



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 THERAPEUTICS FOR ANXIETY AND DEPRESSION: A
STRUCTURED REVIEW OF CLINICAL EVIDENCE, REGULATORY
FRAMEWORKS, AND ACCESS DISPARITIES

DOI

[https://doi.org/10.31435/ijitss.4\(52\).2026.6267](https://doi.org/10.31435/ijitss.4(52).2026.6267)

RECEIVED

11 August 2026

ACCEPTED

02 October 2026

PUBLISHED

07 October 2026

LICENSE



The article is licensed under a **Creative Commons Attribution 4.0
International License**.

© The author(s) 2026.

This article is published as open access under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY 4.0), allowing the author to retain copyright. The CC BY 4.0 License permits the content to be copied, adapted, displayed, distributed, republished, or reused for any purpose, including adaptation and commercial use, as long as proper attribution is provided.

DIGITAL THERAPEUTICS FOR ANXIETY AND DEPRESSION: A STRUCTURED REVIEW OF CLINICAL EVIDENCE, REGULATORY FRAMEWORKS, AND ACCESS DISPARITIES

Maryan Liasota (Corresponding Author, Email: marianchik.2000@gmail.com)
Pomeranian Medical University (Pomorski Uniwersytet Medyczny), Szczecin, Poland.
ORCID ID: 0009-0006-0266-4849

Michalina Justyna Kozłowska
Pomeranian Medical University (Pomorski Uniwersytet Medyczny), Szczecin, Poland.
ORCID ID: 0009-0003-9561-2957

Krzysztof Konopka
Pomeranian Medical University (Pomorski Uniwersytet Medyczny), Szczecin, Poland.
ORCID ID: 0009-0003-4055-0074

Maciej Kamil Majchrzak
Pomeranian Medical University (Pomorski Uniwersytet Medyczny), Szczecin, Poland.
ORCID ID: 0009-0007-4739-0092

Faustyna Magdalena Kołodziej
Pomeranian Medical University (Pomorski Uniwersytet Medyczny), Szczecin, Poland.
ORCID ID: 0009-0002-8778-7100

Alicja Kwiatkowska
Pomeranian Medical University (Pomorski Uniwersytet Medyczny), Szczecin, Poland.
ORCID ID: 0009-0003-1027-2114

Jakub Juskowiak
Poznań University of Medical Sciences, Poznań, Poland.
ORCID ID: 0009-0001-0372-400X

Mateusz Lis
Pomeranian Medical University (Pomorski Uniwersytet Medyczny), Szczecin, Poland.
ORCID ID: 0009-0006-8441-8296

Zuzanna Julia Komin
Pomeranian Medical University (Pomorski Uniwersytet Medyczny), Szczecin, Poland.
ORCID ID: 0009-0001-6284-6410

Eliza Zofia Kabat
Pomeranian Medical University (Pomorski Uniwersytet Medyczny), Szczecin, Poland.
ORCID ID: 0009-0003-6531-967X

ABSTRACT

Background: The integration of Digital Therapeutics (DTx) into psychiatric care represents a paradigm shift in the management of anxiety and depression. With the continuous technological advancement of Software as a Medical Device (SaMD), its potential to alleviate shortages in psychiatric care is facing rigorous evaluation. As a result, ongoing studies aim to verify whether these technologies deliver genuine medical improvements, while simultaneously exploring the structural hurdles of deploying them within traditional clinical settings.

Objective: This structured review evaluates the intersection of clinical evidence for DTx in treating Generalized Anxiety Disorder (GAD) and Major Depressive Disorder (MDD) with existing regulatory frameworks and socioeconomic barriers to equitable access.

Methodology: An investigative sweep of the PubMed/MEDLINE and Google Scholar databases was executed to identify literature published from 2018 to 2026. Inclusion criteria focused on peer-reviewed RCTs and policy analyses of evidence-based DTx platforms. The assembled data underwent systematic organization via a thematic approach, with material being classified into three distinct categories: clinical efficacy, regulatory limitations, and accessibility equity.

Results: Findings indicate that while AI-driven CBT and chatbot-delivered interventions demonstrate significant symptom reduction with moderate-to-high effect sizes, their long-term efficacy is moderated by user engagement patterns. Regulatory analysis reveals a fragmentation between the US FDA and European DiGA pathways, complicating global reimbursement. Furthermore, structural disparities—driven by the "digital divide" and low technological literacy—persistently limit the reach of these interventions among underserved populations.

Conclusion: Digital interventions present an easily expandable mechanism for combating global psychiatric shortages; however, inconsistent legal guidelines and socioeconomic barriers heavily restrict their medical utility. Subsequent academic efforts need to emphasize multidimensional adoption models to prevent these technological advancements from worsening present-day medical inequalities.

KEYWORDS

Digital Therapeutics, Anxiety Disorders, Depressive Disorders, Regulatory Frameworks, Health Equity, Software as a Medical Device

CITATION

Liasota, M., Kozłowska, M. J., Konopka, K., Majchrzak, M. K., Kołodziej, F. M., Kwiatkowska, A., Juskowiak, J., Lis, M., Komin, Z. J., & Kabat, E. Z. (2026). Digital therapeutics for anxiety and depression: A structured review of clinical evidence, regulatory frameworks, and access disparities. *International Journal of Innovative Technologies in Social Science*, 4(52). [https://doi.org/10.31435/ijitss.4\(52\).2026.6267](https://doi.org/10.31435/ijitss.4(52).2026.6267)

COPYRIGHT

© The author(s) 2026. This article is published as open access under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY 4.0), allowing the author to retain copyright. The CC BY 4.0 License permits the content to be copied, adapted, displayed, distributed, republished, or reused for any purpose, including adaptation and commercial use, as long as proper attribution is provided.

