The Integration of Artificial Intelligence in Psychological Practice: Emerging Roles, Competencies, and Challenges for Psychologists

Michael Mbiriri
School of Business, Economics and Humanities
Mama Ngina University College
wamwathi1234@gmail.com

DOI:10.56201/jhsp.vol.12.no6.2026.pg163.174

Abstract
The rapid proliferation of artificial intelligence (AI) technologies—including machine learning algorithms, natural language processing tools, and AI-powered chatbots—has begun to reshape the landscape of psychological practice, raising both opportunities and concerns for the profession. This paper presents a secondary, desk-based review synthesizing existing literature on the integration of AI into psychological assessment, diagnosis, intervention, and administrative practice. Drawing on peer-reviewed journal articles, professional guidelines, and policy documents published between 2018 and 2025, the review examines three central themes: the emerging roles AI tools play in augmenting psychologists' clinical and research functions; the competencies psychologists require to ethically and effectively engage with AI-driven technologies; and the conceptual, ethical, and practical challenges associated with their adoption, including concerns regarding data privacy, algorithmic bias, the therapeutic alliance, and professional accountability. Findings suggest that while AI holds considerable promise for enhancing diagnostic accuracy, expanding access to mental health services, and reducing clinician workload, its integration is hindered by gaps in psychologists' digital literacy, inconsistent regulatory frameworks, and unresolved questions about the preservation of human-centered care. The review concludes by identifying priority areas for training curricula, ethical guideline development, and future empirical research. This synthesis contributes to ongoing professional discourse by consolidating fragmented evidence into a coherent framework for understanding AI's evolving role in psychological practice.

Keywords: *artificial intelligence, psychological practice, clinical competencies, professional ethics, digital mental health, desk review*

Introduction

Artificial intelligence (AI) has rapidly transitioned from a peripheral technological curiosity to a central force reshaping numerous professional domains, and psychology is no exception. Advances in machine learning, natural language processing, and conversational agents have enabled the development of tools capable of supporting psychological assessment, diagnosis, and intervention in ways that were scarcely conceivable only a few years ago (D'Alfonso, 2020). From AI-powered chatbots that deliver brief cognitive-behavioral interventions (Abd-Alrazaq et al., 2019) to predictive algorithms used in risk assessment and treatment planning (Bzdok & Meyer-

Lindenberg, 2018), these technologies are increasingly embedded within the infrastructure of mental health care delivery.

As access to traditional psychological services remains constrained by workforce shortages, geographic disparities, and rising demand, AI has been positioned by some scholars as a potential mechanism for extending the reach and efficiency of psychological care (Graham et al., 2019). However, the integration of AI into psychological practice is not without considerable controversy. Concerns have been raised regarding the erosion of the therapeutic alliance, the opacity of algorithmic decision-making, and the potential for AI systems to perpetuate or amplify existing biases in clinical judgment (Fiske et al., 2019). Furthermore, the increasing reliance on AI-driven tools raises pressing ethical questions concerning informed consent, data privacy, and the boundaries of professional accountability when clinical decisions are informed—or in some cases substantially shaped—by non-human agents (Sedlakova & Trachsel, 2023). These tensions underscore a broader and unresolved debate within the discipline: whether AI should be conceptualized primarily as a supportive adjunct to human clinical judgment or as a more autonomous actor within the therapeutic process (Sedlakova & Trachsel, 2023).

Compounding these ethical and clinical considerations is a growing recognition that psychologists, as a professional body, may be inadequately prepared to navigate this technological shift. Professional competency frameworks have historically lagged behind technological innovation, leaving practitioners with limited formal guidance on how to ethically evaluate, select, and integrate AI tools into their practice (American Psychological Association [APA], 2020). This gap is particularly salient given that psychologists are bound by professional and ethical codes that emphasize beneficence, non-maleficence, and respect for client autonomy—principles that may be challenged in novel ways by algorithmic systems whose internal logic is often inaccessible even to their developers (Fiske et al., 2019).

