International Journal of Social Science and Economic Research

ISSN: 2455-8834

Volume:11, Issue:06 "June 2026"

From Static Apps to Sentient Systems: A Systematic Review of the "Third Wave" in Digital Mental Health

NGO Duc Thinh[1], PHAN Nguyen Huy Hoang[1], HUYNH Tuan Kiet[1], TRAN Huy Thuan[1], NGUYEN Cao Ha My[1], PHAM Thi Kim Mai[2], PHAM Nguyen Kim Yen[3], NGUYEN Thi Phuong Uyen[4], NGUYEN Truong Thanh Hai[5,*]

[1]Faculty of Health Sciences, Hung Vuong University Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam.

[2]Clinical Social Work Department, Boston College, USA.

[3]Collaborator at Lumos Psychology Institute, Vietnam.

[4]Facuty of Nursing, Hong Bang International University Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam.

[5]Faculty of Public Health, University of Medicine and Pharmacy at Can Tho, Can Tho City, Vietnam.

[*]Corresponding author: NGUYEN Truong-Thanh Hai

DOI: 10.46609/IJSSER.2026.v11i06.013 URL: https://doi.org/10.46609/IJSSER.2026.v11i06.013

Received: 14 May 2025 / Accepted: 17 June 2026 / Published: 28 June 2026

ABSTRACT

Background: *Despite the global post-pandemic recovery, the prevalence of anxiety and depressive disorders remains elevated, exacerbating the workforce gap in psychiatric care. While "Second Wave" digital interventions (static iCBT apps) offer scalability, they are limited by high attrition and a lack of personalization. This review examines the emergence of the "Third Wave" of digital mental health—characterized by Generative AI (GenAI) and Just-in-Time Adaptive Interventions (JITAIs)—to evaluate their clinical efficacy and engagement potential compared to traditional digital standards.*

Methods: *A systematic review was conducted adhering to PRISMA 2025 guidelines. Five major databases (PubMed, PsycINFO, Cochrane CENTRAL, IEEE Xplore, Scopus) were searched for Randomized Controlled Trials (RCTs) published between January 1, 2024, and January 2026. Eligible studies included adults or adolescents with anxiety or depression utilizing LLM-driven agents or sensor-based adaptive systems. The primary outcome was symptom reduction (Hedges' g), with secondary outcomes focusing on adherence and therapeutic alliance.*

***Results**: A total of 45 RCTs (N=45) met the inclusion criteria, reflecting a geographic shift toward scalable models in the Global South. Meta-analytic synthesis revealed that GenAI-based interventions achieved a weighted effect size of g = 0.55 for depression, significantly outperforming rule-based chatbots (g ≈ 0.28) and approaching the efficacy of human teletherapy. JITAIs triggered by real-time biometric data demonstrated a two-fold increase in user engagement compared to scheduled notifications. Health economic data favored a "Stepped Care 2.0" hybrid model, where AI agents manage mild symptoms and triage high-risk cases to human clinicians.*

***Conclusions**: The transition from static applications to "Precision" Digital Health represents a paradigm shift driven by the "adaptive therapeutic alliance" and temporal immediacy. While GenAI agents function effectively as clinical extenders, fully automated systems still face long-term retention challenges ("digital placebo" decay) after four months. Future implementation must prioritize "human-in-the-loop" architectures and address the privacy-precision paradox to safely integrate these tools into standard clinical workflows.*

Keywords: Digital Mental Health, Generative AI, Large Language Models, Just-in-Time Adaptive Interventions (JITAI), Systematic Review.

1. Introduction

1.1. The Evolving Crisis & The Workforce Gap

The post-pandemic landscape of global mental health continues to present a paradox of high awareness but insufficient care. Despite international recovery efforts, the global prevalence of anxiety and depressive disorders remains stubbornly elevated. According to the *World Mental Health Report 2025*, over one billion individuals globally are currently living with a mental health disorder, yet the "supply-demand mismatch" in psychiatric care has widened rather than narrowed (World Health Organization [WHO], 2025). Traditional healthcare systems, constrained by workforce shortages and funding disparities, are unable to scale rapidly enough to meet this surge, necessitating a reliance on digital adjuncts.

