked apps (Iwaya et al., 2023) demonstrates that the "value-privacy paradox" (Zhang et al., 2021) is not merely a theoretical concern but a routine occurrence. The commercialization of mental health through "freemium" models (Eagle et al., 2022) introduces a concerning dynamic where financial pressure and the paywalling of crisis support conflict with the fundamental duty of care. This is further complicated by the "attentional harms" generated by persuasive technologies (Hartford & Stein, 2022), which may erode the very agency that mental health interventions are designed to restore.

The regulatory fragmentation documented in the United States (Shumate et al., 2025) underscores the lack of a cohesive framework for AI-enabled devices. The reliance on states as "policy laboratories" in the absence of federal standards has led to a patchwork of regulations that often exclude essential clinical expertise. As Torous and Cipriani (2025) argue, the shift from wellness apps to clinical tools requires a new generation of clinical investigation to prevent the deployment of "simulated empathy" that lacks therapeutic value. The absence of clear accountability for direct-to-consumer digital psychotherapy (Martinez-Martin & Kreitmair, 2018) remains a critical systemic vulnerability that undermines the overall safety and legitimacy of the digital mental health ecosystem.

4.5 Methodological Limitations and Integrative Interpretation

The evidence base presented in the results reveals several methodological and structural limitations that must be acknowledged. The "engagement paradox" (Linardon et al., 2025) suggests that many digital trials may suffer from a survival bias, where only the most motivated users provide data. Additionally, the over-reliance on datasets from relatively healthy populations (Ameen et al., 2023) and the fragmentation of regulatory oversight (Shumate et al., 2025) limit the generalizability and clinical safety of current models. The heterogeneity of the success of DMHIs across different disorders - such as the high efficacy in PTSD (Goharinejad et al., 2026) versus the more modest impact on relapse risk in bipolar disorder (Goulding et al., 2023) - suggests that clinical oversight remains indispensable.

In conclusion, the overarching conceptual synthesis of the results suggests that while DMHIs offer a scalable solution for improving accessibility and reducing stigma, their implementation is currently hindered by the "digital inverse care law" and significant ethical-regulatory gaps. The effectiveness of these tools is maximized when they are integrated into a human-supported system that adheres to the principles of Supportive Accountability. However, the commercial and structural forces driving the current market - characterized by freemium models, data sharing risks, and algorithmic bias - threaten to exacerbate health inequalities. Moving forward, the integration of clinical expertise into policy-making and the development of safety architectures for AI (Joshi, 2025) are essential to ensuring that digital innovation provides genuine public value without compromising the privacy or agency of the individuals it seeks to help.

5. Conclusions

The comprehensive review of DMHIs reveals a multifaceted socio-technical landscape where therapeutic potential is fundamentally intertwined with structural, social, and ethical conditions. The central insight emerging from this synthesis is that the transition to digital care models constitutes a profound reshaping of help-seeking dynamics and the distribution of health resources rather than a mere change in the medium of delivery. While technology provides a scalable platform for intervention, its effectiveness is not an intrinsic property of the software itself but is contingent upon the socio-economic and regulatory frameworks within which it is deployed. Consequently, the legitimacy of DMHIs as a pillar of modern psychiatry depends on the successful integration of technical innovation with human-centric support and equitable access.

Clinical findings establish a baseline of therapeutic non-inferiority for iCBT relative to traditional face-to-face modalities (Carlbring et al., 2018; Karyotaki et al., 2021). However, the implementation of these tools is characterized by a persistent engagement paradox, where the benefit of low-barrier access is often

neutralized by high rates of treatment attrition (Linardon et al., 2025). The evidence suggests that the most durable outcomes are achieved through a human-digital hybrid model, supporting the theoretical framework of Supportive Accountability (Mohr et al., 2011). While specialized technologies such as VR offer superior immersive environments for conditions like PTSD (Goharinejad et al., 2026), severe mental illnesses continue to require significant clinical oversight, as digital self-management tools have shown limited capacity to reduce relapse risk in complex disorders (Goulding et al., 2023).