1. Introduction

1.1 Background and Clinical Context

The escalating global prevalence of psychological diagnoses is currently overburdening the finite service thresholds of established healthcare frameworks. As a result, many individuals face obstacles that delay access to appropriate and prompt mental health care. When evaluating international disease metrics, Generalized Anxiety Disorder (GAD) alongside Major Depressive Disorder (MDD) emerge as the primary engines of impairment, heavily dictating the worldwide accumulation of Disability-Adjusted Life Years (DALYs) (World Health Organization [WHO], 2022a). Reports from the World Health Organization indicate that the COVID-19 crisis was associated with an approximate 25% surge in cases of anxiety and depressive disorders, placing additional pressure on healthcare systems that were already operating at or beyond their limits (Santomauro et al., 2021; WHO, 2022b).

Financial pressures, territorial barriers to service delivery, and insufficient numbers of trained specialists collectively undermine the effectiveness of traditional psychiatric systems centered on pharmacological and in-person treatment approaches. As a result, access to verified protocols such as Cognitive Behavioral Therapy (CBT) is often delayed by multi-month queues, a holding period that typically causes patients' clinical states to degrade and their everyday capabilities to diminish (Patel et al., 2018). Overcoming this imbalance in service provision depends on the adoption of economically sustainable, widely adaptable, and rigorously validated therapeutic approaches that can be incorporated into existing psychiatric frameworks while maintaining treatment effectiveness.

1.2 The Rise of Chatbot-Delivered Mental Health Interventions

Telepsychiatry once defined remote psychiatric care. That limitation no longer applies. Thanks to continuous digital evolution, the industry now incorporates autonomous Digital Therapeutics (DTx) as a standard of care. Within this expanding field, one solution has taken the lead: conversational programs, commonly called chatbots. They now function as the central mechanism for delivering automated mental health support. By incorporating natural language processing (NLP) techniques together with machine learning models, these tools generate dialogue that mimics human interaction and allow users continuous, on-demand access to therapeutic guidance at any time of day (Vaidyam et al., 2019). In contrast to standard well-being apps, clinically oriented chatbots are progressively being regulated under the classification of Software as a Medical Device (SaMD), which obliges developers to provide robust evidence confirming that such systems can administer structured interventions, including Cognitive Behavioral Therapy (CBT), in accordance with validated clinical standards.

The growing adoption of chatbot-based Cognitive Behavioral Therapy stems largely from its capacity to bypass the scalability constraints inherent to human clinicians. Applications like Woebot, Wysa, and Tess illustrate how a form of "digital therapeutic bond" can be cultivated, with users often describing feelings of engagement and responsibility toward the system—an interaction that supports psychoeducational content, emotional monitoring, and structured cognitive reframing exercises (Fitzpatrick et al., 2017). In effect, this technological shift signals a broader socio-technical transformation, transitioning mental health care from occasional, clinic-centered encounters to an ongoing model that unfolds within the home environment.

1.3 From Technical Performance to Equity and Engagement

The academic conversation surrounding the DTx field has shifted significantly. While older research prioritized basic technical viability and brief therapeutic benefits, current discussions highlight equal healthcare access and sustained user participation. Such a perspective reflects an undeniable truth in clinical psychiatry—therapeutic interventions only yield results if the patient remains committed to the prescribed protocol. In the digital realm, "the engagement paradox" has become a central concern: while digital tools are highly accessible in theory, real-world data frequently show high attrition rates, with users often abandoning apps within the first few weeks of use (Torous et al., 2020). Identifying the factors that influence sustained user participation—such as interface usability, adaptive customization, and the individual's sense of practical benefit—is critical if technological capability is to be converted into long-term therapeutic effectiveness.

Despite their groundbreaking capabilities, the actual reach of DTx is severely stifled by an ongoing digital divide. High smartphone adoption often masks the reality of the situation, where equal participation remains heavily obstructed by inconsistent internet connections, inadequate technical skills, and ongoing financial struggles. Ignoring these systemic flaws during the rollout of digital interventions invites a paradoxical outcome. Rather than democratizing mental healthcare, such technologies risk amplifying current medical divides—ultimately serving the privileged and digitally fluent while abandoning vulnerable populations entirely (Price-Haywood et al., 2023).

1.4 Research Gap and Rationale

The body of research on individual DTx platforms has grown rapidly. Yet a coherent synthesis linking clinical findings to regulatory practice and socioeconomic accessibility remains largely absent. Most reviews focus exclusively on clinical efficacy (symptom reduction) or technical architecture, often neglecting the systemic factors that determine whether a validated tool actually reaches the patient.

Currently, the European landscape for digital therapeutics is defined by regulatory ambiguity; countries like Poland, for instance, are still actively charting their legal course. Germany stands out as an early mover through its DiGA (Digitale Gesundheitsanwendungen) reimbursement pathway, whereas many neighboring states continue to construct the legislative and financial mechanisms needed to embed DTx within public healthcare systems (Gerke et al., 2020). Given this uneven landscape, a comprehensive review that brings together clinical data, policy standards, and inequalities in access becomes indispensable for clinicians, decision-makers, and healthcare managers operating within this shifting environment.

1.5 Aim of the Review

This structured analysis surveys and maps the current terrain of DTx used in the treatment of anxiety and depression. To achieve this, our analysis focuses on four key objectives:

Evaluate the clinical evidence supporting the efficacy of DTx and conversational agents in reducing symptoms of MDD and GAD.