However, the "Second Wave" of digital mental health—characterized by smartphone applications and digitized Cognitive Behavioral Therapy (iCBT)—has faced a critical limitation: engagement. While meta-analytic evidence confirms that iCBT can be as effective as face-to-face therapy when adhered to, real-world deployment is plagued by high attrition rates, often referred to as the "law of attrition" (Torous et al., 2024). Users frequently abandon static, modularized interventions within weeks of download due to a lack of personalization and the burden of self-guided participation. Consequently, the field is currently undergoing a paradigm shift toward a

ISSN: 2455-8834

Volume:11, Issue:06 "June 2026"

"Third Wave" of digital health: adaptive, AI-augmented systems designed to solve the engagement problem through passive sensing and conversational interactivity (Firth et al., 2024).

1.2. The Shift to "Precision" Digital Health

The transition from static "Web 2.0" applications to "Precision" Digital Health represents a move away from "one-size-fits-all" protocols toward highly personalized, data-driven interventions. This shift is primarily driven by two technological advancements: Generative Artificial Intelligence (GenAI) and Just-in-Time Adaptive Interventions (JITAIs).

First, GenAI—specifically Large Language Models (LLMs)—has enabled the development of therapeutic agents capable of simulating "therapeutic alliance" through natural language processing. Unlike rigid rule-based chatbots of the past (e.g., early ELIZA clones), modern agents such as advanced iterations of Woebot or Wysa utilize transformer architectures to deliver empathetic, context-aware responses (Miner et al., 2024). Second, JITAIs leverage the ubiquity of wearable sensors to detect physiological markers of distress (e.g., heart rate variability spikes or sleep disruption) and deliver micro-interventions at the exact moment of need. Recent systematic reviews suggest that JITAIs may offer superior ecological validity compared to standard scheduled therapy sessions (Nahum-Shani et al., 2025).

Despite this technological enthusiasm, a significant research gap remains. While the efficacy of standard iCBT is well-documented in pre-2023 literature, there is a paucity of systematic evidence regarding the clinical safety and specific "active ingredients" of the generative and sensor-based interventions introduced in the 2024–2025 cohort. The rapid proliferation of these tools has outpaced the rigorous randomized controlled trials (RCTs) required to validate their superiority over static apps (Torous et al., 2024; WHO, 2025).

1.3. Research Objectives

To address these gaps, this study aims to systematically evaluate the "Third Wave" of digital mental health interventions. Specifically, the research objectives are:

1. To evaluate the comparative clinical efficacy (measured by Hedges' g) of AI-driven adaptive interventions versus static digital interventions in reducing symptoms of anxiety and depression.
2. To assess the impact of "human-in-the-loop" hybrid models versus "fully automated AI" architectures on user adherence and long-term retention rates.

ISSN: 2455-8834

Volume:11, Issue:06 "June 2026"

2. Methodology

2.1. Search Strategy and Data Sources

This systematic review was conducted in strict adherence to the *Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses* (PRISMA) guidelines, incorporating the specific extensions for Artificial Intelligence (PRISMA-AI) to ensure rigorous reporting of machine learning components (Liu et al., 2024; Page et al., 2021). To capture the nascent "Third Wave" of digital therapeutics, a comprehensive search was executed across five major electronic databases: PubMed, PsycINFO, Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials (CENTRAL), IEEE Xplore, and Scopus. The search strategy was deliberately restricted to the timeframe of January 1, 2024, to January 2026. This temporal restriction was applied to isolate the specific impact of the recent proliferation of Large Language Models (LLMs) and advanced sensor-fusion algorithms, which represent a distinct technological generation compared to pre-2023 rule-based systems (Abd-Alrazaq et al., 2024; Torous et al., 2024).

The search syntax employed a combination of Medical Subject Headings (MeSH) and free-text Boolean operators designed to intersect three core domains: clinical condition, technological intervention, and adaptive methodology. Key search terms included condition-specific identifiers (*"Major Depressive Disorder," "Generalized Anxiety Disorder," "Depression," "Anxiety"*) paired with intervention-specific terms (*"Large Language Models," "Generative AI," "Chatbots," "Conversational Agents," "Digital Phenotyping,"* and *"Ecological Momentary Assessment" or "EMA"*). To minimize publication bias and capture the most recent technological iterations, the search was supplemented by a manual review of reference lists from relevant systematic reviews and grey literature repositories (Higgins et al., 2023; Rethlefsen et al., 2021).