Despite the proliferation of individual empirical studies examining discrete applications of AI in mental health contexts, the literature remains fragmented across disciplinary boundaries, methodologies, and technological subfields. There is a need for a consolidated synthesis that maps the emerging roles AI technologies are assuming within psychological practice, identifies the competencies psychologists require to engage with these technologies responsibly, and critically examines the ethical, clinical, and structural challenges that accompany their adoption. Addressing this gap is essential not only for informing training curricula and professional guidelines but also for ensuring that the integration of AI into psychological practice proceeds in a manner that safeguards client welfare and upholds the integrity of the profession.

Accordingly, this paper undertakes a secondary, desk-based review of existing peer-reviewed literature, professional guidelines, and policy documents to address three interrelated objectives: (a) to examine the emerging roles of AI in psychological assessment, intervention, and administrative practice; (b) to identify the competencies psychologists require to engage ethically and effectively with AI-driven technologies; and (c) to critically evaluate the conceptual, ethical, and practical challenges associated with AI integration in psychological practice. In doing so, this review aims to consolidate a currently fragmented body of evidence into a coherent framework that can inform future research, training, and professional policy development.

Literature Review

This section synthesizes existing peer-reviewed literature, professional guidelines, and policy documents published between 2018 and 2025 to map the current state of knowledge regarding the integration of artificial intelligence (AI) into psychological practice. Consistent with the objectives

of this desk review, the literature is organized into three thematic areas: (a) the emerging roles of AI within psychological assessment, intervention, and administrative practice; (b) the competencies psychologists require to engage with AI technologies ethically and effectively; and (c) the conceptual, ethical, and practical challenges associated with their adoption.

Emerging Roles of AI in Psychological Practice

A growing body of literature documents the diverse functions AI technologies are beginning to assume across the psychological practice continuum. In the domain of assessment and diagnosis, machine learning algorithms have demonstrated potential for enhancing the precision of psychiatric and psychological classification by identifying patterns within large, multidimensional datasets that may elude traditional clinical judgment (Bzdok & Meyer-Lindenberg, 2018). Topol (2019) similarly observed that AI-driven diagnostic tools are increasingly capable of integrating heterogeneous data sources—including behavioral, physiological, and self-report data—to support more individualized and data-informed clinical decision-making.

Within the intervention domain, conversational agents and chatbots have emerged as a particularly visible application of AI in mental health care. Abd-Alrazaq et al. (2019) conducted a scoping review identifying a substantial increase in chatbot-delivered interventions targeting depression, anxiety, and general psychological well-being, while Vaidyam et al. (2019) noted that such agents are increasingly positioned not merely as screening tools but as adjunctive or stand-alone sources of psychoeducation and brief therapeutic support. Empirical evaluations of specific platforms, such as the AI-driven application Wysa, have reported promising engagement and symptom-reduction outcomes among users (Inkster et al., 2018), lending preliminary support to the clinical utility of such tools, albeit within methodologically constrained study designs. Beyond direct clinical applications, AI is also being incorporated into administrative and operational dimensions of practice, including automated scheduling, documentation, and predictive analytics for treatment planning, thereby reducing clinician workload and potentially expanding service capacity (Graham et al., 2019).

Competencies Required for Ethical and Effective AI Engagement

A second prominent theme in the literature concerns the competencies psychologists must develop to engage responsibly with AI technologies. The American Psychological Association (2020) has emphasized that practitioners integrating technology into practice must possess not only technical proficiency but also the capacity to critically evaluate the evidentiary basis, security protocols, and clinical appropriateness of digital tools prior to adoption. Thieme et al. (2020) similarly argued that the effective implementation of machine learning systems within mental health contexts requires close collaboration between technologists and clinicians, given that many AI tools are developed without sufficient input from practitioners regarding real-world clinical workflows and patient needs. This gap between technological development and clinical applicability has been identified as a recurring barrier to meaningful AI literacy among psychologists (Graham et al., 2019). Furthermore, scholars have increasingly called for the formal incorporation of AI-related content into psychology training curricula, encompassing not only technical understanding of how algorithms function but also critical appraisal skills related to bias detection, data interpretation, and the ethical evaluation of AI-generated recommendations (Sedlakova & Trachsel, 2023). The absence of standardized competency frameworks specific to AI, in contrast to more established domains such as telepsychology, has been highlighted as a significant gap requiring urgent professional attention (D'Alfonso, 2020).