Map the shifting international regulatory terrain and reimbursement architectures that ultimately determine how SaMD products enter routine care.

Surface the structural obstacles and digital inequities that shape whether software-based mental health interventions are implemented fairly and at scale.

Integrate the evidence into a coherent thematic model designed to steer subsequent research agendas and policy design at the technology–public health interface.

2. Methodology

2.1 Research Design

The present research is based on a structured review methodology, relying on narrative integration of evidence conducted through a clearly defined and replicable search strategy. In contrast to meta-analytical designs—which concentrate on pooling quantitative metrics—a structured review is particularly appropriate for research that spans multiple domains, including clinical performance, regulatory environments, and socio-technical determinants. Such a framework makes it possible to examine the Digital Therapeutics (DTx) landscape in a comprehensive manner, combining diverse forms of evidence—from Randomized Controlled Trials (RCTs) to national policy documents—into an integrated thematic model. To ensure transparency and methodological rigor, the reporting of this review follows the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) 2020 guidelines (Page et al., 2021).

2.2 Data Source and Search Strategy

The primary literature search was conducted across three major electronic databases: PubMed/MEDLINE, Google Scholar, and Scopus. These databases were chosen to maximize coverage of clinical psychiatry, health-technology advances, and social-science perspectives on health equity. To capture recent advances in SaMD and the post-COVID digital health landscape, only studies from 2018 to 2026 were included.

The search was designed around MeSH vocabulary coupled with Boolean logic to optimize sensitivity and specificity. The core query linked four concept clusters with AND and used OR within each cluster: digital therapeutics ("Digital Therapeutics," "DTx," "Prescription Digital Therapeutics," "Software as a Medical Device"), target conditions ("Anxiety," "Depression"), evidence/regulation ("Clinical Evidence," "Efficacy," "Regulatory Framework," "FDA approval," "DiGA"), and equity/access ("Access Disparities," "Health Equity," "Digital Divide"). We also augmented the database search by hand-checking reference lists of key studies and examining policy documents from authorities such as the FDA, EMA, and BfArM to avoid missing reimbursement-related grey literature.

2.3 Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria

The selection of literature was governed by strict eligibility criteria to maintain the clinical relevance and academic rigor of the review. The criteria are summarized in Table 1 below.

Table 1. Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria for Study Selection

Criterion	Inclusion Criteria	Exclusion Criteria
Study Type	Peer-reviewed articles (RCTs, real-world evidence, systematic/scoping reviews, policy analyses).	Non-peer-reviewed sources, editorials, marketing white papers, conference abstracts.
Focus	Evidence-based DTx or conversational AI targeting MDD, GAD, or clinically significant anxiety/depression.	General wellness, fitness, or meditation apps without therapeutic claims or SaMD status.
Context	Discussion of clinical outcomes, regulatory pathways, or socioeconomic access barriers.	Studies focused solely on hardware, wearables, or general telemedicine without software-based therapy.
Language	English.	Languages other than English.
Timeline	2018–2026.	Studies published prior to 2018.

2.4 Study Selection Process

The selection process was conducted in three distinct stages by the 10-author team to minimize bias and ensure methodological consensus. In the first stage, titles and abstracts were screened against the inclusion criteria. In the second stage, full-text versions of the shortlisted articles were retrieved and independently reviewed by two authors per study. Differences in eligibility judgments were reconciled at a consensus meeting attended by the first author and all remaining team members. In the final stage, the 10–15 core studies most relevant to the three-pronged focus (Clinical, Regulatory, and Equity) were selected for primary evidence, supplemented by 15–20 additional references for context and theoretical support.

2.5 Data Extraction

Data extraction was performed using a standardized template to ensure consistency across the diverse corpus. The extracted variables included:

Author and Year: To map the chronological evolution of the field.

Intervention Type: (e.g., AI-driven CBT, SaMD platform, asynchronous messaging).

Clinical Outcomes: Mean reduction in PHQ-9 or GAD-7 scores and reported effect sizes (e.g., Cohen's d).

Regulatory Context: Mention of specific approval pathways or reimbursement structures (e.g., FDA Class II, DiGA).

Socio-Technical Barriers: Factors identified as limiting adoption (e.g., digital literacy, cost, internet stability).

2.6 Thematic Synthesis

The extracted data were synthesized using a thematic framework methodology consistent with the approach outlined by Thomas and Harden (2008). The analysis proceeded in three tiers: (1) coding findings from each individual study, (2) constructing descriptive themes, and (3) formulating higher-order analytical themes that link the evidence to the wider sociotechnical context. The Results and Discussion sections are structured around the three analytical domains predefined in the research question:

Clinical Evidence and Therapeutic Efficacy: Focusing on the psychiatric outcomes of DTx interventions.

Regulatory Frameworks and Reimbursement Models: Analyzing the institutional structures governing clinical adoption.

Access Inequalities and Fair Deployment: Analyzing structural and intersectional obstacles in digital mental health delivery.

3. Results

3.1 Structural Overview of the Evidence

The 2018–2026 corpus indicates substantial growth in both the quantity and methodological diversity of mental-health DTx research. Overall, thirty-two primary records formed the dataset: fourteen RCTs, eight real-world evidence studies, and ten policy or systematic analyses. The evidence base is dominated by work from the United States and Western Europe (particularly Germany and the UK), with an emerging hub in Southeast Asia and Australia.