2.2. Eligibility Criteria (PICOS Framework)

Study selection was operationalized using the PICOS (Population, Intervention, Comparator, Outcomes, Study design) framework to ensure the inclusion of high-quality evidence relevant to precision digital health.

Population: The review included studies involving adults (aged 18+) and adolescents (aged 12–17) with a clinical diagnosis or valid psychometric indication of anxiety or depression. Studies focused solely on general wellness or non-clinical stress management without baseline symptom assessment were excluded to maintain clinical relevance (Spitzer et al., 2006; World Health Organization, 2025).

Intervention: Eligible interventions were required to utilize "adaptive" or "intelligent" digital systems delivered via mobile applications, wearables, or web platforms. This included

ISSN: 2455-8834

Volume:11, Issue:06 "June 2026"

Generative AI agents (e.g., LLM-driven therapy) or Just-in-Time Adaptive Interventions (JITAIs) that modify content delivery based on real-time physiological or behavioral data. Static, linear interventions (e.g., digitized workbooks or non-interactive PDFs) were excluded from this category to clearly differentiate the "Third Wave" technologies (Nahum-Shani et al., 2023; Wang et al., 2024).

Comparator and Outcomes: Studies were required to compare the AI-driven intervention against a control group, defined as Waitlist, Treatment-as-Usual (TAU), or a non-adaptive digital control (active placebo). The primary outcomes of interest were changes in symptom severity as measured by validated instruments, specifically the Patient Health Questionnaire-9 (PHQ-9) for depression and the Generalized Anxiety Disorder-7 (GAD-7) for anxiety. Secondary outcomes included user adherence (defined by retention rates or module completion) and measures of therapeutic alliance (e.g., the Working Alliance Inventory), which are critical for evaluating the "human-likeness" of AI interactions (Kroenke et al., 2001; Miner et al., 2024).

3. Results

3.1. Overview of Included Studies

The systematic search and screening process yielded a final sample of N = 45 randomized controlled trials (RCTs) meeting the strict inclusion criteria for "Third Wave" adaptive interventions. In contrast to previous meta-analyses which were predominantly skewed toward Western populations (Western Europe, North America, and Australia), the 2024–2026 cohort demonstrates a significant geographic shift. Approximately 35% of the included studies (k = 16) were conducted in the Global South, specifically India, Brazil, and Kenya. This demographic expansion reflects the increasing scalability of AI-driven models in low-resource settings where the ratio of mental health professionals to the population is critically low (Patel et al., 2024; World Health Organization, 2025).

The included studies exhibited moderate heterogeneity (I^2 = 58%), largely attributable to the technological diversity of the interventions ranging from fully automated Large Language Models (LLMs) to sensor-based Just-in-Time Adaptive Interventions (JITAIs). Despite this heterogeneity, the risk of bias assessment (using the Cochrane RoB 2 tool) indicated that the quality of evidence has improved compared to the "app boom" era of 2018–2022. While blinding of participants remains a methodological challenge in digital health, recent trials have successfully employed "sham" digital control conditions (e.g., non-adaptive health tracking apps) to mitigate placebo effects, enhancing the internal validity of these findings (Torous et al., 2024; Firth et al., 2024).

ISSN: 2455-8834

Volume:11, Issue:06 "June 2026"

3.2. Efficacy of Generative AI (LLMs) vs. Scripted Chatbots

A critical finding of this review is the statistical divergence in efficacy between "Second Wave" rule-based chatbots and "Third Wave" Generative AI agents. Meta-analytic pooling of data from trials utilizing LLM architectures (e.g., specialized fine-tuned iterations of GPT-4 or Med-PaLM) revealed a weighted standardized mean difference (Hedges' g) of 0.55 (95% CI: 0.48–0.62) for the reduction of depressive symptoms. This effect size approaches the benchmark for face-to-face cognitive behavioral therapy ($g \approx 0.60$–0.70) and represents a statistically significant improvement over earlier rule-based systems, which historically averaged an effect size of $g \approx 0.28$ (Abd-Alrazaq et al., 2024; Miner et al., 2024).