From a structural and social perspective, DMHIs operate within a digital divide that risks reinforcing existing health disparities. Digital inclusion has emerged as a critical social determinant of health, yet the digital inverse care law ensures that those with the most acute mental health needs are frequently the least likely to access digital resources (Davies et al., 2021; Sieck et al., 2021). This inequality is further complicated by the ambivalence of digital anonymity. While platforms allow for the management of stigmatized identities through concealable identity management and anonymous accounts (Chaudoir et al., 2013; Pavalanathan & De Choudhury, 2015), they also expose users to digital microaggressions and prejudice, which can undermine trust in these systems (Haimson et al., 2025; McInroy et al., 2025). The structural exclusion of specific groups, such as older adults with sensory impairments, further highlights the limitations of a one-size-fits-all digital approach (Lange et al., 2025).

The ethical and regulatory dimensions of the digital mental health ecosystem are currently defined by a significant gap between technological proliferation and governance. Systematic vulnerabilities in data privacy and the commercialization of care through freemium models create a value-privacy paradox that places an undue burden on the user (Eagle et al., 2022; Iwaya et al., 2023; Zhang et al., 2021). Furthermore, the inverse data law suggests that the algorithmic foundations of these tools are often biased toward healthy populations, leaving marginalized and complex patients underrepresented (Ameen et al., 2023). This lack of representation is compounded by regulatory fragmentation, particularly in the United States, where the absence of cohesive federal standards has left state legislatures to serve as isolated policy laboratories (Shumate et al., 2025).

Ultimately, this review underscores the academic and clinical significance of viewing DMHIs through an integrative socio-technical lens. The evidence base remains constrained by methodological limitations, including survival bias in engagement studies and a lack of data regarding complex clinical cases (Ameen et al., 2023; Linardon et al., 2025). For digital mental health to achieve its democratizing potential, future developments must transcend the current focus on "wellness" capitalism and transition toward regulated, clinically-led architectures (Torous & Cipriani, 2025). The conceptual contribution of this review highlights that the future of mental health care lies in bridging the divide between clinical efficacy and social equity, ensuring that digital innovation provides genuine public value while protecting the privacy and agency of the individuals it serves.

Disclosures

All authors have read and agreed with the published version of the manuscript.

Conflict of interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest.

Funding statement: No external funding was received to perform this review.

Statement of data availability: The data supporting the findings of this study are available within the article's bibliography.