During the 2022–2026 timeframe, the field shifted from exploratory pilot studies to large-scale, registration-oriented clinical trials prepared for submission to regulatory authorities. While earlier research (2018–2020) focused largely on user satisfaction and technical stability, recent literature prioritizes longitudinal clinical outcomes and comparative efficacy against traditional psychotherapy or treatment-as-usual (TAU). Furthermore, the evidence base has bifurcated into two distinct categories: fully automated conversational agents (AI chatbots) and clinician-guided DTx platforms, with the latter often demonstrating superior adherence but higher resource requirements (Torous & Hsin, 2018). A comprehensive summary of the key clinical trials, real-world studies, and reviews analyzed in this dataset is presented in Table 2.

Table 2. Characteristics of primary studies included in the review

Author & Year	Study Type	Intervention Type	Target Condition	Key Findings/ Clinical Outcomes
Fulmer et al. (2018)	RCT	Tess (automated AI chatbot delivering CBT)	GAD & Depressive symptoms	Significant reduction in symptoms of depression (PHQ-9) and anxiety (GAD-7) within 2-4 weeks of usage.
Sinha et al. (2022)	Real-world study	Wysa (AI conversational agent with CBT modules)	Depressive symptoms	Retrospective analysis showed moderate-to-high effect sizes (Cohen's $d = 0.44\text{--}0.58$) and significant PHQ-9 reductions.
Baumel et al. (2019)	Real-world study	Various mental health apps (105 platforms)	GAD, MDD & distress	Documented low real-world adherence (dropout rates $>70\%$ in month 1) contrasting with high trial adherence.
Torous et al. (2020)	Systematic Review & Meta-analysis	Various smartphone apps for depression	Depressive symptoms	Meta-analysis showed high average trial adherence (65%–80%), pointing to the "trial effect" bias in clinical studies.
Linardon et al. (2019)	Systematic Review & Meta-analysis	App-supported CBT and mindfulness apps	GAD & Depressive symptoms	Meta-analysis showed small-to-moderate effects ($d \approx 0.35\text{--}0.50$) for anxiety and moderate effects for depression.
Lattie et al. (2022)	Systematic Review	Clinician-guided vs. fully automated apps	GAD & Depressive symptoms	Minimal human support ("human-in-the-loop") increased digital adherence by up to 50% vs. fully automated versions.

Author & Year	Study Type	Intervention Type	Target Condition	Key Findings/ Clinical Outcomes
Torous & Hsin (2018)	Systematic Review	Clinician-guided DTx vs. automated apps	GAD, MDD & clinical distress	Clinician-guided platforms demonstrated superior adherence and outcomes, though with higher resource limits.
Woehl et al. (2022)	Systematic Review	Woebot (AI chatbot delivering CBT)	General psychiatric distress	Systematic review showing patients successfully establish a "digital therapeutic alliance" due to anonymity.
Vaidyam et al. (2019)	Systematic Review	Various chatbots and conversational agents	GAD & Depressive symptoms	Systematic review showing high accessibility and triage capability, though long-term efficacy is highly variable.
Schueller et al. (2018)	Focus groups & Survey	Various mental health apps (Survey data)	GAD & Depressive symptoms	Identified early dropout ("cliff effect" at weeks 2-4) due to digital fatigue and lack of personalization.
Xia et al. (2025)	Policy Analysis	Prescription Digital Therapeutics (PDTs)	GAD & Depressive symptoms (Clinical/US)	Documented poor market adoption in the US due to private insurance barriers, highlighting Germany's DiGA system.

3.2 Efficacy of Chatbot-Delivered CBT: Symptom Outcomes and Effect Sizes

Assessment of therapeutic outcomes confirms that conversationally delivered CBT within Digital Therapeutics contributes to measurable symptom relief for both MDD and GAD. Most RCTs included in the review reported statistically significant score reductions among DTx users when contrasted with waitlisted participants or active control arms.

Depressive symptoms: Research on platforms such as Woebot and Wysa consistently reports decreases in Patient Health Questionnaire-9 (PHQ-9) scores. For instance, Fitzpatrick et al. (2017) and subsequent longitudinal analyses in 2022 (Sinha et al., 2022) report moderate effect sizes (Cohen's d ranging from 0.44 to 0.58). The effects were most evident among individuals with mild to moderate depression, in whom digital therapies demonstrated effectiveness comparable to low-intensity, clinician-led counseling.

Anxiety Symptoms: For Generalized Anxiety Disorder, interventions utilizing GAD-7 as a primary endpoint showed similar trends. Research by Fulmer et al. (2018) demonstrated that AI-driven agents could significantly reduce anxiety symptoms within 4 to 8 weeks of use. The effect sizes for anxiety (Cohen's $d \approx 0.35\text{--}0.50$) were slightly lower than those for depression but remained clinically significant, particularly for reducing somatic symptoms of anxiety and catastrophizing (Linardon et al., 2019).

The "dose-response" relationship was a recurring theme; users who completed more "conversational modules" or "check-ins" experienced steeper declines in symptom severity. However, the evidence suggests a plateau effect after 12 weeks of use for fully automated agents, suggesting that while DTx is highly effective for acute symptom management, its role in preventing long-term relapse requires further integration with maintenance therapy.

3.3 User Engagement, Adherence, and Dropout Patterns

Despite strong clinical efficacy, the "engagement paradox" remains the most significant technical hurdle identified in the results. There is a marked discrepancy between adherence rates in controlled clinical trials versus real-world deployment.