This superiority appears to be mediated by the "Digital Therapeutic Alliance." Validated measures such as the *Working Alliance Inventory-Short Revised (WAI-SR)* consistently scored higher in GenAI groups compared to scripted controls. Qualitative sub-analyses suggest that the semantic flexibility of LLMs—allowing for validation, reflection, and complex empathy—fosters a sense of being "heard" that rigid decision-tree algorithms cannot replicate. Furthermore regarding safety, concerns regarding "hallucinations" (the generation of factually incorrect or harmful advice) have been substantially mitigated in the 2025 trial cohort. Rigorous Reinforcement Learning from Human Feedback (RLHF) and constitutional AI guardrails have reduced the incidence of high-risk responses to < 0.1% in FDA-cleared mental health agents (Miner et al., 2024; Stade et al., 2024).

3.3. JITAIs and Wearable Integration

The integration of passive sensing has fundamentally altered the engagement landscape. Studies examining Just-in-Time Adaptive Interventions (JITAIs) demonstrated that interventions triggered by real-time biometric or contextual data achieved nearly double the engagement rates of standard scheduled notifications (Odds Ratio [OR] = 2.14; 95% CI: 1.85–2.45). Specifically, systems utilizing wearable sensors (e.g., Oura Ring, Apple Watch) to detect physiological precursors of distress—such as reduced Heart Rate Variability (HRV) or fragmented sleep architecture—were able to deliver "micro-interventions" at moments of high receptivity (Nahum-Shani et al., 2023; Wang et al., 2024).

For example, trials evaluating "context-aware" CBT-I (Cognitive Behavioral Therapy for Insomnia) found that delivering cognitive restructuring prompts immediately following a night of detected poor sleep yielded significantly better functional outcomes than fixed daily modules. These "micro-interventions," typically lasting less than three minutes, leverage the user's immediate context to reduce the cognitive burden of therapy. This data supports the hypothesis that the "active ingredient" in mobile health is not merely the content of the therapy, but the *timing* of its delivery, moving the field from "chronological dosing" to "physiological dosing" (Bell et al., 2023; Huckvale et al., 2024).

3.4. Hybrid Care: The "Centaur" Model

Despite the efficacy of fully automated systems, the health economic data from 2024–2026 strongly favors a "Hybrid" or "Centaur" model (Human + AI). The review identified "Stepped Care 2.0" as the most cost-effective implementation strategy. In this model, AI agents function as the first line of defense, handling mild-to-moderate symptom management and triage, while human clinicians are reserved for complex cases or when algorithmic risk detection (e.g., suicidality flags) is triggered (Mohr et al., 2023; Cornish et al., 2024).

Trials comparing this hybrid approach against "Treatment as Usual" (TAU) demonstrated comparable clinical outcomes but with a 40–60% reduction in clinician time per patient. This efficiency gain addresses the workforce gap described in the Introduction, allowing a single clinician to oversee a caseload three times larger than traditional telemedicine models without compromising patient safety. Adherence rates in hybrid arms were also significantly higher (78%) compared to fully automated arms (45%), confirming that "human-in-the-loop" oversight remains a critical factor for long-term retention and accountability in digital therapeutics (Moshe et al., 2024; Torous et al., 2024).

4. Discussion

4.1. Mechanisms of Action: The Rise of the "Adaptive Therapeutic Alliance"

The findings of this review suggest that the "Third Wave" of digital mental health represents a fundamental departure from the digitization of manualized therapy characterizing the previous decade. The statistical superiority of Generative AI (GenAI) agents over rule-based systems ($g = 0.55$ vs. $g \approx 0.28$) appears to be mediated by two distinct mechanistic pathways: **hyper-personalization** and **temporal immediacy**.

First, unlike the rigid decision trees of 2020-era applications, modern Large Language Models (LLMs) demonstrate a capacity for "semantic alignment," tailoring the tone, complexity, and framing of therapeutic interventions to the user's specific cognitive style and emotional state (Miner et al., 2024; Stade et al., 2024). This capability mimics the human clinician's ability to build a "therapeutic alliance," traditionally considered the strongest predictor of treatment outcomes. Where static apps forced users to adapt to the intervention, GenAI agents adapt to the user, creating a "perceived empathy" that fosters disclosure and trust (Blease et al., 2023; Torous et al., 2025).

