EPV0741

Strengths and limitations of the use of Artificial Intelligence in Mental Health

A. Alberca-González[1] and E. Fernández-Jiménez[1,2,3]*

[1]Faculty of Social Sciences and Communication, Universidad Europea de Madrid, Villaviciosa de Odón; [2]Department of Psychiatry, Clinical Psychology and Mental Health, La Paz University Hospital and [3]Hospital La Paz Institute for Health Research (IdiPAZ), Madrid, Spain
*Corresponding author.
doi: 10.1192/j.eurpsy.2025.1426

Introduction: Artificial intelligence (AI) is emerging as a disruptive tool in medicine and healthcare, especially in Mental Health. Its ability to process large volumes of data and detect complex patterns has opened up new possibilities for the diagnosis, treatment, and monitoring of mental disorders, providing opportunities to improve the clinical accuracy and personalisation of therapeutic intervention. However, the use of AI in Mental Health poses critical challenges involving ethical, privacy, and inherent issues regarding the quality and validity of the models employed.
Objectives: The aim of this review is to critically analyse the strengths and limitations of the use of AI in Mental Health, offering a balanced perspective on the potential benefits and associated risks.
Methods: A narrative review of the current scientific literature was conducted on the main applications of AI in the diagnosis, treatment, and monitoring of mental disorders as well as the barriers to its effective implementation.
Results: The main strengths identified were the ability of AI to provide more accurate and personalised diagnoses, continuous monitoring of patients' well-being, increased efficiency in the delivery of Mental Health services, and the possibility of analysing large volumes of data in reduced times, thus improving the ability to detect and track symptoms. However, regarding limitations, the scientific literature highlights the lack of transparency in many of the studies conducted, problems of methodological quality, risks regarding the perpetuation of pre-existing biases, concerns about the privacy of sensitive data, and the potential risk of dehumanisation of care by prioritising automated systems over human contact. In addition, the need for rigorous validation and a clear regulatory framework are key issues in ensuring the ethical and safe use of these technologies.
Conclusions: In conclusion, AI represents a resource with immense potential for transforming clinical practice in Mental Health care, providing more accurate diagnoses, personalised interventions, and real-time monitoring. However, its implementation must be accompanied by rigorous scientific and regulatory scrutiny to mitigate ethical risks and ensure the protection of patients' privacy and dignity. It is necessary to ensure that technological advances go hand in hand with a humanised approach, where technology complements, but does not replace, the essential therapeutic connection in Mental Health care.

Disclosure of Interest: None Declared

EPV0742

Perceptions and Attitudes Towards Artificial Intelligence Among Education and Mental Health Professionals: A Comparative Pilot Study

A. Alberca-González[2] and E. Fernández-Jiménez[1,2,3]*

[1]Department of Psychiatry, Clinical Psychology and Mental Health, La Paz University Hospital, Madrid; [2]Faculty of Social Sciences and Communication, Universidad Europea de Madrid, Villaviciosa de Odón and [3]Hospital La Paz Institute for Health Research (IdiPAZ), Madrid, Spain
*Corresponding author.
doi: 10.1192/j.eurpsy.2025.1427

Introduction: The integration of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in education and mental health fields represents an innovative path to optimize diagnostic, intervention, and monitoring processes, although it poses ethical and technical challenges that must be carefully assessed. Understanding how professionals in these areas perceive this technology is essential to support its informed and effective adoption.
Objectives: This study aimed to explore and compare perceptions and attitudes towards AI among professionals in education and mental health by examining key dimensions such as efficiency, personalization, diagnosis, monitoring, privacy, and validation.
Methods: A cross-sectional pilot study was conducted with a sample of 17 professionals divided into two groups: five from the educational sector and 12 from the clinical-mental health sector. An online structured questionnaire, designed ad hoc, was used, comprising ten dimensions addressing diagnosis, monitoring, efficiency, data analysis, quality, ethics, dependency, validation, ease of use, and AI acceptance. All participants provided written informed consent to participate in this study.
Results: The findings are as follows:

- High agreement in perceived efficiency across both sectors (>80%).
- Greater optimism in personalization within the educational sector (80% vs. 58.3% in mental health).
- General concern about the validation of AI systems (94.1% consider it insufficiently rigorous).
- Significant resistance to AI implementation (82.4%).
- Key perceived barriers: Data privacy (85%) and risk of dehumanization (76%).

Conclusions: While AI's potential to enhance efficiency is acknowledged in both areas, reservations persist concerning the validity and safety of these systems, particularly regarding data privacy and the integrity of professional-patient or student relationships. These findings suggest the need to develop comprehensive validation programs and specific protocols that facilitate the ethical and technically sound implementation of AI in these fields.

Disclosure of Interest: None Declared

https://doi.org/10.1192/j.eurpsy.2025.1427 Published online by Cambridge University Press