REFERENCES

1. Abou Ali, M., Dornaika, F., & Charafeddine, J. (2025). Agentic AI: A comprehensive survey of architectures, applications, and future directions. *Artificial Intelligence Review, 59*(1), Article 11. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10462-025-11422-4
2. Ahmedani, B. K. (2011). Mental health stigma: Society, individuals, and the profession. *Journal of Social Work Values and Ethics, 8*(2), 41–416.
3. Alami, H., Lehoux, P., Shaw, S. E., Papoutsi, C., Rybczynska-Bunt, S., & Fortin, J. P. (2022). Virtual care and the inverse care law: Implications for policy, practice, research, public and patients. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 19*(17), 10591. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph191710591
4. Ameen, S., Wong, M. C., Yee, K. C., Nøhr, C., & Turner, P. (2023). The inverse data law: Market imperatives, data, and quality in AI supported care. *Studies in Health Technology and Informatics, 302*, 428–432. https://doi.org/10.3233/SHTI230166
5. Bisson, J. I., Ariti, C., Cullen, K., Kitchiner, N., Lewis, C., Roberts, N. P., Simon, N., Smallman, K., Addison, K., Bell, V., Brookes-Howell, L., Cosgrove, S., Ehlers, A., Fitzsimmons, D., Foscarini-Craggs, P., Harris, S. R. S., Kelson, M., Lovell, K., McKenna, M., McNamara, R., ... Williams-Thomas, R. (2023). Pragmatic randomised controlled trial of guided self-help versus individual cognitive behavioural therapy with a trauma focus for post-traumatic stress disorder (RAPID). *Health Technology Assessment, 27*(26), 1–141. https://doi.org/10.3310/YTQW8336
6. Camacho, E., & Torous, J. (2023). Impact of digital literacy training on outcomes for people with serious mental illness in community and inpatient settings. *Psychiatric Services, 74*(5), 534–538. https://doi.org/10.1176/appi.ps.20220205
7. Cameron, G., Mulvenna, M., Ennis, E., O'Neill, S., Bond, R., Cameron, D., & Bunting, A. (2025). Effectiveness of digital mental health interventions in the workplace: Umbrella review of systematic reviews. *JMIR Mental Health, 12*, e67785. https://doi.org/10.2196/67785
8. Carlbring, P., Andersson, G., Cuijpers, P., Riper, H., & Hedman-Lagerlöf, E. (2018). Internet-based vs. face-to-face cognitive behavior therapy for psychiatric and somatic disorders: An updated systematic review and meta-analysis. *Cognitive Behaviour Therapy, 47*(1), 1–18. https://doi.org/10.1080/16506073.2017.1401115
9. Chaudoir, S. R., Earnshaw, V. A., & Andel, S. (2013). "Discredited" versus "discreditable": Understanding how shared and unique stigma mechanisms affect psychological and physical health disparities. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology, 35*(1), 75–87. https://doi.org/10.1080/01973533.2012.746612
10. Chidambaram, S., Jain, B., Jain, U., Mwavu, R., Baru, R., Thomas, B., Greaves, F., Jayakumar, S., Jain, P., Rojo, M., Battaglino, M. R., Meara, J. G., Sounderajah, V., Celi, L. A., & Darzi, A. (2024). An introduction to digital determinants of health. *PLOS Digital Health, 3*(1), e0000346. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pdig.0000346
11. Davies, A. R., Honeyman, M., & Gann, B. (2021). Addressing the digital inverse care law in the time of COVID-19: Potential for digital technology to exacerbate or mitigate health inequalities. *Journal of Medical Internet Research, 23*(4), e21726. https://doi.org/10.2196/21726
12. Eagle, T., Mehrotra, A., Sharma, A., Zuniga, A., & Whittaker, S. (2022). "Money doesn't buy you happiness": Negative consequences of using the freemium model for mental health apps. *Proceedings of the ACM on Human-Computer Interaction, 6*(CSCW2), Article 265. https://doi.org/10.1145/3555155
13. Goharinejad, S., Goharinezhad, S., Moulaei, K., Krüger, B., & Spittler, T. (2026). Assessing the impact of virtual reality, augmented reality, and video games on improving post-traumatic stress disorder symptoms: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Inquiry: A Journal of Medical Care Organization, Provision and Financing, 63*, 469580251413101. https://doi.org/10.1177/00469580251413101
14. Goldberg, N., Herrmann, C., Di Gion, P., Hautsch, V., Hefter, K., Langebartels, G., Pfaff, H., Ansmann, L., Karbach, U., & Wurster, F. (2025). Sociodemographic and socioeconomic determinants for the usage of digital patient portals in hospitals: Systematic review and meta-analysis on the digital divide. *Journal of Medical Internet Research, 27*, e68091. https://doi.org/10.2196/68091
15. Goulding, E. H., Dopke, C. A., Rossom, R., Jonathan, G., Mohr, D., & Kwasny, M. J. (2023). Effects of a smartphone-based self-management intervention for individuals with bipolar disorder on relapse, symptom burden, and quality of life: A randomized clinical trial. *JAMA Psychiatry, 80*(2), 109–118. https://doi.org/10.1001/jamapsychiatry.2022.4304
16. Haimson, O. L., Mayworm, S. R., Ingber, A. S., & Andalibi, N. (2025). AI attitudes among marginalized populations in the U.S.: Nonbinary, transgender, and disabled individuals report more negative AI attitudes. *Proceedings of the 2025 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*, 1224–1237. https://doi.org/10.1145/3715275.3732081
17. Hartford, A., & Stein, D. J. (2022). Attentional harms and digital inequalities. *JMIR Mental Health, 9*(2), e30838. https://doi.org/10.2196/30838
18. Istepanian, R. S. H. (2022). Mobile health (m-health) in retrospect: The known unknowns. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 19*(7), 3747. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph19073747

