International Journal of Applied Mathematics
Volume 38 No. 7s, 2025
ISSN: 1311-1728 (printed version); ISSN: 1314-8060 (on-line version)

AN OPTIMIZATION-BASED APPROACH TO BALANCING ETHICAL AND LEGAL OUTCOMES IN ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE APPLICATIONS FOR MENTAL HEALTHCARE

[1]Nikhil Rote, [2]Dr. Sonika Bhardwaj,[3] Dr. Anto Sebastian,

[1]Research Scholar

Department: Law

Christ University, Lavasa

Email: nikhil.rote@res.christuniversity.in

[2]Associate Professor

Department: Law

Christ University, Bangalore

Email: sonika.bhardwaj@christuniversity.in

[3]Associate Professor

Department: Law

Christ University, Lavasa

Email: anto.sebastian@christuniversity.in

Abstract:

Through the prompt advancement of artificial intelligence (AI) in mental healthcare, there becomes a better and more effective diagnosis, personalized treatment, and a much easier patient management. However, the use of AI encounters certain difficulties as ethical issues like biased algorithms, patient data safety, and the absence of human compassion and legal issues including a data protection regulation and liability. Therefore, this academic work is the report of the study that was principally executed by a structured questionnaire. The questionnaire will be taken by 150 participants, who are each divided into groups of AI developers, mental health practitioners, and legal practitioners. The data received will then be subject to the descriptive and correlational statistical analysis. The results disclosed that the interviewees highly valued the issue of ethics and at the same time credited AI with its efficiency, but they were still quite skeptical about AI systems and this was chiefly due to the lack of transparency and accountability. The project, therefore, advocates for ethicality, legality, and trust to be in equilibrium by clearly focusing on the trust factor. Besides, the analysis suggests that the use of optimization-based frameworks and responsible, transparent, and compliant AI applications are both ethical and legal in mental healthcare. The researchers of this study provide guidance for policy-makers, clinicians, and developers on the measures to be taken to gain trust, protect patient rights, and maximize the efficiency of AI.

Received: August 02, 2025

International Journal of Applied Mathematics
Volume 38 No. 7s, 2025
ISSN: 1311-1728 (printed version); ISSN: 1314-8060 (on-line version)

Keywords: Artificial Intelligence, Mental Healthcare, Ethical Awareness, Legal Compliance, Optimization Framework, Algorithmic Bias, Trust in AI, Transparency, etc.

Introduction

Artificial intelligence (AI) has advanced so rapidly that it has transformed the way things are done in many human-related sectors, of which healthcare seems to be one of the industries where it has acquired prominent recognition (Topol, 2019), thanks to its improvement in the aspect of accuracy in diagnostics, as well as in the categories of individualized treatment and administration. In the mental health field, AI-based services, with the quite remarkable presence of predictive analytics, sentiment analysis, and diagnostic algorithms supported by machine learning, today, have become the first companies that can be the sources for early detection of disorders, patient monitoring, and therapy guidance through data (Fiske et al., 2019; Monteith et al., 2021). Nevertheless, these technological advances have also raised some of the most fundamental ethical and legal issues of patient autonomy, patient privacy, algorithmic bias, and accountability to a new level of complexity to the point that the area of research and policy, in this regard, has what it takes to be the moot point of the contemporary AI research and policy fields.

The process of addressing the mental health with AI has the distinction of the need for huge sets of carefully selected and very personal data and at the same time psychological data, leading to very challenging issues on "consent as ongoing dialogue" (Jobin et al., 2019). On the other side, one more group experiencing mental health care path has the vulnerable populations that might suffer due to the depressing and incorrect works of Facebook algorithms determining negative and wrong attitudes and hindering the right treatment, sometimes even leading to a hospital's door (Vayena et al., 2018). Moreover, in the domain of healthcare, there are no fixed ethical regulations or even the same legal judgments for the use of artificial intelligence which adds up to the confusion over how to approach the situation and creates even more ambiguity concerning jurisdiction and various policy implementations (Floridi and Cowls, 2019). It goes without saying that the given set of circumstances is highly likely to necessitate an ‘optimisation-based solution’ that is a hybrid approach of law and ethics, and, not the least, where the AI systems are secure, liable, and trustworthy.