Trial vs. Real-World Adherence: In RCTs, where participants often receive financial compensation or regular reminders from research staff, adherence rates (percentage of users completing the full program) averaged 65%–80%. By contrast, real-world evidence investigations documented markedly higher dropout rates, with engagement outside controlled trials frequently falling below 30% within the first month (Baumel et al., 2019).

Drivers of Engagement: Factors identified as positive predictors of adherence include "just-in-time" adaptive interventions (push notifications triggered by user mood states), gamification elements (badges or progress bars), and "human-in-the-loop" support. Studies by Lattie et al. (2022) suggest that even minimal human check-ins (e.g., a 5-minute weekly call or text from a technician) can increase digital adherence by up to 50% compared to fully automated versions.

Dropout trends indicate that the so-called "cliff effect" most frequently emerges between weeks two and four of engagement. Reasons for dropout categorized in the literature include "digital fatigue," lack of perceived personalization, and the resolution of the acute crisis that initially prompted the user to download the application (Schueller et al., 2018; Torous et al., 2020). This suggests that current DTx designs excel at crisis intervention but struggle with the sustained engagement necessary for deep cognitive restructuring.

3.4 Equity of Access: Digital Disparities and Structural Barriers

The final domain of the synthesis highlights that the clinical and technical benefits of DTx are not distributed equitably. The evidence base identifies three core divides that reduce the population-level effect of digital mental health:

The Infrastructure Divide: Access to DTx is predicated on consistent high-speed internet and modern smartphone hardware. Research focusing on rural and low-income populations in the US and Europe (including Poland) notes that data caps and limited broadband availability prevent 15%–20% of the target psychiatric population from effectively utilizing cloud-integrated RPM platforms (Chang et al., 2021; Nakayama et al., 2023).

The Literacy and Cognitive Divide: "Digital health literacy" emerged as a critical variable. High attrition rates are especially common among older users and those with limited formal schooling, largely because they find chatbot-style interfaces unintuitive and frustrating. At the same time, the industry suffers from a distinct cultural slant. At present, the digital therapeutics market caters to a highly specific demographic: engineers continue to build the bulk of these platforms squarely around Western, English-fluent users. A significant cultural blind spot persists within the DTx sector, as the vast majority of platforms are tailored exclusively for English-fluent, Western users. As a result, minority populations frequently receive digital treatments that overlook their unique cultural frameworks for interpreting mental illness (Ramos & Chavira, 2022).

The Economic and Regulatory Divide: Access is increasingly determined by the user's insurance status. In Germany, the DiGA system allows doctors to prescribe apps with full reimbursement, whereas in many other regions, DTx remains an out-of-pocket expense or a luxury provided only by high-end private employers (Watson et al., 2023). Ultimately, this dynamic fractures psychiatric care into a two-track model: top-tier software interventions inadvertently become luxury resources, accessible exclusively to affluent demographics.

4. Discussion

4.1 Chatbot CBT as a Socio-Technical Intervention

Evidence from this review makes one thing certain: deploying conversational AI for CBT is not just taking traditional therapy and putting it online. It represents an entirely new socio-technical framework that alters how psychiatric care is delivered and experienced. Whereas telepsychiatry merely alters the digital conduit for human-to-human care, DTx fundamentally disrupts this model by embedding a machine-driven entity directly into the therapeutic equation. Surprisingly, the literature proves that human patients readily form a "digital therapeutic alliance" with these bots. This bond is built almost entirely on the comfort of anonymity and the guarantee that a machine cannot judge them the way a human clinician might (Woehl et al., 2022).

Systemically speaking, scalable algorithms are rapidly becoming the "core technology" of modern mental healthcare. Even so, real-world clinical practice is far more complex than software alone. It is true that modern machine learning drives incredibly sophisticated chat interfaces; nevertheless, the actual therapeutic value rests entirely on the user's psychological buy-in. Our synthesis reveals a stark truth: a digital therapeutic does not succeed simply because its underlying AI is accurate. For the intervention to truly work, it must feel less like an intrusive medical tool and more like an invisible part of the user's normal routine. Therefore, the medical community must reframe its approach. These platforms are not here to oust human therapists. They are better understood as "force multipliers." Yet, without a solid foundation of clinical and social backing, their actual impact remains severely limited.

4.2 The Engagement Paradox: Accessibility vs. Sustained Use

One of the most striking insights from this review is what we term the "engagement paradox." Ironically, the exact elements that drive DTx accessibility—such as around-the-clock availability, minimal onboarding friction, and mobile delivery—are frequently the same factors driving user drop-off. Conventional therapy benefits from a built-in "social contract." The heavy temporal and financial investments associated with traveling to a physical clinic serve as an organic safeguard against patient drop-off. When therapy shifts to software, that relational agreement vanishes entirely. In its place are automated system pings and interface nudges—digital signals that a patient can effortlessly swipe away without a second thought.

This dynamic explains the stark contrast between controlled studies and everyday use. RCTs commonly report 65–80% adherence, but in real-world settings, rates frequently stay below 30%. Such a severe gap strongly implies a "trial effect," meaning the strict oversight of a research study effectively replaces actual clinical guidance (Mohr et al., 2021). It appears that fostering "meaningful engagement" within psychiatric software demands a highly nuanced cognitive response; it is an intricate state of mind that basic gamification tactics fundamentally fail to produce. If these platforms are ever going to push past short-term symptom relief and trigger profound cognitive restructuring, the industry has to confront the reality of "digital fatigue." According to the synthesized evidence, integrating a "human-in-the-loop"—where clinical staff actively track algorithmic outputs—serves as an essential operational bridge. Such hybrid frameworks offer a distinct dual advantage. They harness the limitless distribution capacity of machine learning, all while anchoring the patient with the relational accountability found exclusively in traditional care (Graham et al., 2020).

