

Supplementary Material

Closing the accessibility gap to mental health treatment with a conversational AI-enabled self-referral tool

Johanna Habicht^{1 *}, Sruthi Viswanathan¹, Ben Carrington¹, Tobias Hauser^{1,2}, Ross Harper¹, Max Rollwage¹

1 Limbic Limited, London, UK

2 Max Planck UCL Centre for Computational Psychiatry and Ageing Research
University College London, London WC1B 5EH, UK


* johanna@limbic.ai

Total number of self-referrals

To ensure that the observed increase in the total number of referrals in the manuscript was not due to other forms of referrals (e.g., GP referrals) increasing during the study period, we conducted a secondary analysis of only self-referrals. We repeated the analysis reported in the manuscript for self-referrals and used data from the same services during the same time period.

The implementation of the AI-enabled self-referral tool resulted in an 18% increase in the total number of self-referrals at the same time period as reported in the manuscript, whereas the other services had a 7% increase in self-referrals in the same time period (Figure 1).

The increase in total self-referral numbers for services using the AI-enabled self-referral tool was significantly higher than the increase for other similar services ($\chi^2(1) = 106.5$, $p < 0.001$). This suggests that the self-referral tool facilitates an increase in self-referrals.



Supplementary Figure 1: The total number of self-referrals pre- and post-implementation of the AI-enabled self-referral tool for services that implemented the novel tool (pink) and other similar services that did not implement the tool (grey). There was a 18% increase in self-referrals for services that used the AI tool, whereas other services had a 7% increase in the same time period. The increase in self-referrals for services using the self-referral tool was significantly higher than the increase for other similar services.*** $p < 0.001$

Total number of referrals split by demographic group

		Total referrals pre AI tool	Total referrals post AI tool
Gender identity	Female	20735	24520
	Male	9775	11300
	Non-binary	100	335
	Not answered/unknown	70	70
Sexual orientation	Heterosexual	24560	27935
	Bisexual	1840	2395
	Homosexual	445	530
	Not answered/unknown	3880	5385
Ethnic group	White	26230	30065
	Asian	1000	1390
	Mixed	840	970
	Black	565	800
	Other	255	315
	Not answered/unknown	1635	2525

Supplementary Table 1: Total number of referrals pre-implementation of the AI-enabled self-referral tool and post-implementation of the tool. These numbers were used to calculate the percentage changes reported in the manuscript.

Number of referrals categorised by demographic group and feedback theme

Theme	Number of referrals split by gender identity		χ^2	Corrected p value
	Other	Females and Males		
Convenient	434	23948	7.79	0.142
Provided hope	84	5768	8.84	0.079
Self-realisation	65	3175	0.04	22.47
Human-free	113	3691	22.7	0.00005
Needed specific support	45	1624	4.8	0.77
Other neutral feedback	33	1248	2.46	3.148
Expected support sooner	20	828	0.58	12.02
Wanted urgent support	14	484	1.57	5.69
Other negative feedback	5	297	0.02	23.74

Supplementary Table 2: The number of referrals, categorised by gender identity and feedback theme, along with the corresponding Chi Square and corrected p values for comparing the gender minority group with females and males for each theme.

Theme	Number of referrals split by sexual orientation		χ^2	Corrected p value
	Bisexual	Heterosexual		
Convenient	1621	20110	0.72	10.68
Provided hope	306	4992	27.8	<0.00001
Self-realisation	192	2691	3.49	1.671
Human-free	369	2980	62.4	<0.00001
Needed specific support	162	1257	30.8	<0.00001
Other neutral feedback	78	1021	0.28	16.08
Expected support sooner	40	679	3.90	1.307
Wanted urgent support	27	403	0.84	9.671
Other negative feedback	16	239	0.43	13.74


Supplementary Table 3: The number of referrals, categorised by sexual orientation and feedback theme, along with the corresponding Chi Square and corrected p values for comparing the bisexual individuals with heterosexual individuals for each theme.

Theme	Number of referrals split by ethnic group		χ^2	Corrected p value
	Asian and Black ethnic groups	White		
Convenient	1343	21905	24.2	0.00002
Provided hope	322	5253	2.74	2.64
Self-realisation	281	2783	46.6	<0.00001
Human-free	215	3416	0.82	9.83
Needed specific support	133	1408	14.6	0.00361
Other neutral feedback	84	1106	1.12	7.83
Expected support sooner	67	709	7.02	0.217
Wanted urgent support	36	428	1.49	6.00
Other negative feedback	18	265	0.0	27.0

Supplementary Table 4: The number of referrals, categorised by ethnic group and feedback theme, along with the corresponding Chi Square and corrected p values for comparing the Asian and Black ethnic groups with the White group for each theme.

Feedback comparison between all minority groups and majority group


To ensure that the feedback from all minority groups was consistent with the minority groups where we saw an increase in total referrals, we conducted a supplementary analysis that included all minority groups, not just those where we observed a significant increase in referrals compared to the majority group, as reported in the main manuscript. The findings from this supplementary analysis were consistent with those reported in the main manuscript.



Supplementary Figure 2: Breakdown of feedback themes from minority (pink bars) and majority (grey bars) groups. A) Breakdown of feedback for gender minority groups compared to females and males. B) Breakdown of feedback for sexuality minority groups compared heterosexual individuals. C) Breakdown of feedback for ethnic minority groups compared White individuals. *** $p < 0.001$; ** $p < 0.01$; t $p < 0.1$

Access to clinical assessment

To ensure that the increase in the number of referrals did not result in longer wait times for clinical assessment and a reduction in the number of people accessing these assessments, we compared the percentage of people who were assessed during the study between the services that used the AI-enabled self-referral tool and services that did not use the tool. We conducted a two-way ANOVA to investigate the effects of the time period (i.e., pre- and post-implementation of the AI-enabled self-referral tool) and tool usage on the number of clinical assessments. The analysis showed a significant effect of the time period ($F(1, 13) = 4.67$, $p = 0.035$), indicating a reduction in the number of assessments over time. However, there was no significant effect of tool usage ($F(1, 13) = 0.06$, $p = 0.803$), and no significant interaction between time period and tool usage ($F(1, 13) = 0.09$, $p = 0.764$), suggesting that the AI-enabled self-referral tool did not have a negative impact on the number of assessments that were conducted.



Supplementary Figure 3: The percentage of individuals who went through a clinical assessment in the study time period for services that implemented the novel AI-enabled self-referral tool (pink) and other similar services that did not implement the tool (grey).