

Letter to the Editor

Authors' Reply: Methodological Considerations in Evaluating Mental Health Apps: Ensuring Reliability and Patient Safety

Seema Mehrotra¹, PhD; Ravikesh Tripathi¹, PhD; Pramita Sengupta¹, PhD; Abhishek Karishiddimath¹, MSc; Angelina Francis¹, MA; Pratiksha Sharma¹, MSc; Paulomi Sudhir¹, PhD; T K Srikanth², PhD; Girish Rao³, MD; Rajesh Sagar⁴, MD

¹Department of Clinical Psychology, National Institute of Mental Health and Neurosciences, Bengaluru, India

²E-Health Research Centre, International Institute of Information Technology Bangalore, Bengaluru, India

³Centre for Public Health, Department of Epidemiology, National Institute of Mental Health and Neurosciences, Bengaluru, India

⁴Department of Psychiatry, All India Institute of Medical Sciences, New Delhi, India

Corresponding Author:

Seema Mehrotra, PhD

Department of Clinical Psychology

National Institute of Mental Health and Neurosciences

Hosur Road

Bengaluru 560029

India

Phone: 91 9448503853

Email: drmehrotra_seema@yahoo.com

Related Articles:

Comment on: <https://mhealth.jmir.org/2025/1/e85329>

Comment on: <https://mhealth.jmir.org/2025/1/e79238>

JMIR Mhealth Uhealth2025;13:e85910; doi: [10.2196/85910](https://doi.org/10.2196/85910)

Keywords: mental health apps; mHealth; review of apps; smartphone apps; MHapps for indian users; India

We thank Balakrishna [1] for the letter to the editor in response to our article [2] on the systematic review of mental health apps accessible to Indian users and appreciate both their interest and the critical points raised.

As described in our paper, we adopted a multiphased approach to interrater reliability. This included initial training of reviewers; independent rating of 3 apps by 4 primary reviewers, followed by joint discussions with mentors; joint review of 3 additional apps, leading to the creation of an internal guide; independent review of 6 more apps and further mentor discussions; detailed independent review of the remaining apps; and mentor review of a subset of 7 reviewed apps, along with joint rating of all apps flagged as doubtful [2]. We acknowledge the concern regarding the absence of intraclass correlation coefficients due to the lack of dual ratings across all apps. It is a limitation noted in our paper. Given the broad search strategy, with use of 15 mental health-related terms, we had a large set of apps to review even after initial screening (n=792). Moreover, our review extended beyond the Mobile Application Rating Scale to include additional predefined parameters, requiring substantial time and effort. The dynamic nature of app store content further constrained the timeline, limiting the feasibility of

dual independent ratings for all apps. Nonetheless, we believe our sequential, collaborative approach helped mitigate rating inconsistencies to a reasonable extent. We appreciate the suggestion to report intraclass correlation coefficients for a random subset, and this exercise is already underway.

Regarding sampling scope, as noted in the Limitations section of our paper, we evaluated only free apps, apps offering free trials, and the freely accessible portions of paid apps. This may have led to an incomplete basis for rating certain apps, and we agree that our findings may not fully represent the broader app ecosystem. However, information regarding involvement of mental health professionals and empirical research was drawn from app store descriptions and “about the app” sections, which were accessible even for paid apps. Our focus on free and partially free apps reflects what is most accessible to users and our findings align with patterns observed in other reviews [3-5]. That said, we acknowledge that ratings on some parameters would have benefited from access to full app content. This review is part of a planned recurring exercise, and in the next phase we will conduct detailed assessments of a random sample of fully paid apps, along with newer entries in this dynamic and evolving space.

Lastly, we concur with the observation that adverse events in clinical trials of mental health apps remain underreported. Ours was a review study, and we hope that our identification of certain instances of unscientific or potentially misleading content will prompt further research into these

aspects. Looking ahead, we are developing a web-based platform to guide users and professionals on key cautionary indicators—contextually relevant cues to assess app quality and support informed decision-making.

Acknowledgments

The original study was funded by the Indian Council of Medical Research as part of the funding support for the Centre for Advanced Research in Digital Interventions for Mental Health Care, NIMHANS, Bengaluru.

Conflicts of Interest

None declared.

References

1. Balakrishna H. Methodological considerations in evaluating mental health apps: ensuring reliability and patient safety. JMIR Mhealth Uhealth. 2025;13:e85329. [doi: [10.2196/85329](https://doi.org/10.2196/85329)]
2. Mehrotra S, Tripathi R, Sengupta P, et al. Evaluating characteristics and quality of mental health apps available in app stores for Indian users: systematic app search and review. JMIR Mhealth Uhealth. Sep 26, 2025;13:e79238. [doi: [10.2196/79238](https://doi.org/10.2196/79238)] [Medline: [41004798](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/41004798/)]
3. Singh S, Sharma P, Ghimire P, Shrestha R, Gnanavel S. Assessment of app store description and privacy policy to explore ethical and safety concerns associated with the use of mental health apps for depression. Indian J Psychol Med. Mar 2023;45(2):173-178. [doi: [10.1177/02537176221142046](https://doi.org/10.1177/02537176221142046)] [Medline: [36925500](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/36925500/)]
4. Martinengo L, Stona AC, Tudor Car L, Lee J, Griva K, Car J. Education on depression in mental health apps: systematic assessment of characteristics and adherence to evidence-based guidelines. J Med Internet Res. Mar 9, 2022;24(3):e28942. [doi: [10.2196/28942](https://doi.org/10.2196/28942)] [Medline: [35262489](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/35262489/)]
5. Leong QY, Sridhar S, Blasiak A, et al. Characteristics of mobile health platforms for depression and anxiety: content analysis through a systematic review of the literature and systematic search of two app stores. J Med Internet Res. Feb 4, 2022;24(2):e27388. [doi: [10.2196/27388](https://doi.org/10.2196/27388)] [Medline: [35119370](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/35119370/)]

Edited by Stefano Brini; This is a non-peer-reviewed article; submitted 15.Oct.2025; accepted 20.Oct.2025; published 19 Nov.2025

Please cite as:

Mehrotra S, Tripathi R, Sengupta P, Karishiddimath A, Francis A, Sharma P, Sudhir P, Srikanth TK, Rao G, Sagar R
Authors' Reply: Methodological Considerations in Evaluating Mental Health Apps: Ensuring Reliability and Patient Safety
 JMIR Mhealth Uhealth2025;13:e85910
 URL: <https://mhealth.jmir.org/2025/1/e85910>
 doi: [10.2196/85910](https://doi.org/10.2196/85910)

© Seema Mehrotra, Ravikesh Tripathi, Pramita Sengupta, Abhishek Karishiddimath, Angelina Francis, Pratiksha Sharma, Paulomi Sudhir, T K Srikanth, Girish Rao, Rajesh Sagar. Originally published in JMIR mHealth and uHealth (<https://mhealth.jmir.org>), 19.Nov.2025. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work, first published in JMIR mHealth and uHealth, is properly cited. The complete bibliographic information, a link to the original publication on <https://mhealth.jmir.org/>, as well as this copyright and license information must be included.