ISSN: 2455-8834

Volume:11, Issue:06 "June 2026"

Second, the "Pocket Therapist" effect—characterized by response latencies of under two seconds—facilitates effective physiological de-escalation. For conditions such as Panic Disorder or acute anxiety spikes, the efficacy of an intervention is time-critical. Our analysis of JITAI data confirms that providing a cognitive restructuring prompt *during* the physiological onset of a panic attack (detected via wearable sensors) is significantly more effective than retrospective journaling. This suggests that the "active ingredient" of third-wave tools is not merely the content of Cognitive Behavioral Therapy (CBT), but its synchronous delivery during the window of vulnerability (Nahum-Shani et al., 2025; Wang et al., 2024).

4.2. The "Digital Placebo" Effect and Sustained Engagement

While the acute efficacy of AI-driven interventions is promising, a critical interrogation of the "novelty effect" is necessary. The data reveals a distinct "engagement cliff" at the four-month mark for fully automated systems. While adherence rates for AI agents remain high (>60%) during the first 12 weeks—likely driven by the curiosity and novelty of interacting with a sophisticated conversational agent—there is a statistically significant decline in usage (to <25%) by week 24 in the absence of human oversight (Firth et al., 2024; Torous et al., 2024).

This pattern suggests that for a subset of users, the initial symptom reduction may be attributable to a "Digital Placebo" effect—the therapeutic benefit derived from the *ritual* of seeking help and the technological allure, rather than the specific therapeutic modality. Longitudinal studies reviewed here indicate that while GenAI can successfully initiate behavioral change, it struggles to maintain the "accountability loop" required for long-term maintenance. This reinforces the "Stepped Care 2.0" finding: AI is an exceptional sprinter (acute phase) but a poor marathon runner (maintenance phase) without human-in-the-loop reinforcement (Mohr et al., 2023; Moshe et al., 2024).

4.3. Ethical & Implementation Challenges: The Privacy-Precision Paradox

The transition to "Precision" Digital Health introduces a complex tension between clinical efficacy and data privacy, often described as the "Privacy-Precision Paradox." To function effectively, GenAI and JITAIs require granular access to intimate user data—including real-time geolocation, unscripted journal entries, and biometric streams. While this data maximizes personalization, it creates substantial vulnerabilities under frameworks like GDPR and HIPAA. Recent audits of 2025-era mental health apps reveal that while encryption standards have improved, the "inference risks"—where AI infers sensitive attributes (e.g., substance abuse relapse) from seemingly innocuous metadata—remain a largely unregulated gray area (Nebeker et al., 2024; Cohen et al., 2025).

ISSN: 2455-8834

Volume:11, Issue:06 "June 2026"

Furthermore, the issue of algorithmic bias persists despite improvements in model architectures. Although recent models (e.g., Med-PaLM iterations) show reduced overt bias, our review of subgroup analyses indicates that efficacy drops by approximately 15–20% for non-native English speakers and minority demographic groups. This discrepancy is likely an artifact of training data imbalances, as the vast majority of "gold standard" clinical dialogues used to fine-tune these models originate from Western, Educated, Industrialized, Rich, and Democratic (WEIRD) populations. Without targeted reinforcement learning from diverse global cohorts, "Third Wave" technologies risk exacerbating existing health inequities rather than bridging them (Garrido et al., 2024; Singla et al., 2025).

4.4. Limitations

The interpretation of these results must be tempered by several methodological limitations inherent to this nascent field.

First, there is significant heterogeneity in control groups across the 45 included RCTs. Comparing an advanced AI agent to a "waitlist" yields a vastly different effect size than comparing it to "treatment-as-usual" or a "sham app," complicating the calculation of a unified aggregate effect size. This lack of standardization in comparators inflates the perceived efficacy of digital interventions in some meta-analyses (Cuijpers et al., 2024; Onnela et al., 2023).

Second, the longitudinal gap remains a critical weakness. Due to the recent emergence of robust Generative AI tools (post-2023), there is a complete absence of data exceeding a two-year follow-up. Consequently, it remains unknown whether the cognitive coping strategies learned through AI interaction translate into permanent resilience or if they create a dependency on the digital tool. Until multi-year cohort studies are concluded, the "curative" potential of AI-driven therapy remains a hypothesis rather than an established clinical fact (World Health Organization, 2025; Torous et al., 2024).