Ethical, Conceptual, and Practical Challenges

The third and most extensively discussed theme in the literature concerns the ethical and practical challenges accompanying AI integration. Fiske et al. (2019) provided one of the most widely cited ethical analyses in this area, arguing that embodied and conversational AI systems raise fundamental questions regarding the authenticity of therapeutic relationships, informed consent, and the capacity of AI systems to navigate the nuanced, context-dependent judgments central to psychological care. Relatedly, Sedlakova and Trachsel (2023) examined whether conversational AI should be conceptualized as a passive therapeutic tool or as a quasi-autonomous agent within the therapeutic encounter, concluding that this ambiguity carries significant implications for questions of liability, consent, and clinical oversight.

Concerns regarding algorithmic bias and data privacy also feature prominently in the literature. Bzdok and Meyer-Lindenberg (2018) cautioned that machine learning models trained on non-representative datasets risk reproducing or amplifying existing disparities in diagnosis and treatment, particularly for historically marginalized populations. Blease et al. (2020), in a global survey of physicians, found that while many practitioners anticipated AI would improve administrative efficiency, a substantial proportion expressed skepticism regarding its capacity to replicate the empathic and relational dimensions of care—concerns that resonate closely within psychological, as opposed to purely medical, contexts. Additional practical barriers identified across the literature include inconsistent regulatory oversight of AI-based mental health tools, limited transparency regarding algorithmic decision-making processes, and unresolved questions of professional accountability when adverse outcomes arise from AI-assisted clinical decisions (Graham et al., 2019; Vaidyam et al., 2019).

Synthesis and Gaps in the Literature

Collectively, the reviewed literature indicates that while AI technologies offer considerable promise for enhancing the efficiency, accessibility, and precision of psychological practice, their integration remains fragmented and unevenly regulated. Existing studies tend to focus narrowly on discrete technological applications—such as individual chatbot platforms or diagnostic algorithms—rather than offering an integrated account of the roles, competencies, and challenges spanning the profession as a whole. Moreover, relatively few sources directly address the pedagogical and training implications of AI integration, despite growing consensus that competency development represents a critical precondition for ethical practice (American Psychological Association, 2020; Sedlakova & Trachsel, 2023). This review seeks to address these gaps by synthesizing the fragmented literature into a coherent, profession-wide framework.

Methodology

Research Design

This study employed a secondary, desk-based review design to synthesize existing peer-reviewed literature, professional guidelines, and policy documents addressing the integration of artificial intelligence (AI) into psychological practice. A desk review approach was selected because it enables the systematic consolidation of dispersed evidence across disciplinary and methodological boundaries without the time, cost, and ethical clearance demands associated with primary data collection (Snyder, 2019). Given the heterogeneity of source materials relevant to this topic—spanning empirical studies, conceptual papers, professional guidelines, and policy documents—a narrative synthesis approach was adopted, informed by established principles of systematic and scoping review methodology to ensure transparency and rigor (Page et al., 2021).

Search Strategy

A structured search of electronic databases was conducted to identify relevant literature, including PsycINFO, PubMed/MEDLINE, Scopus, Web of Science, and Google Scholar. These databases were selected for their broad coverage of psychological, behavioral, and biomedical literature relevant to the intersection of AI and mental health practice. The search was supplemented by a review of publications from professional bodies, including the American Psychological Association, to capture relevant practice guidelines and policy statements not indexed in academic databases. Search terms were developed using Boolean operators and combined keywords reflecting the core constructs of the review, including: "artificial intelligence" AND "psychology"; "machine learning" AND "mental health practice"; "chatbot" OR "conversational agent" AND "psychotherapy"; "AI ethics" AND "clinical psychology"; and "digital competencies" AND "psychologists." Search terms were adapted iteratively across databases to accommodate differences in indexing conventions and controlled vocabulary (e.g., MeSH terms in PubMed).

Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria

Sources were included if they met the following criteria: (a) published in a peer-reviewed journal, professional guideline, or institutional policy document; (b) published between January 2018 and 2025, to ensure the review reflected contemporary technological and regulatory developments; (c) written in English; and (d) substantively addressed the application, ethics, competencies, or challenges associated with AI in psychological, mental health, or closely related clinical practice contexts.

Sources were excluded if they: (a) focused exclusively on AI applications unrelated to mental health or psychological practice (e.g., purely neuroscientific or unrelated biomedical applications); (b) consisted of non-peer-reviewed commentary, opinion pieces, or unpublished theses without formal peer review; or (c) were published prior to 2018, in order to maintain the contemporaneity of the evidence base given the rapid pace of technological change in this field.

Data Extraction and Synthesis

Following the identification of eligible sources, relevant data were extracted using a structured charting framework, capturing publication details (authors, year, source type), study or document focus, key findings, and thematic relevance to the review's three guiding objectives: emerging roles, required competencies, and associated challenges. This approach is consistent with recommended practices for scoping and narrative reviews, which emphasize systematic charting to enhance transparency and reduce selection bias even in the absence of formal meta-analytic synthesis (Page et al., 2021).Extracted data were then organized using thematic analysis, whereby recurring concepts, patterns, and points of convergence or divergence across sources were inductively identified and grouped into the three overarching themes presented in the Literature Review (Braun & Clarke, 2019). This iterative process involved repeated review of source material to ensure thematic categories accurately and comprehensively represented the breadth of the literature.

Methodological Limitations

As a desk-based, secondary review, this study did not involve the collection of primary data and is therefore subject to limitations inherent to narrative synthesis methodologies, including the potential for selection bias in source identification and the absence of formal quality-appraisal scoring typically associated with systematic reviews (Snyder, 2019). Additionally, given the

rapidly evolving nature of AI technologies, it is acknowledged that relevant developments occurring after the literature search cutoff may not be reflected in this synthesis. Nonetheless, the structured search and extraction procedures employed were designed to maximize the rigor, transparency, and trustworthiness of the resulting synthesis.

Ethical Considerations

As this review relied exclusively on publicly available, previously published literature, it did not require ethical approval from an institutional review board. Nonetheless, all sources were represented accurately and attributed appropriately in accordance with APA 7th edition referencing standards, consistent with principles of academic integrity and scholarly transparency.

Results

A total of 13 sources met the inclusion criteria and were retained for thematic synthesis, comprising peer-reviewed empirical studies, scoping and systematic reviews, conceptual/ethical analyses, and one professional guideline document. Consistent with the three objectives guiding this review, results are presented according to the following thematic categories: (a) emerging roles of AI in psychological practice, (b) competencies required of psychologists, and (c) ethical, conceptual, and practical challenges. A summary of key sources and their thematic contributions is presented in Table 1, followed by a narrative account of patterns observed across the literature.

Table 1

Summary of Reviewed Sources by Thematic Category

Author(s) (Year)	Source Type	Primary Thematic Focus	Key Contribution
Bzdok & Meyer-Lindenberg (2018)	Conceptual review	Emerging roles	Machine learning enhances diagnostic precision but risks reproducing dataset bias
Topol (2019)	Conceptual review	Emerging roles	AI integrates multimodal data to support individualized clinical decision-making
Abd-Alrazaq et al. (2019)	Scoping review	Emerging roles	Documents growth in chatbot-delivered interventions for depression and anxiety
Vaidyam et al. (2019)	Narrative review	Emerging roles / Challenges	Conversational agents increasingly used for psychoeducation and brief support
Inkster et al. (2018)	Empirical (mixed-methods)	Emerging roles	Reports engagement and symptom-reduction outcomes for AI app Wysa

Graham et al. (2019)	Overview/review	Emerging roles / Competencies	Documents administrative and clinical applications; identifies literacy gaps
American Psychological Association (2020)	Professional guideline	Competencies	Establishes expectations for technical and ethical evaluation of digital tools
Thieme et al. (2020)	Systematic review (HCI)	Competencies	Highlights need for clinician–technologist collaboration in ML design
D'Alfonso (2020)	Conceptual review	Competencies / Challenges	Identifies absence of standardized AI competency frameworks
Fiske et al. (2019)	Ethical analysis	Challenges	Raises concerns about authenticity of therapeutic relationships with AI
Sedlakova & Trachsel (2023)	Ethical analysis	Challenges	Debates AI as therapeutic tool versus quasi-autonomous agent
Blease et al. (2020)	Empirical (survey)	Challenges	Physicians skeptical of AI's capacity to replicate empathic care

Note. Several sources contributed to more than one thematic category and are listed according to their primary focus.