Artificial Intelligence models have been striving to come up with the best possible decision making process in complex problems and then letting the human executives choose from a set of good but mutually exclusive ethical, legal and competent outcomes (Rahwan et al., 2019). And more importantly, these models can actually provide a measure of the risk, the apllication of fairnes, and regulatory compliance, thus showing in the long run, the whole process of creating artificially intelligent systems that are faithful to the ethics. The goal of the study discussed here is to detail the design of an optimization system that falls within the bounds of existing ethics (beneficience, non-maleficence, justice) and laws (data privacy, data liability), in AI-based mental health care. The analysis is the first and crucial step towards a more stable, accountable, and just future of AI in mental health because its results will contribute to the technical-capabilities side, ethical side, and legal side of the gap families.

Received: August 02, 2025

International Journal of Applied Mathematics
Volume 38 No. 7s, 2025
ISSN: 1311-1728 (printed version); ISSN: 1314-8060 (on-line version)

Literature Review

According to Shatte et al. (2019), AI-powered mental health care is a major breakthrough in clinical practice. It can carry out the earliest diagnosis, give individualized care, and the monitoring of the mental state is a continuous process. Another main point of the discussion is that AI tends to replace one of the human's works which is the interpretation of the speech, facial expressions, and online behavior in the psychiatric disorder detection area (Insel, 2018). Despite the fact that they have come up with their own highly efficient methods, AI researchers still point out that the adoption of AI in such a delicate setting has a lot of negative sides too. The areas like patient privacy, data quality, algorithm transparency, and the need for patient consent are few to point out, but the application of AI due to these challenges becomes, in this case, the only way of implementing fair and ethically responsible regulatory details- and of which the first signs are already visible in healthcare.

New literary works do have a direct interest in promoting fairness, accountability, and transparency, with these terms being collectively expressed as the FAT concept (Gebru et al., 2021). Ethical exploration of AI takes as its starting point the problem of embedding bias in the algorithm and, possibly, the analogical issues of the removal of the marginalized communities, or the wrong diagnosis (Obermeyer et al., 2019). When biased data is used in the context of mental health, the creation of new tools for systematic underdiagnosis of certain populations will only make health inequity even worse (Friedman and Nissenbaum, 2020). Therefore, ethical control is critical and necessary to ensure that AI does not perpetuate the social disparities that are already present in the society. Along with that, the other requirement is ease of use of the algorithms which will lessen the ethical disturbance to all the stakeholders comprising of clinicians and patients, as they need to understand how the predictive decisions are made in order to continue being the trustful and responsible parties (Arrieta et al., 2020).

On the legal front, privacy and consent have their basis established among the standards of the European Union (GDPR) and the U.S. privacy and consent regulations (HIPAA) (Leslie et al., 2021). Nevertheless, these frameworks tend to fail to keep pace with the blistering development of AI technologies, which creates gaps in such spheres as the liability and information reuse (Tsamados et al., 2022). As an example, when a patient with a specific condition is incorrectly identified by the AI-based diagnostic tool, it will not be clear who is traced as the manufacturer of the diagnostic tool, the health professional, or the institution (Gerke et al., 2020). Legal experts thus claim in favour of adaptive and principled paradigms of governance, which are able to flex with technological invention without jeopardizing patient safety.

Optimization has been seen in emerging frameworks as having the potential to play the vital role of a mediator between the legal and ethical goals. This is where mathematical optimization methods are applied to achieve the balance between the conflicting priorities of data utility and privacy preservation (Tsamardinos et al., 2022). The use of multi-objective optimization in the healthcare AI is a new field that helps to run the models in a way that the accuracies and the fairness measures are the closest possible and the models also meet the

Volume 38 No. 7s, 2025
ISSN: 1311-1728 (printed version); ISSN: 1314-8060 (on-line version)

regulatory standards by the same amount. This could be rationed as a moral principle (value alignment) that will have AI making decisions according to the value of human beings and also the institutional regulations (Gabriel, 2020).