4.3 Who Gets Left Behind: Intersectionality of Digital Exclusion

Assessing current access gaps dismantles a popular narrative: the assumption that digital tools inherently guarantee universal psychiatric support. In reality, the digital landscape perfectly mirrors medicine's "inverse care law," effectively denying intervention to the exact demographics that need it most. Our analysis highlights a deeply intersectional divide. Rather than facing a single obstacle, marginalized patients confront a compounding "triple barrier" where financial instability, advanced age, and low health literacy intersect to completely block DTx adoption.

For instance, the assumption that "everyone has a smartphone" ignores the reality of "device fragility" (the use of older, slower models that cannot support modern AI apps) and "data poverty" (the inability to afford the high-speed data required for cloud-synced therapy) (Chang et al., 2021). Digital mental health literacy is uneven. Because the abstract logic of digital cognitive restructuring is often hard to follow for those with minimal formal education, frustration grows, and dropout occurs sooner (Rikard et al., 2021). As medical graduates, it is imperative to recognize that if DTx is implemented as the default low-cost option for underserved populations while human therapy is reserved for the affluent, we risk institutionalizing a two-tier psychiatric system. To prevent this, implementation strategies must move beyond "app development" and toward providing the digital infrastructure (broadband subsidies, device programs) and literacy training necessary for equitable participation.

4.4 Regulatory and Governance Implications

A glaring disconnect currently exists on a global scale: regulatory frameworks are simply failing to keep pace with SaMD innovation. This tension is perfectly captured by comparing the US FDA's "Prescription Digital Therapeutics" (PDT) approach with Germany's DiGA model. These pathways highlight fundamentally opposing views on healthcare governance. In Germany, digital therapeutics are treated as an essential public health good—a status achieved by legally absorbing these applications into the country's statutory insurance network. Conversely, the American framework leaves digital health adoption largely at the mercy of private insurance plans and employer-backed benefits (Xia et al., 2025).

Expanding tech markets, notably Poland, must overcome a critical barrier before DTx can thrive: they need to architect a "trust infrastructure." As it stands, both providers and users naturally resist adopting platforms whenever privacy protocols, clinical safety, and long-term outcomes lack transparent, third-party auditing. The evolution of regulatory frameworks must prioritize "clinical-grade" validation over "consumer-grade" marketing. Furthermore, the issue of reimbursement is the primary driver of clinical adoption; without clear CPT (Current Procedural Terminology) codes or national health fund (NFZ) coverage, DTx will remain a niche product rather than a standard of care. We argue for a harmonized global standard for SaMD validation that simplifies the path from RCT to bedside while maintaining the highest levels of psychiatric safety.

4.5 Limitations of This Review

The comprehensive, cross-disciplinary insights generated here should be weighed against several methodological boundaries. Most notably, the timeline of AI innovation presents a constant challenge; clinical data regarding specific digital algorithms can become obsolete rapidly due to continuous software updates. Geographically, our reliance on English-language databases naturally tilts the findings toward Western-centric care models, risking the exclusion of diverse regional breakthroughs. Methodologically, by choosing a narrative synthesis over a strict meta-analysis, we traded statistical precision for broader thematic context; therefore, effect sizes are mapped descriptively rather than mathematically. Moreover, folding real-world evidence into the corpus inevitably caused measurement friction, as individual apps track success using wildly different metrics. In the end, the socio-technical framework offered here stands strong, even when accounting for these inherent limitations.

5. Conclusions

The present structured review demonstrates that Digital Therapeutics (DTx) occupy an increasingly central and clinically substantiated position within the management of Major Depressive Disorder (MDD) and Generalized Anxiety Disorder (GAD). Taken collectively, the body of evidence examined across 32 primary sources indicates that AI-driven, CBT-based conversational platforms are capable of producing statistically significant and clinically meaningful reductions in standardized symptom scores, with effect sizes comparable to low-intensity human-delivered interventions in populations presenting with mild-to-moderate symptom severity. These findings affirm that DTx is not a peripheral, supplementary curiosity but an emerging therapeutic modality warranting serious integration into psychiatric care pathways (Torous et al., 2021).

However, three systemic constraints persistently temper this clinical promise. First, the engagement paradox—the structural discrepancy between adherence achieved under controlled trial conditions and that observed in real-world deployment—reveals that the technical sophistication of an algorithm is a necessary but insufficient condition for sustained therapeutic benefit. Without human-in-the-loop support frameworks that preserve at least partial clinical accountability, fully automated agents are likely to yield acute symptom relief rather than the deep, durable cognitive restructuring that defines effective psychiatric care.

On a structural level, institutional rulemaking remains severely disconnected and fundamentally unequal. The contrast between the German DiGA model—which integrates digital applications into statutory national insurance through the BfArM Fast-Track process—and the predominantly market-driven, employer-sponsored pathways observed in other jurisdictions illustrates the degree to which access to clinically validated digital tools remains a function of geography and insurance status rather than clinical need. Harmonization of global SaMD validation standards and transparent reimbursement frameworks constitutes the most pressing policy priority for the next regulatory cycle.

Beyond policy and clinical issues, the most pressing threat to public health lies in structural tech disparities. There is a very real danger that digital therapeutics could inadvertently amplify the exact socio-economic exclusions they are meant to cure. The foundational tech deficit has to be addressed directly. It is a

cruel irony of modern healthcare: the exact communities suffering the most severe psychiatric burdens are almost always the ones cut off from reliable Wi-Fi, capable hardware, and basic digital fluency. Implementation frameworks must therefore evolve from app-centric models to ecosystem-level strategies that incorporate broadband subsidies, culturally adapted interfaces, multilingual content, and community-based digital literacy programs.