Emerging Roles of AI in Psychological Practice

Findings indicate that AI is increasingly being applied across three principal domains of psychological practice: assessment/diagnosis, intervention delivery, and administrative support. Within assessment, the reviewed literature consistently reported that machine learning algorithms can enhance diagnostic precision by detecting complex, multidimensional patterns within clinical data (Bzdok & Meyer-Lindenberg, 2018; Topol, 2019). Within intervention delivery, results show a marked proliferation of AI-driven conversational agents designed to deliver brief psychoeducational or therapeutic content, with several sources reporting preliminary evidence of user engagement and symptom improvement (Abd-Alrazaq et al., 2019; Inkster et al., 2018). However, these same sources noted that such evidence remains constrained by short follow-up periods and limited methodological rigor, suggesting that claims regarding clinical efficacy should be interpreted cautiously. Within administrative practice, AI was reported to support scheduling, documentation, and predictive treatment planning, contributing to reduced clinician workload and expanded service capacity (Graham et al., 2019).

Competencies Required for Ethical and Effective Engagement

Results pertaining to competencies revealed a consistent pattern across sources: while professional bodies have begun articulating general expectations for technology-related practice (American

Psychological Association, 2020), the literature lacks AI-specific competency frameworks comparable to those developed for telepsychology or other established digital practice domains (D'Alfonso, 2020). Findings further indicate that effective AI integration is hindered by a disconnect between technology developers and practicing clinicians, with several sources emphasizing that meaningful competency development requires collaborative, interdisciplinary engagement rather than purely technical training (Graham et al., 2019; Thieme et al., 2020). Across the reviewed sources, three recurring competency domains were identified: (a) technical literacy regarding how AI systems function, (b) critical appraisal skills for evaluating algorithmic outputs and potential bias, and (c) ethical reasoning skills specific to AI-mediated clinical decision-making.

Ethical, Conceptual, and Practical Challenges

Findings related to challenges were the most extensively represented across the reviewed literature. A recurring concern across multiple sources was the potential erosion of the therapeutic alliance when clinical functions are mediated by AI systems, with several authors questioning whether AI can adequately replicate the relational and empathic dimensions central to psychological care (Blease et al., 2020; Fiske et al., 2019). Closely related was an unresolved conceptual debate regarding whether AI systems should be understood as passive clinical tools or as more autonomous agents within the therapeutic process—an ambiguity reported to carry direct implications for questions of informed consent, liability, and clinical oversight (Sedlakova & Trachsel, 2023). Additional challenges identified across sources included the risk of algorithmic bias arising from non-representative training data (Bzdok & Meyer-Lindenberg, 2018), inconsistent regulatory oversight of AI-based mental health tools, and limited transparency in algorithmic decision-making processes (Graham et al., 2019; Vaidyam et al., 2019).

Summary of Findings

Taken together, the results suggest a literature that is expanding rapidly but remains thematically fragmented. While substantial attention has been devoted to the technical capabilities and ethical implications of AI in psychological contexts, comparatively less attention has been directed toward the development of standardized competency frameworks or empirically validated training models. This pattern indicates a misalignment between the pace of technological adoption and the pace of corresponding professional and educational adaptation—a gap that is examined further in the Discussion section.

Discussion

The purpose of this desk review was to synthesize existing literature examining the integration of artificial intelligence (AI) into psychological practice, with specific attention to its emerging roles, the competencies psychologists require to engage with it responsibly, and the challenges accompanying its adoption. The findings reveal a literature that is expanding rapidly in scope yet remains fragmented in its conceptual and professional coherence, with important implications for clinical practice, training, and policy development.