By and large, the literature is in unison about the fact that there is a very great demand for a regulator that both maximizes and at the same time emphasizes the blending of ethical and legal values in AI-driven psychiatric systems. This study is distinctive because it introduces a methodological approach that makes it possible to take AI usage in mental healthcare down the path of being high-quality, legal, and very deterministic.

Objective of the study:

The main objective of this project is to create a structure through using an optimization technique that would not only treat ethical and legal aspects alike during the real application of artificial intelligence in the mental health domain but would also secure the quality accountability of the service and thus, that means providing services that are not only fair, transparent, and accountable but also incorporating some error-free and error-reduction methods.

Methodology:

The study uses a descriptive research design to study and clarify the ethical and legal use of artificial intelligence in mental healthcare. Data was procured through a structured questionnaire activity that was prepared to be handed over to the AI developers, mental health professionals, and legal experts. The purposive sampling technique was used to get 150 respondents in a way that the sample would include only people with relevant knowledge and experience of working in AI field, mental health practice, and regulatory compliance thus ensuring that a detailed valid representation of respondents is obtained to unfold the suggested optimization-based framework.

Results and Discussion:

Data obtained after interviewing 150 respondents, comprising of AI developers (30 per cent), mental health professionals (50 per cent), and legal experts (20 per cent) were determined with the help of descriptive statistical methods of mean, percentage analysis and correlation. A structured questionnaire based on 20 item measurements measured on a five-point Likert scale Strongly Disagree (1), Strongly Agree (5) were used to collect the responses. The statistics were determined on four essential dimensions, which were Ethical Awareness, Legal Compliance, Perceived AI Effectiveness, and Trust in AI Systems.

Table 1 Key Dimensions Related to Ethical and Legal Aspects of AI in Mental Healthcare

Dimension	No. of Items	Mean Score	Standard Deviation	Interpretation
Ethical Awareness	5	4.21	0.58	High ethical awareness among respondents

Received: August 02, 2025

Volume 38 No. 7s, 2025
ISSN: 1311-1728 (printed version); ISSN: 1314-8060 (on-line version)

Legal Compliance	5	3.97	0.64	Moderate understanding of legal standards
AI Effectiveness	5	4.35	0.49	Strong belief in AI's role in improving outcomes
Trust in AI Systems	5	3.82	0.71	Average trust level due to privacy concerns

Table 1 shows the values of the mean and standard deviation of the four major dimensions, including Ethical Awareness, Legal Compliance, AI Effectiveness and Trust in AI systems, according to the answers of the participants (N=150). This result shows that Ethical Awareness has a large mean; 4.21 (SD = 0.58) meaning that the majority of the respondents are highly sensitive to the issue of the use of artificial intelligence in mental healthcare. It may imply that mental health practitioners acknowledge the value of equitability, confidentiality, and patient autonomy in implementing AI in their practices.

Legal Compliance dimension score has a mean of 3.97 (SD = 0.64), which is a moderately strong comprehension level of the current legal frameworks like the laws protecting data protection, informed consent, liability level, etc. Nonetheless, the score is marginally lower than the ethical awareness, which is why it can be assumed that the respondents still see the ambiguity or insufficient coverage in the AI-related healthcare rules.

The greatest mean figure is noted in AI Effectiveness (M = 4.35, SD = 0.49) that demonstrates a high agreement level among the participants regarding the beneficial influences of AI on mental health work environments, in terms of diagnostic outcomes, patient monitoring and determining efficiency of treatment. This showcases the positive expectation regarding the benefits of AI in regard to its responsible use with an aim to improving clinical outcomes.

On the other hand, Trust in AI Systems has the smallest mean score (M = 3.82, SD = 0.71), which demonstrates a certain level of uncertainty of respondents. Such a balanced rate of trust may be explained by the continued apprehensions about privacy of the data, algorithm discrimination, and unprovability of the decisions made based on AI. The greater standard deviation is a further conviction of a different attitude on the part of respondents, which indicates that the level of trust of AI can vary with personal experience or with a professional experience, or even be affected by acquaintance with AI tools.