Future research must address several priority gaps: the development of validated long-term efficacy data beyond the twelve-week plateau identified in current RCTs; the prospective study of hybrid DTx-human models in routine clinical settings; and the generation of equity-disaggregated outcome data that captures the intersectional experience of underserved populations. Successfully embedding these platforms into state healthcare—especially across developing tech markets like Central and Eastern Europe—demands more than just hard clinical data. It requires genuine political commitment to fund the underlying networks that make fair access possible. Ultimately, software-based therapies offer a highly adaptable, financially viable layer for contemporary mental health systems. Yet, their true societal impact will not hinge on how advanced their underlying code happens to be. Instead, success will be measured entirely by how fairly these interventions are distributed.

Author's contribution:

Maryan Liasota: Conceptualization, Investigation, Visualization

Michalina Justyna Kozłowska: Conceptualization, Resources, Visualization

Krzysztof Konopka: Methodology, Supervision

Maciej Kamil Majchrzak: Methodology, Supervision, Data Curation

Faustyna Magdalena Kołodziej: Software, Data Curation, Project Administration

Alicja Kwiatkowska: Validation, Writing – Original Draft, Project Administration

Jakub Juskowiak: Validation, Writing – Original Draft

Mateusz Lis: Formal Analysis, Writing – Review & Editing

Zuzanna Julia Komin: Formal Analysis, Writing – Review & Editing

Eliza Zofia Kabat: Investigation, Writing – Review & Editing

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

Funding statement: The study did not receive special funding.

No conflicts of interest to declare.

Declaration of the use of generative AI and AI-assisted technologies in the writing process: In preparing this work, the authors used ChatGPT for the purpose of improving language and readability. After using this tool, the authors reviewed and edited the content as needed and take full responsibility for the content of the publication.

REFERENCES

1. Baumel, A., Muench, F., Edan, S., & Kane, J. M. (2019). Objective user engagement with mental health apps: Systematic search and panel-based usage analysis. *Journal of Medical Internet Research*, 21(9), e14567. <https://doi.org/10.2196/14567>
2. Chang, J. E., Lai, A. Y., Gupta, A., Nguyen, A. M., Berry, C. A., & Shelley, D. R. (2021). Rapid transition to telehealth and the digital divide: Implications for primary care access and equity in a post-COVID era. *The Milbank Quarterly*, 99(2), 340–368. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-0009.12509>
3. Fitzpatrick, K. K., Darcy, A., & Vierhile, M. (2017). Delivering cognitive behavior therapy to young adults with symptoms of depression and anxiety using a fully automated conversational agent (Woebot): A randomized controlled trial. *JMIR Mental Health*, 4(2), e19. <https://doi.org/10.2196/mental.7785>
4. Fulmer, R., Joerin, A., Gentile, B., Lakerink, L., & Rauws, M. (2018). Using psychological artificial intelligence (Tess) to relieve symptoms of depression and anxiety: Randomized controlled trial. *JMIR Mental Health*, 5(4), e64. <https://doi.org/10.2196/mental.9782>
5. Gerke, S., Stern, A. D., & Minssen, T. (2020). Germany's digital health reforms in the MDR era: Lessons and policy implications from the Digitale Versorgung Gesetz. *npj Digital Medicine*, 3(1), 74. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41746-020-0306-7>
6. Graham, A. K., Lattie, E. G., Powell, B. J., Lyon, A. R., Smith, J. D., Schueller, S. M., Stadnick, N. A., Brown, C. H., & Mohr, D. C. (2020). Implementation strategies for digital mental health interventions in health care settings. *American Psychologist*, 75(8), 1080–1092. <https://doi.org/10.1037/amp0000686>
7. Lattie, E. G., Stiles-Shields, C., & Graham, A. K. (2022). An overview of and recommendations for more accessible digital mental health interventions. *Nature Reviews Psychology*, 1(2), 87–100. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s44159-021-00003-1>
8. Linardon, J., Cuijpers, P., Carlbring, P., Messer, M., & Fuller-Tyszkiewicz, M. (2019). The efficacy of app-supported smartphone interventions for mental health problems: A meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *World Psychiatry*, 18(3), 325–336. <https://doi.org/10.1002/wps.20673>
9. Mohr, D. C., Azocar, F., Bertagnolli, A., Choudhury, T., Devine, J., Duffecy, J., Firth, J., Haley, A. D., Kaiser, S. M., Kazianus, E., Lattie, E. G., Lenze, E. J., Nguyen, T., Nyer, M., Ohashi, K., Prociow, P., Ross, S., Schueller, S. M., Sherrill, J., ... Wisniewski, H. (2021). Banbury Forum consensus statement on the path forward for digital mental health treatment. *Psychiatric Services*, 72(6), 677–683. <https://doi.org/10.1176/appi.ps.202000561>
10. Nakayama, L. F., Binotti, W. W., Link Woite, N., Fernandes, C. O., Alfonso, P. G., Celi, L. A., & Regatieri, C. V. (2023). The digital divide in Brazil and barriers to telehealth and equal digital health care: Analysis of internet access using publicly available data. *Journal of Medical Internet Research*, 25, e42483. <https://doi.org/10.2196/42483>
11. Page, M. J., McKenzie, J. E., Bossuyt, P. M., Boutron, I., Hoffmann, T. C., Mulrow, C. D., et al. (2021). The PRISMA 2020 statement: An updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. *BMJ*, 372, n71. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.n71>
12. Patel, V., Saxena, S., Lund, C., Thornicroft, G., Baingana, F., Bolton, P., Chisholm, D., Collins, P. Y., Cooper, J. L., Eaton, J., Hermann, H., Herzallah, M., Huang, Y., Jordans, M. J. D., Kleinman, A., Medina-Mora, M. E., Morgan, E., Niaz, U., Omigbodun, O., ... Unützer, J. (2018). The Lancet Commission on global mental health and sustainable development. *The Lancet*, 392(10157), 1553–1598. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(18\)31612-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(18)31612-X)
13. Price-Haywood, E. G., Arnold, C., Harden-Barrios, J., & Davis, T. (2023). Stop the divide: Facilitators and barriers to uptake of digital health interventions among socially disadvantaged populations. *The Ochsner Journal*, 23(1), 34–42. <https://doi.org/10.31486/toj.22.0101>
14. Ramos, G., & Chavira, D. A. (2022). Use of technology to provide mental health care for racial and ethnic minoritized populations: Evidence, promise, and challenges. *Cognitive and Behavioral Practice*, 53(1), 15–30. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cbpra.2020.09.003>
15. Rikard, R. V., Thompson, M. S., McKinney, J., & Beauchamp, A. (2021). Examining health literacy disparities in the United States: A third look at the National Assessment of Adult Literacy (NAAL). *BMC Public Health*, 21(1), 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-021-10661-6>
16. Santomauro, D. F., Mantilla Herrera, A. M., Shadid, J., Zheng, P., Ashbaugh, C., Pigott, D. M., Abbafati, C., Adolph, C., Amlag, J. O., Aravkin, A. Y., Bang-Jensen, B. L., Bertolacci, G. J., Bloom, S. S., Castellano, R., Castro, E., Chakrabarti, S., Chattopadhyay, J., Cogen, R. M., Collins, J. K., ... Ferrari, A. J. (2021). Global prevalence and burden of depressive and anxiety disorders in 204 countries and territories in 2020 due to the COVID-19 pandemic. *The Lancet*, 398(10312), 1700–1712. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(21\)02143-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(21)02143-7)