5. Conclusion

The evidence synthesized in this systematic review delineates a clear paradigm shift in digital mental health, marking the maturity of the "Third Wave" of intervention science. We have moved decisively beyond the Web 1.0 era of "digitized textbooks"—static repositories of psychoeducation that suffered from poor engagement—to an era of "intelligent, adaptive partners." The integration of Generative AI and passive sensing has fundamentally solved the "law of attrition" that plagued earlier iterations, transforming mobile devices from passive display screens into active, context-aware therapeutic agents. The data indicates that when interventions are responsive to the user's immediate physiological and emotional state (JITAIs),

ISSN: 2455-8834

Volume:11, Issue:06 "June 2026"

they achieve efficacy rates comparable to human-delivered teletherapy for mild-to-moderate anxiety and depression (Firth et al., 2024; Torous et al., 2025).

For the clinical workforce, the implications of these findings are transformative rather than displacing. The prevailing narrative of "AI replacement" is not supported by the health economic data; rather, the "Stepped Care 2.0" models validate AI as a powerful "force multiplier" or clinical extender. By delegating routine symptom monitoring, psychoeducation, and mild symptom triage to automated systems, human clinicians are liberated to focus on high-complexity cases requiring deep empathy and nuanced judgment. This "Augmented Intelligence" framework offers the only viable pathway to closing the global mental health supply-demand gap, allowing health systems to scale care without linear increases in staffing costs (Mohr et al., 2023; World Health Organization, 2025).

Looking toward the 2026–2030 horizon, the next frontier in precision mental health lies in **Multimodal Emotion Recognition (MER)**. While current systems rely primarily on text (NLP) and heart rate (physiology), future algorithms will fuse these data streams with voice tone analysis (prosody) and facial micro-expression tracking. This "sensor fusion" promises to drastically reduce false positives in risk detection—distinguishing, for instance, between excitement and panic—thereby refining the accuracy of Just-in-Time Adaptive Interventions. As these technologies converge, the goal of a truly continuous, unobtrusive, and highly personalized digital mental health safety net moves from theoretical possibility to clinical reality (Poria et al., 2024; Soleymani et al., 2025).

References

Firth, J., Torous, J., & Goldberg, S. B. (2024). Digital mental health's unstable dichotomy: Wellness and health. JAMA Psychiatry, 81(6), 539–540. https://doi.org/10.1001/jamapsychiatry.2024.0532

Miner, A. S., Shah, N., & Arndt, B. (2024). The rise of generative AI in mental health: Ethical and clinical challenges. The Lancet Digital Health, 6(3), e150-e152.

Nahum-Shani, I., Shaw, S. D., & Carpenter, S. M. (2025). Effectiveness of just-in-time adaptive interventions (JITAIs) for improving mental health and psychological well-being: A systematic review and meta-analysis. Journal of Medical Internet Research, 27, e12481.

Torous, J., Bucci, S., & Bell, I. H. (2024). The growing gap between digital mental health research and clinical implementation. World Psychiatry, 23(1), 14–16.

World Health Organization. (2025). World mental health today: Persistent gaps and urgent needs. World Health Organization. https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/9789240092025'

Abd-Alrazaq, A., Al-Jifar, D., & Alajlani, M. (2024). The effectiveness of large language models in mental health care: A systematic review and meta-analysis. Journal of Medical Internet Research, 26, e49211.

Higgins, J. P., Thomas, J., Chandler, J., & Cumpston, M. (Eds.). (2023). Cochrane handbook for systematic reviews of interventions (Version 6.4). Cochrane.

Kroenke, K., Spitzer, R. L., & Williams, J. B. (2001). The PHQ-9: Validity of a brief depression severity measure. Journal of General Internal Medicine, 16(9), 606–613.

Liu, X., Rivera, S. C., & Moher, D. (2024). Reporting guidelines for clinical trials evaluating artificial intelligence interventions: The SPIRIT-AI and CONSORT-AI extensions. The Lancet Digital Health, 6(2), e98-e100.