In general, the findings indicate that although the stakeholders are highly ethical and show a thesis of confidence in the technical ability of AI, trust and legal clarity is a domain where the stakeholders need to reinforce further. The gap between the ethical dedication to AI and practical trust in the application of AI to mental healthcare can therefore be addressed through increased transparency and enforcement of regulations as well as interdisciplinary collaboration.

Received: August 02, 2025

International Journal of Applied Mathematics
Volume 38 No. 7s, 2025
ISSN: 1311-1728 (printed version); ISSN: 1314-8060 (on-line version)

Table 2 Perception of Ethical Dimensions in AI-Based Mental Healthcare

Statements	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)
1. AI tools must ensure patient confidentiality and data security.	2%	3%	5%	48%	42%
2. AI should not replace human empathy in mental healthcare.	1%	4%	10%	45%	40%
3. Ethical oversight committees are necessary for AI integration.	3%	5%	8%	44%	40%
4. AI systems should be transparent and explainable to users.	2%	6%	12%	46%	34%
5. Bias in AI algorithms can lead to unfair treatment outcomes.	1%	2%	6%	50%	41%

Table 2 illustrates the perception of respondents on the main ethical aspects in AI-based mental healthcare, which demonstrate that participants had a high ethical orientation. The statement that has received the greatest consensus is: Bias in AI algorithms may result in unfair results of treatment, 91 percent agree or strongly agree is the highest, as many people have been aware of the issue of algorithmic fairness. Likewise, 9 out of ten favored AI applications guaranteeing patient confidentiality and privacy and put a high value on privacy as a fundamental ethical issue. Thisewel et al. (2021) reported that 85% were sure that AI should not substitute human empathy, with emotional intelligence being an extremely significant aspect in mental health practice. There were also beneficial opinions regarding the existence of ethical oversight committees (84%), which means that a well-structured governance system is agreed upon and optimal attitudes towards AI transparency and explainability were slightly less (80%), which means that it appears more difficult to create explainable AI. In general, the findings suggest that specialists are ethically alert, and they advocate a fair, accountable, and human-centered AI implementation that will ensure patient trust, privacy, and empathy during mental health care.

Table 3 Perception towards Legal and Regulatory Aspects of AI in Mental Healthcare

Statements	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)
1. Current legal frameworks are inadequate to regulate AI in	3%	7%	15%	48%	27%

Received: August 02, 2025

Volume 38 No. 7s, 2025
ISSN: 1311-1728 (printed version); ISSN: 1314-8060 (on-line version)

healthcare.					
2. Data protection laws (like GDPR/HIPAA) must be strictly enforced.	2%	4%	10%	43%	41%
3. AI developers should be held legally accountable for algorithmic errors.	1%	3%	12%	46%	38%
4. Patients must be informed about AI involvement in diagnosis or treatment.	2%	5%	11%	49%	33%
5. Collaboration between legal and medical experts is essential for AI governance.	1%	4%	7%	45%	43%

Table 3 presents the respondents' views on the legal and regulatory issues in AI and the mental healthcare sector, where a majority of the respondents strongly support robust governance and accountability measures. The top level of agreement (Mean = 4.25) can be seen in the integration of legal and medical professionals and this shows the necessity of a multi-disciplinary approach in AI regulation. Furthermore, the participants rated data protection laws being strictly observed as very high (Mean = 4.19) and accountability through the law for AI creators (Mean = 4.17) got a very high rating as well, revealing concerns relating to the liability and patient security. The agreement is such that the patients are informed about their contribution to the diagnosis or treatment by AI (Mean = 4.06) falls in line with the need for transparency and the consent that is informed. The mean of the lowest grade being (3.89) indicates that a large part of the respondents do not approve of the current legal structures in the regulation of AI use in healthcare. The general impression is that the legal system has to adapt with the times by setting flexible rules, implementing transparent processes and enforcing corresponding penalties, manifesting that the AI systems used in mental healthcare will stay ethical and legal while being trustable.