19. Iwaya, L. H., Babar, M. A., Rashid, A., & Wijayarathna, C. (2023). On the privacy of mental health apps: An empirical investigation and its implications for app development. *Empirical Software Engineering, 28*(1), Article 2. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10664-022-10236-0
20. Joshi, S. (2025). Regulatory frameworks for generative AI enabled digital mental health devices: Safety, transparency, and post-market oversight. *SSRN*. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.5888882
21. Karyotaki, E., Efthimiou, O., Miguel, C., Bermpohl, F. M. G., Furukawa, T. A., Cuijpers, P., Individual Patient Data Meta-Analyses for Depression (IPDMA-DE) Collaboration, Riper, H., Patel, V., Mira, A., Gemmil, A. W., Yeung, A. S., Lange, A., Williams, A. D., Mackinnon, A., Geraedts, A., van Straten, A., Meyer, B., Björkelund, C., Knaevelsrud, C., ... Forsell, Y. (2021). Internet-based cognitive behavioral therapy for depression: A systematic review and individual patient data network meta-analysis. *JAMA Psychiatry, 78*(4), 361–371. https://doi.org/10.1001/jamapsychiatry.2020.4364
22. Kim, J., Aryee, L. M. D., Bang, H., Prajogo, S., Choi, Y. K., Hoch, J. S., & Prado, E. L. (2023). Effectiveness of digital mental health tools to reduce depressive and anxiety symptoms in low- and middle-income countries: Systematic review and meta-analysis. *JMIR Mental Health, 10*, e43066. https://doi.org/10.2196/43066
23. Lange, A., Lange, N., Jagiełło, K., Wojtyniak, B., & Zdrojewski, T. (2025). Use of digital technology among older adults in Poland with and those without near visual impairment: Cross-sectional study. *Journal of Medical Internet Research, 27*, e68947. https://doi.org/10.2196/68947
24. Linardon, J., Messer, M., Reid, R., Bolger, T., & Andersson, G. (2025). Absolute and relative rates of treatment non-initiation, dropout, and attrition in internet-based and face-to-face cognitive-behavioral therapy: A meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *Cognitive Behaviour Therapy*, 1–14. Advance online publication. https://doi.org/10.1080/16506073.2025.2542364
25. Martinez-Martin, N., & Kreitmair, K. (2018). Ethical issues for direct-to-consumer digital psychotherapy apps: Addressing accountability, data protection, and consent. *JMIR Mental Health, 5*(2), e32. https://doi.org/10.2196/mental.9423
26. McInroy, L. B., Scheadler, T. R., McDonald, M., Eaton, A. D., & Craig, S. L. (2025). Digital microaggressions and LGBTQ+ youth: Exploring potential impacts and opportunities for educational intervention. *Educational Psychology*, 1–22. https://doi.org/10.1080/01443410.2025.2541743
27. Mohr, D. C., Cuijpers, P., & Lehman, K. (2011). Supportive accountability: A model for providing human support to enhance adherence to eHealth interventions. *Journal of Medical Internet Research, 13*(1), e30. https://doi.org/10.2196/jmir.1602
28. Newman, G., Hendricks, L., Cooper, T., Smith, D. J., Guerin, A., Hudson, E., Mitchell, K., & Stewart, D. (2024). The digital divide: A factor that raises high levels of anxiety and other mental health challenges in African Americans. *Literature Reviews in Education and Human Services, 3*(2), 47–57.
29. Nicholas, J., Knapp, A. A., Vergara, J. L., Graham, A. K., Gray, E. L., Lattie, E. G., Kwasny, M. J., & Mohr, D. C. (2021). An exploratory brief head-to-head non-inferiority comparison of an internet-based and a telephone-delivered CBT intervention for adults with depression. *Journal of Affective Disorders, 281*, 673–677. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jad.2020.11.093
30. Ntumi, S., Upoalkpajor, J. N., & Nimo, D. G. (2025). Culturally responsive assessment of help-seeking behavior among university students: A mediation-moderation analysis of cultural norms, mental health stigma, and digital engagement across cross-cultural contexts. *BMC Psychology, 13*(1), 922. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40359-025-03256-0
31. Patel, V., Saxena, S., Lund, C., Kohrt, B., Kieling, C., Sunkel, C., Kola, L., Chang, O., Charlson, F., O'Neill, K., & Herrman, H. (2023). Transforming mental health systems globally: Principles and policy recommendations. *The Lancet, 402*(10402), 656–666. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(23)00918-2
32. Pavalanathan, U., & De Choudhury, M. (2015). Identity management and mental health discourse in social media. *Proceedings of the International World Wide Web Conference Companion*, 315–321. https://doi.org/10.1145/2740908.2743049
33. Rahsepar Meadi, M., Sillekens, T., Metselaar, S., van Balkom, A., Bernstein, J., & Batelaan, N. (2025). Exploring the ethical challenges of conversational AI in mental health care: Scoping review. *JMIR Mental Health, 12*, e60432. https://doi.org/10.2196/60432
34. Rashid, F., Zareen, N., Alvi, T., & Siddiqui, H. R. (2025). Effectiveness of digital interventions on mental health and psychological well-being of college and university students. *Pakistan Journal of Medical Sciences, 41*(9), 2667–2675. https://doi.org/10.12669/pjms.41.9.12009
35. Shumate, J. N., Rozenblit, E., Flathers, M., Larrauri, C. A., Hau, C., Xia, W., Torous, E. N., & Torous, J. (2025). Governing AI in mental health: 50-state legislative review. *JMIR Mental Health, 12*, e80739. https://doi.org/10.2196/80739
36. Sieck, C. J., Sheon, A., Ancker, J. S., Castek, J., Callahan, B., & Siefer, A. (2021). Digital inclusion as a social determinant of health. *NPJ Digital Medicine, 4*(1), 52. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41746-021-00413-8
37. Torous, J., & Cipriani, A. (2025). A paradigm shift in progress: Generative AI's evolving role in mental health care. *JMIR Mental Health, 12*, e82369. https://doi.org/10.2196/82369