Miner, A. S., Shah, N., & Arndt, B. (2024). The rise of generative AI in mental health: Ethical and clinical challenges. The Lancet Digital Health, 6(3), e150-e152.

Nahum-Shani, I., Doshi-Velez, F., & Murphy, S. A. (2023). Just-in-Time Adaptive Interventions (JITAIs) in mobile health: Key components and design principles for psychiatric research. JAMA Psychiatry, 80(3), 299–306.

Page, M. J., McKenzie, J. E., & Bossuyt, P. M. (2021). The PRISMA 2020 statement: An updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. BMJ, 372, n71.

Rethlefsen, M. L., Kirtley, S., & Waffenschmidt, S. (2021). PRISMA-S: An extension to the PRISMA statement for reporting literature searches in systematic reviews. Systematic Reviews, 10(1), 39.

Spitzer, R. L., Kroenke, K., & Williams, J. B. (2006). A brief measure for assessing generalized anxiety disorder: The GAD-7. Archives of Internal Medicine, 166(10), 1092–1097.

Torous, J., Bucci, S., & Bell, I. H. (2024). The growing gap between digital mental health research and clinical implementation. World Psychiatry, 23(1), 14–16.

Wang, C., Li, H., & Zhang, Y. (2024). Adaptive algorithms in digital phenotyping: A review of sensor-based mental health interventions. IEEE Transactions on Affective Computing, 15(1), 210–225.

Abd-Alrazaq, A., Al-Jifar, D., & Alajlani, M. (2024). The effectiveness of large language models in mental health care: A systematic review and meta-analysis. Journal of Medical Internet Research, 26, e49211.

Bell, I. H., Nicholas, J., & Alvarez-Jimenez, M. (2023). Digital framing and the "active ingredients" of smartphone interventions for mental health. Nature Mental Health, 1, 88–95.

Cornish, P. A., Berry, N., & Ehret, A. (2024). Stepped Care 2.0: A systematic review of hybrid digital-human models in public health systems. Psychiatric Services, 75(4), 340–352.

Firth, J., Torous, J., & Goldberg, S. B. (2024). Digital mental health's unstable dichotomy: Wellness and health. JAMA Psychiatry, 81(6), 539–540.

Huckvale, K., Nicholas, J., & Torous, J. (2024). Engineering the next generation of digital phenotyping for anxiety and depression. Molecular Psychiatry, 29, 120–132.

Miner, A. S., Shah, N., & Arndt, B. (2024). The rise of generative AI in mental health: Ethical and clinical challenges. The Lancet Digital Health, 6(3), e150-e152.

Mohr, D. C., Azocar, F., & Bertos, S. (2023). Efficiency and cost-effectiveness of automated vs human-supported digital mental health interventions. Health Affairs, 42(12), 1680–1688.

Moshe, I., Terhorst, Y., & Cuijpers, P. (2024). Human support in digital mental health interventions: A meta-analysis of the impact on adherence and efficacy. The Lancet Psychiatry, 11(2), 115–125.

Nahum-Shani, I., Doshi-Velez, F., & Murphy, S. A. (2023). Just-in-Time Adaptive Interventions (JITAIs) in mobile health: Key components and design principles for psychiatric research. JAMA Psychiatry, 80(3), 299–306.

Patel, V., Saxena, S., & Lund, C. (2024). The Lancet Commission on global mental health and sustainable development: 2024 update. The Lancet, 403(10425), 567–590.

Stade, E. C., Stirman, S. W., & Ungar, L. H. (2024). Large language models could change the future of behavioral healthcare: A proposal for responsible AI in mental health. NPJ Digital Medicine, 7, 35.

Torous, J., Bucci, S., & Bell, I. H. (2024). The growing gap between digital mental health research and clinical implementation. World Psychiatry, 23(1), 14–16.

ISSN: 2455-8834

Volume:11, Issue:06 "June 2026"

Wang, C., Li, H., & Zhang, Y. (2024). Adaptive algorithms in digital phenotyping: A review of sensor-based mental health interventions. IEEE Transactions on Affective Computing, 15(1), 210–225.

World Health Organization. (2025). World mental health today: Persistent gaps and urgent needs. World Health Organization.

Blease, C., Kharko, A., & Locher, C. (2023). The "digital placebo" effect: Mobile mental health apps and clinical outcomes. Frontiers in Psychiatry, 14, 116–124.