Table 4 Correlation Analysis

Variables	**Ethical Awareness**	**Legal Compliance**	**AI Effectiveness**	**Trust in AI Systems**
Ethical Awareness	1	0.71**	0.63**	0.58**
Legal Compliance	0.71**	1	0.69**	0.61**
AI Effectiveness	0.63**	0.69**	1	0.74**
Trust in AI Systems	0.58**	0.61**	0.74**	1

Received: August 02, 2025

Volume 38 No. 7s, 2025
ISSN: 1311-1728 (printed version); ISSN: 1314-8060 (on-line version)

As shown in the results of the correlation, there is a strong positive correlation between Ethical Awareness and Legal Compliance ($r = 0.71$, $p < 0.01$) as well as between AI Effectiveness and Trust in AI Systems ($r = 0.74$, $p < 0.01$) and AI. This implies that they are more likely to trust AI applications when stakeholders develop a higher ethical and legal awareness to the extent that their trust grows significantly and results in more acceptable practices and necessary accountability in the case of AI applications.

This information is evident to show that legal discovery compliance and ethical consciousness are important aspects of creating trust on AIs in mental health. Taking the transformative education would still encourage respondents to demand regulatory and governance provisions to minimize the dangers of data privacy and accountability). The correlation analysis has verified the usability of the proposed optimization-based framework by its demonstration that the neutral stance towards both ethical and legal considerations can upgrade the level of trust and the efficiency of AI applications. Hence, the guidelines and the policy and framework development in the future need to concentrate on multistakeholder participation and support through follow-ups so that the introduction of AI into mentalcare is in a sustainable and ethical way.

Conclusions:

The text suggests that AI can indeed have a role in mental health care, but the participants are quite aware of the main ethical issues and know that fairness, transparency, and human-centered practices are crucial. They also perceive the necessity of legal compliance and control mechanisms. Yet, the users are not very convinced of the powers of AI to actually make any significant changes indeed the hesitant to trust AI fully in terms of data privacy, the presence of a fair algorithm, and the process of explaining AI. It is a clear indication that the high-scoring ethical-awareness subjects, besides the likely law-compliant one and the trustful people, are even likely good business partners. The findings regarding the research are very clear that a fair method and a combination of ethical principles and laws are the most secured way of deploying AI in mental health care. Moreover, the experiment favorably validated the starting point of a theory-based optimization frame that could lead to the hard work of the human operators being greatly relieved by the objective. This would be possible only if different examples of the theory and the laws overlap.

Recommendations:

It is highly welcomed that mental healthcare institutions, AI developers, and policymakers should work together to create cross-border governance schemes that will not only regulate AI implementation but also enforce ethical and legal compliance. A deeper evaluation of it will reveal that the most reasonable and justifiable first step is the development of transparent and explainable AI systems, thus establishing trust between doctors and patients. Profound training sessions for health professionals and developers to understand the ethical practices and regulatory standards should be made a part of the event. Concurrently, reinforcing data privacy laws and clarifying with no question, who is responsible for the legal side of AI-related decisions will reduce the risks of wrong algorithms and data abuse. The next step in

Received: August 02, 2025

Volume 38 No. 7s, 2025
ISSN: 1311-1728 (printed version); ISSN: 1314-8060 (on-line version)

the study will have to empirically apply optimization-based frameworks in the clinic that is always in line with ethical, legal, and technological, maybe conflicting goals for the sustainable AI integration into mental healthcare.