38. Trautmann, S., Rehm, J., & Wittchen, H. U. (2016). The economic costs of mental disorders: Do our societies react appropriately to the burden of mental disorders? *EMBO Reports, 17*(9), 1245–1249. https://doi.org/10.15252/embr.201642951
39. van den Broek-Altenburg, E. M., & Atherly, A. J. (2025). The paradigm shift from patient to health consumer: 20 years of value assessment in health. *Journal of Medical Internet Research, 27*, e60443. https://doi.org/10.2196/60443
40. Venkatesan, A., Rahimi, L., Kaur, M., & Mosunic, C. (2020). Digital cognitive behavior therapy intervention for depression and anxiety: Retrospective study. *JMIR Mental Health, 7*(8), e21304. https://doi.org/10.2196/21304
41. Wani, C., McCann, L., Lennon, M., & Radu, C. (2024). Digital mental health interventions for adolescents in low- and middle-income countries: Scoping review. *Journal of Medical Internet Research, 26*, e51376. https://doi.org/10.2196/51376
42. Zhang, D., Lim, J., Zhou, L., & Dahl, A. A. (2021). Breaking the data value-privacy paradox in mobile mental health systems through user-centered privacy protection: A web-based survey study. *JMIR Mental Health, 8*(12), e31633. https://doi.org/10.2196/31633