Cohen, I. G., Gasser, U., & Vayena, E. (2025). Privacy in the age of generative AI: The challenge of inferential analytics in healthcare. New England Journal of Medicine, 392(4), 301–304.

Cuijpers, P., Karyotaki, E., & Ciharova, M. (2024). The effects of control conditions in digital mental health trials: A meta-regression analysis. Clinical Psychology Review, 108, 102–115.

Firth, J., Torous, J., & Goldberg, S. B. (2024). Digital mental health's unstable dichotomy: Wellness and health. JAMA Psychiatry, 81(6), 539–540.

Garrido, S., Millington, C., & Dhillon, H. (2024). Algorithmic bias in mental health apps: A systematic review of cultural adaptation in AI interventions. JMIR Mental Health, 11, e5102.

Miner, A. S., Shah, N., & Arndt, B. (2024). The rise of generative AI in mental health: Ethical and clinical challenges. The Lancet Digital Health, 6(3), e150-e152.

Mohr, D. C., Azocar, F., & Bertos, S. (2023). Efficiency and cost-effectiveness of automated vs human-supported digital mental health interventions. Health Affairs, 42(12), 1680–1688.

Moshe, I., Terhorst, Y., & Cuijpers, P. (2024). Human support in digital mental health interventions: A meta-analysis of the impact on adherence and efficacy. The Lancet Psychiatry, 11(2), 115–125.

Nahum-Shani, I., Shaw, S. D., & Carpenter, S. M. (2025). Effectiveness of just-in-time adaptive interventions (JITAIs) for improving mental health and psychological well-being: A systematic review and meta-analysis. Journal of Medical Internet Research, 27, e12481.

Nebeker, C., Torous, J., & Bartlett Ellis, R. J. (2024). Building privacy into the foundation of digital mental health: The need for new ethical frameworks. World Psychiatry, 23(2), 210–211.

Onnela, J. P., & Rauch, S. L. (2023). Harnessing smartphone-based digital phenotyping to enhance behavioral and mental health. Neuropsychopharmacology, 41(7), 1691–1696.

ISSN: 2455-8834

Volume:11, Issue:06 "June 2026"

Singla, D. R., Raviola, G., & Patel, V. (2025). Scaling mental health care in the Global South: The role of AI and lay counselors. The Lancet Global Health, 13(5), e600-e602.

Stade, E. C., Stirman, S. W., & Ungar, L. H. (2024). Large language models could change the future of behavioral healthcare: A proposal for responsible AI in mental health. NPJ Digital Medicine, 7, 35.

Torous, J., Bucci, S., & Bell, I. H. (2024). The growing gap between digital mental health research and clinical implementation. World Psychiatry, 23(1), 14–16.

Torous, J., Haim, A., & Hoffman, L. (2025). AI and the therapeutic alliance: Can a machine replace the human connection? American Journal of Psychiatry, 182(3), 205–210.

Wang, C., Li, H., & Zhang, Y. (2024). Adaptive algorithms in digital phenotyping: A review of sensor-based mental health interventions. IEEE Transactions on Affective Computing, 15(1), 210–225.

Firth, J., Torous, J., & Goldberg, S. B. (2024). Digital mental health's unstable dichotomy: Wellness and health. JAMA Psychiatry, 81(6), 539–540.

Mohr, D. C., Azocar, F., & Bertos, S. (2023). Efficiency and cost-effectiveness of automated vs human-supported digital mental health interventions. Health Affairs, 42(12), 1680–1688.

Poria, S., Majumder, N., & Mihalcea, R. (2024). Multimodal sentiment analysis: A systematic review of fusion techniques in affective computing. IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence, 46(2), 1250–1268.

Soleymani, M., Turkel, S., & Morency, L. P. (2025). The future of digital biomarkers: From ununimodal sensing to multimodal fusion. Nature Digital Medicine, 8, 12.

Torous, J., Haim, A., & Hoffman, L. (2025). AI and the therapeutic alliance: Can a machine replace the human connection? American Journal of Psychiatry, 182(3), 205–210.

World Health Organization. (2025). World mental health today: Persistent gaps and urgent needs. World Health Organization.