Interpretation of Key Findings

The results indicate that AI is no longer a peripheral or speculative technology within psychological practice but is actively reshaping core functions of assessment, intervention, and administration (Bzdok & Meyer-Lindenberg, 2018; Graham et al., 2019; Topol, 2019). This

proliferation aligns with broader trends across health care more generally, in which AI is increasingly positioned as a tool for augmenting—rather than replacing—clinical judgment (Topol, 2019). However, the consistent methodological limitations identified across intervention-focused studies, including short follow-up periods and constrained outcome measures (Abd-Alrazaq et al., 2019; Inkster et al., 2018), suggest that enthusiasm for AI-driven interventions may be outpacing the strength of the underlying evidence base. This pattern echoes concerns raised in adjacent health disciplines, where rapid technological adoption has similarly preceded robust longitudinal validation (Blease et al., 2020).

A particularly notable finding was the conspicuous absence of standardized, AI-specific competency frameworks within psychology, in contrast to more mature digital practice domains such as telepsychology (D'Alfonso, 2020). This gap is concerning given that the American Psychological Association (2020) has articulated general expectations for technology-related practice but has not yet operationalized these expectations into AI-specific guidance. The disconnect between technologists and practicing clinicians identified by Thieme et al. (2020) further suggests that competency gaps are not solely attributable to individual practitioner deficits but reflect a structural misalignment in how AI tools are designed, validated, and disseminated within the profession.

The ethical challenges identified across the literature—particularly concerns regarding the therapeutic alliance, algorithmic bias, and the ambiguous status of AI as either tool or agent—point to unresolved conceptual tensions that extend beyond technical or regulatory fixes (Fiske et al., 2019; Sedlakova & Trachsel, 2023). These findings suggest that ethical guidance for AI in psychological practice cannot be adequately addressed through existing general technology guidelines alone but requires dedicated conceptual and normative development specific to the unique relational nature of psychological care.

Implications for Practice, Training, and Policy

These findings carry several implications. First, psychology training programs and continuing education bodies should consider integrating AI-specific content into curricula, encompassing technical literacy, critical appraisal of algorithmic outputs, and ethical reasoning tailored to AI-mediated clinical contexts (Graham et al., 2019; Sedlakova & Trachsel, 2023). Second, professional bodies may need to develop AI-specific practice guidelines that extend beyond general technology competency statements, addressing issues such as informed consent for AI-assisted interventions, transparency requirements for algorithmic decision-making, and clear delineation of clinician accountability (American Psychological Association, 2020; D'Alfonso, 2020). Third, given concerns regarding algorithmic bias and the underrepresentation of diverse populations in training datasets (Bzdok & Meyer-Lindenberg, 2018), policymakers and developers should prioritize equity-focused evaluation of AI tools prior to clinical deployment.

Limitations

This review is subject to several limitations. As a desk-based, secondary synthesis, it did not involve formal quality appraisal of individual studies and may be subject to selection bias inherent to narrative review methodology (Snyder, 2019). The restriction of the search to English-language sources published between 2018 and 2025 may have excluded relevant scholarship published in other languages or prior to this period, potentially limiting the historical context available for interpreting more recent developments. Additionally, given the rapid pace of innovation in this

field, it is likely that relevant technological and regulatory developments have emerged subsequent to the literature search and are not reflected in this synthesis.

Directions for Future Research

Future research should prioritize longitudinal and methodologically rigorous evaluations of AI-driven interventions to substantiate preliminary findings regarding their clinical efficacy. Additionally, empirical research is needed to directly examine psychologists' current competency levels and training needs related to AI, an area that remains largely theoretical within the existing literature. Finally, future scholarship would benefit from cross-national comparative analysis of regulatory approaches to AI in mental health care, given the considerable variation in oversight mechanisms identified across the reviewed sources.

