

Peer Review

Review of: "AI and Mental Health – A Policy Perspective"

Sudip Bhattacharya¹

1. All India Institute of Medical Sciences, India

Specific points-

Kindly write about the burden of mental health and treatment options in the introduction section.

<https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/36993001/>

Why is AI required?

<https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/36636147/>

Give examples of the use of AI in other medical conditions, like breast cancer, and then come to mental health.

<https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s12672-024-01671-0>

<https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/39372870/>

Can you provide specific examples of ethical considerations for vulnerable groups in the context of AI and mental health?-

<https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/34321721/>

What are some specific international policy examples that could enhance the current UK-focused analysis?

General points-

The paper demonstrates considerable strengths, but there are also areas that could be improved. At times, it shifts between discussing the clinical applications of AI, such as the use of chatbots in therapy, and the

broader societal harms mediated by AI, such as job insecurity or harmful online content. While both aspects are relevant, the commentary would benefit from clearer framing at the outset to distinguish these domains and provide a more coherent structure. The policy analysis is also heavily UK-focused, which is valuable but somewhat narrow. A brief comparison with EU, US, or WHO-level approaches to AI and mental health could help contextualise the argument and highlight international best practices or policy gaps. In particular, the section on the Employment Rights Bill is significant but feels somewhat speculative, and the analysis would be stronger if it more clearly separated evidence-based concerns from anticipated or theoretical risks.

In terms of mental health framing, much of the evidence presented relates to risk factors such as job loss, job insecurity, or exposure to harmful online content. However, these could be more clearly linked back to specific mental health outcomes such as anxiety, depression, or suicide risk. Additionally, ethical considerations around vulnerable groups—including children, low-skilled workers, and minority communities—could be more fully developed to ensure equity is central to the discussion. The use of references is another area where improvements could be made. While the inclusion of media reports (e.g., *City AM*) provides timeliness, these should ideally be balanced with more peer-reviewed or governmental sources to strengthen the credibility of the evidence base. Furthermore, reference formatting is inconsistent in terms of spacing and punctuation and would benefit from standardisation.

Finally, the paper could be made more concise and cohesive by addressing issues of presentation and style. Certain sections, particularly those addressing the displacement of workers by AI, revisit the same points multiple times. Condensing these passages would improve readability and flow. Similarly, transitions between sections could be smoother, as some shifts—such as the move from social media harms to employment impacts—feel abrupt. With clearer structure, stronger evidence integration, and improved flow, the paper would present an even more compelling policy perspective on AI and mental health.

Declarations

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.