

Peer Review

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

Matthew Allen¹

1. University of California, San Diego, United States

- Thank you for the opportunity to review! Nice work!
- I feel that this paper covers a timely, interesting topic and raises numerous important points. However, I felt the paper suffered from a lack of clarity and organization, and I finished unclear on the central message. Some of the paper focused on social media, other parts on job losses/fear of job losses, but I wasn't clear on why these two topics were focused on and what the call to action was. Make a case for why you're focusing on these two facets of AI and mental health. In general, I would try to have a clearer focus/thread throughout the writing, and I would align the title with this improved focus. I would also add that if you are suggesting a need for more public health/policy focus on these topics, it would help if you suggested potential policies to be considered rather than just saying it needs to be thought about.
- I would also point out that there is a TON of literature addressing potential regulatory strategies for AI. Referring more to such literature (outside of the specific UK initiatives cited in the article) would strengthen the discussion.
- "the wider long-term implications of AI" – please expand on what you mean by this phrase that is employed several times.
- "fear of potential job losses due to AI" – do you explain how policy changes could avoid this?
- "To minimise the negative mental health impact, alternative progression opportunities will be needed." – I'm unsure what this is referring to.
- "the rise of AI (including through social media)" – this is referred to several times. I think it would be useful to expound more on how AI is affecting social media.
- One other brief note: I would encourage spending some time improving the writing quality. Short, clear sentences are often more impactful and understandable than lengthy ones. There were multiple

areas in the article where you used short, clear sentences. Other parts were more difficult to parse. I also noticed some grammatical errors which we are all in danger of :)

- I spent ~30 minutes on this review and wish I had time to spend more.

Declarations

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.