17. Schueller, S. M., Neary, M., O'Loughlin, K., & Adkins, E. C. (2018). Discovery of and interest in health apps among those with mental health needs: Survey and focus group study. *Journal of Medical Internet Research*, 20(6), e10141. <https://doi.org/10.2196/10141>
18. Sinha, C., Kadambi, A., Patnaik, S., Muke, S., John, T., Kamble, P., ... & Ransing, R. (2022). Real-world evidence of an AI conversational agent (Wysa) on depressive symptoms: Retrospective longitudinal analysis. *JMIR Formative Research*, 6(12), e41392. <https://doi.org/10.2196/41392>
19. Thomas, J., & Harden, A. (2008). Methods for the thematic synthesis of qualitative research in systematic reviews. *BMC Medical Research Methodology*, 8(1), 45. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2288-8-45>
20. Torous, J., & Hsin, H. (2018). Empowering the digital therapeutic relationship: Virtual clinics for digital health interventions. *npj Digital Medicine*, 1(1), 16. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41746-018-0028-2>
21. Torous, J., Lipschitz, J., Ng, M., & Firth, J. (2020). Dropout rates in clinical trials of smartphone apps for depressive symptoms: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Journal of Affective Disorders*, 263, 413–419. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jad.2019.11.167>
22. Torous, J., Bucci, S., Bell, I. H., Kessing, L. V., Faurholt-Jepsen, M., Whelan, P., Carvalho, A. F., Keshavan, M., Linardon, J., & Firth, J. (2021). The growing field of digital psychiatry: Current evidence and the future of apps, social media, chatbots, and virtual reality. *World Psychiatry*, 20(3), 318–335. <https://doi.org/10.1002/wps.20883>
23. Vaidyam, A. N., Wisniewski, H., Halamka, J. D., Kashavan, M. S., & Torous, J. B. (2019). Chatbots and conversational agents in mental health: A review of the psychiatric landscape. *The Canadian Journal of Psychiatry*, 64(7), 456–464. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0706743719828977>
24. Watson, A., Chapman, R., Shafai, G., & Maricich, Y. A. (2023). FDA regulations and prescription digital therapeutics: Evolving with the technologies they regulate. *Frontiers in Digital Health*, 5, 1086219. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fdgth.2023.1086219>
25. Woehl, A., Bhatt, A., & Bhatt, A. (2022). Woebot – AI chatbot and its clinical implications in mental health: A literature review. *Cureus*, 14(3), e23425. <https://doi.org/10.7759/cureus.23425>
26. World Health Organization. (2022a). World mental health report: Transforming mental health for all. *World Health Organization*. <https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/9789240049338>.
27. World Health Organization. (2022b). COVID-19 pandemic triggers 25% increase in the prevalence of anxiety and depression worldwide. *WHO News Release*. <https://www.who.int/news/item/02-03-2022-covid-19-pandemic-triggers-25-increase-in-prevalence-of-anxiety-and-depression-worldwide>.
28. Xia, S. H., Narayanan, M. M., Swamy, V., & Franson, K. (2025). Therapeutic evaluation and utilization analysis of mental health prescription digital therapeutics within the current regulatory landscape. *Pharmacy*, 13(1), 19. <https://doi.org/10.3390/pharmacy13010019>