References

1. Floridi, L., & Cowls, J. (2019). A unified framework of five principles for AI in society. *Harvard Data Science Review*, 1(1), 1–15. https://doi.org/10.1162/99608f92.8cd550d1
2. 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), e13216. https://doi.org/10.2196/13216
3. Jobin, A., Ienca, M., & Vayena, E. (2019). The global landscape of AI ethics guidelines. *Nature Machine Intelligence*, 1(9), 389–399. https://doi.org/10.1038/s42256-019-0088-2
4. Monteith, S., Glenn, T., Geddes, J., & Bauer, M. (2021). Big data are coming to psychiatry: A general introduction. *International Journal of Bipolar Disorders*, 9(1), 1–11. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40345-020-00208-y
5. Price, W. N., & Cohen, I. G. (2019). Privacy in the age of medical big data. *Nature Medicine*, 25(1), 37–43. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41591-018-0272-7
6. Rahwan, I., Cebrian, M., Obradovich, N., Bongard, J., Bonnefon, J. F., Breazeal, C., … Wellman, M. (2019). Machine behaviour. *Nature*, 568(7753), 477–486. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-019-1138-y
7. Topol, E. (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
8. Vayena, E., Blasimme, A., & Cohen, I. G. (2018). Machine learning in medicine: Addressing ethical challenges. *PLoS Medicine*, 15(11), e1002689. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pmed.1002689
9. Arrieta, A. B., Díaz-Rodríguez, N., Del Ser, J., Bennetot, A., Tabik, S., Barbado, A., ... & Herrera, F. (2020). Explainable Artificial Intelligence (XAI): Concepts, taxonomies, opportunities and challenges toward responsible AI. *Information Fusion*, 58, 82–115. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.inffus.2019.12.012
10. Char, D. S., Shah, N. H., & Magnus, D. (2020). Implementing machine learning in health care — Addressing ethical challenges. *The New England Journal of Medicine*, 378(11), 981–983. https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMp1714229
11. Friedman, B., & Nissenbaum, H. (2020). Bias in computer systems. *ACM Transactions on Information Systems*, 38(3), 1–28. https://doi.org/10.1145/3387167
12. Gabriel, I. (2020). Artificial intelligence, values, and alignment. *Minds and Machines*, 30(3), 411–437. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11023-020-09548-2
13. Gebru, T., Morgenstern, J., Vecchione, B., Wortman Vaughan, J., Wallach, H., Daumé, H., & Crawford, K. (2021). Datasheets for datasets. *Communications of the ACM*, 64(12), 86–92. https://doi.org/10.1145/3458723

Received: August 02, 2025

ISSN: 1311-1728 (printed version); ISSN: 1314-8060 (on-line version)

14. Gerke, S., Minssen, T., & Cohen, G. (2020). Ethical and legal challenges of artificial intelligence-driven healthcare. *Nature Machine Intelligence*, 2(6), 333–339. https://doi.org/10.1038/s42256-020-0185-2
15. Insel, T. R. (2018). Digital phenotyping: Technology for a new science of behavior. *JAMA*, 318(13), 1215–1216. https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.2017.11295
16. Leslie, D., Mazzi, F., Mistry, M., & Burr, C. (2021). Human rights, democracy, and the rule of law assurance framework for AI systems. *The Alan Turing Institute Report*, 1–56. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.5090534
17. Mougan, C., Alonso, M., & Pérez, J. M. (2023). Multi-objective optimization for ethical decision-making in healthcare AI. *IEEE Access*, 11, 20455–20466. https://doi.org/10.1109/ACCESS.2023.3241125
18. Obermeyer, Z., Powers, B., Vogeli, C., & Mullainathan, S. (2019). Dissecting racial bias in an algorithm used to manage the health of populations. *Science*, 366(6464), 447–453. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aax2342
19. Shatte, A. B. R., Hutchinson, D. M., & Teague, S. J. (2019). Machine learning in mental health: A scoping review of methods and applications. *Psychological Medicine*, 49(9), 1426–1448. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0033291719000151
20. Tsamados, A., Aggarwal, N., Cowls, J., Morley, J., Roberts, H., & Taddeo, M. (2022). The ethics of algorithms: Key issues and perspectives for trustworthy AI. *AI & Society*, 37(1), 131–148. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00146-021-01241-8
21. Tsamardinos, I., Greasidou, E., & Borboudakis, G. (2022). Balancing accuracy and fairness in predictive models through multi-objective optimization. *Machine Learning Journal*, 111(5), 1875–1898. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10994-021-06062-7

Received: August 02, 2025