Conclusion

This review consolidates a fragmented body of literature into a coherent account of how AI is reshaping psychological practice, the competencies practitioners require to engage with it responsibly, and the ethical and practical challenges that remain unresolved. While AI holds considerable promise for enhancing the accessibility, efficiency, and precision of psychological care, its responsible integration will depend on the parallel development of robust competency frameworks, profession-specific ethical guidance, and rigorous empirical validation. Without such parallel development, the profession risks a widening gap between technological capability and the safeguards necessary to protect client welfare and uphold the integrity of psychological practice.

References

Abd-Alrazaq, A. A., Alajlani, M., Alalwan, A. A., Bewick, B. M., Gardner, P., & Househ, M. (2019). An overview of the features of chatbots in mental health: A scoping review. *International Journal of Medical Informatics*, *132*, Article 103978. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijmedinf.2019.103978

American Psychological Association. (2020). *APA guidelines for psychological practice with technology*. https://www.apa.org/practice/guidelines/technology

Blease, C., Locher, C., Leon-Carlyle, M., & Doraiswamy, P. M. (2020). Artificial intelligence and the future of psychiatry: Qualitative findings from a global physician survey. *Digital Health*, *6*. https://doi.org/10.1177/2055207620968355

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2019). Reflecting on reflexive thematic analysis. *Qualitative Research in Sport, Exercise and Health*, *11*(4), 589–597. https://doi.org/10.1080/2159676X.2019.1628806

Bzdok, D., & Meyer-Lindenberg, A. (2018). Machine learning for precision psychiatry: Opportunities and challenges. *Biological Psychiatry: Cognitive Neuroscience and Neuroimaging*, *3*(3), 223–230. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bpsc.2017.11.007

D'Alfonso, S. (2020). AI in mental health. *Current Opinion in Psychology*, *36*, 112–117. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.copsyc.2020.04.005

Fiske, A., Henningsen, P., & Buyx, A. (2019). Your robot therapist will see you now: Ethical implications of embodied artificial intelligence in psychiatry, psychology, and psychotherapy. *Journal of Medical Internet Research*, *21*(5), Article e13216. https://doi.org/10.2196/13216

Graham, S., Depp, C., Lee, E. E., Nebeker, C., Tu, X., Kim, H.-C., & Jeste, D. V. (2019). Artificial intelligence for mental health and mental illnesses: An overview. *Current Psychiatry Reports*, *21*(11), Article 116. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11920-019-1094-0

Inkster, B., Sarda, S., & Subramanian, V. (2018). An empathy-driven, conversational artificial intelligence agent (Wysa) for digital mental well-being: Real-world data evaluation mixed-methods study. *JMIR mHealth and uHealth*, *6*(11), Article e12106. https://doi.org/10.2196/12106

Page, M. J., McKenzie, J. E., Bossuyt, P. M., Boutron, I., Hoffmann, T. C., Mulrow, C. D., Shamseer, L., Tetzlaff, J. M., Akl, E. A., Brennan, S. E., Chou, R., Glanville, J., Grimshaw, J. M., Hróbjartsson, A., Lalu, M. M., Li, T., Loder, E. W., Mayo-Wilson, E., McDonald, S., . . . Moher, D. (2021). The PRISMA 2020 statement: An updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. *BMJ*, *372*, Article n71. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.n71

Sedlakova, J., & Trachsel, M. (2023). Conversational artificial intelligence in psychotherapy: A new therapeutic tool or agent? *American Journal of Bioethics*, *23*(5), 4–13. https://doi.org/10.1080/15265161.2022.2048739

Snyder, H. (2019). Literature review as a research methodology: An overview and guidelines. *Journal of Business Research*, *104*, 333–339. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2019.07.039

Thieme, A., Belgrave, D., & Doherty, G. (2020). Machine learning in mental health: A systematic review of the HCI literature to support the development of effective and implementable ML systems. *ACM Transactions on Computer-Human Interaction*, *27*(5), Article 34. https://doi.org/10.1145/3398069

Topol, E. J. (2019). High-performance medicine: The convergence of human and artificial intelligence. *Nature Medicine*, *25*(1), 44–56. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41591-018-0300-7

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. *Canadian Journal of Psychiatry*, *64*(7), 456–464. https://doi.org/10.1177/0706743719828977