

1 PLOS ONE

2

3 **A mixed methods analysis of youth mental health intervention feasibility and**
4 **acceptability in a North American city: perspectives from Seattle, Washington**

5 **Short: Identifying mental health interventions for urban youth**

6 Authors: Augustina Mensa-Kwao¹, Ingrid Sub Cuc², Tessa Concepcion¹, Christopher G. Kemp³,

7 Matthew Hughsam⁴, Moitreyee Sinha⁴ Pamela Y. Collins^{1,5}

8 ¹ Department of Global Health, University of Washington, Seattle, Washington, United States of
9 America

10

11 ² Department of Native American Studies, University of California Davis, Davis, California,
12 United States of America

13

14 ³ Johns Hopkins University, Department of International Health, Baltimore, Maryland, United
15 States of America

16

17 ⁴ citiesRise, New York, New York, United States of America

18

19 ⁵ Department of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences, University of Washington, United States of
20 America

21

22

23

24 Corresponding author:

25 Pamela Y. Collins

26 Email: pamelaycollins@gmail.com

27

28

29

30

31 **Word count:** 8600

32 **Abstract**

33 Word count: 298

34 Introduction: In March 2021, the Governor of Washington declared a youth mental health crisis.
35 State data revealed high rates of youth suicide and inadequate access to services. This mixed-
36 methods study examines youth and adult perspectives on mental health service gaps and
37 opportunities in Seattle by assessing needs, feasibility, and acceptability of interventions to
38 support youth mental health.

39 Methods: We interviewed 15 key informants to identify the contextual, structural, and individual-
40 level factors that increase the risk of poor mental health and deter access to care among young
41 people. We complimented these data with a cross-sectional 25-item survey of 117 participants
42 in King County to assess the feasibility and acceptability of interventions for youth mental
43 health. We conducted a deductive thematic qualitative analysis of the interviews and performed
44 descriptive analyses of the quantitative data, using t-tests and χ^2 tests to summarize and
45 compare participant characteristics stratified by age group.

46 Results: Qualitative informants attributed challenges to youth mental health to social and
47 relational problems. Example interventions included creating environments that increase
48 belonging and implementation of culturally congruent mental health services. Quantitative study
49 participants rated all evidence-based mental health interventions presented as highly
50 acceptable. However, youth preferred interventions promoting social connectedness, peer
51 support, and holistic approaches to care, while non-youth preferred interventions focused on
52 suicide, alcohol, and substance abuse prevention. Both key informants and survey participants
53 identified schools as the highest priority setting for mental health interventions. There were no
54 significant differences among quantitative outcomes.

55 Conclusion: Our findings highlight the need for reducing social isolation and increasing social
56 connectedness to support youth mental health. Schools and digital tools were preferred

57 platforms for implementation. Engaging multiple stakeholders, especially young people, and
58 addressing cultural needs and accessibility of mental health resources are important pre-
59 implementation activities for youth mental health intervention in a US city.

60 Introduction

61 Psychosocial stressors induced by the COVID-19 pandemic have precipitated a mental
62 health crisis for young people in cities around the United States. The U.S. Surgeon General
63 issued an advisory on youth mental health in late 2021, signaling the public health significance
64 of the issue and the need for “the nation’s immediate awareness and action (1).” In Seattle,
65 Washington, hospitals and emergency rooms endured unprecedented rates of admission for
66 psychiatric complaints throughout 2021 (2). The state’s Governor declared a youth mental
67 health crisis in March of 2021, marking the need to prioritize youth well-being (2). However,
68 challenges to youth mental health were growing well before the pandemic.

69 In Washington State, the youth suicide rate stood at 11.4 per 100,000 in 2016; however, by
70 2020, it had risen to 15.7 per 100,000 (3). Currently, approximately 22% of youth aged 15-24 in
71 the state of Washington are estimated to live with a mental disorder, while 12% are estimated to
72 live with a substance use disorder (4). However, access to standard mental health services is
73 limited in many parts of the state, given workforce shortages (5).

74 Seattle’s social context, notable for rising rates of gun violence, racial and ethnic disparities
75 in the criminal justice system and in health outcomes, as well as housing instability and
76 homelessness, significantly shapes the mental health trajectories of young people (6-8). Recent
77 policies and programs seek to support the social and mental wellbeing of youth and families.
78 Best Starts for Kids (BSK), an initiative launched in 2015, invests in early child development,
79 and youth and family initiatives throughout King County (9). Seattle is also known for community
80 activism and sustainable urbanization that supports community well-being and works to reduce
81 social risk factors that can contribute to poor mental health outcomes (10).

82 These efforts matter. While urban environments can pose high risks for poor mental health
83 (11-13), they can also offer mental health-promoting environments, institutions, and services
84 that are accessible, affordable, and culturally appropriate to diverse populations, supporting

85 youth mental health through promotion, prevention and care (13-16). Few cities adopt an
86 intersectoral approach to address the mental health needs of adolescents and young adults,
87 taking advantage of resources within and outside of the health system. In response to these
88 needs, the citiesRISE consortium, a global platform committed to transforming the state of
89 mental health policy and practice in cities around the world (17), enables young people to drive
90 action in their communities by positioning them as expert partners with local stakeholders and
91 by creating a unified youth voice. citiesRISE selected Seattle as a primary site to initiate
92 engagement around youth mental health.

93 In 2019, a citiesRISE landscaping assessment of youth mental health identified
94 opportunities to engage and support young people in Seattle. These opportunities included
95 promoting racial equity, expanding the definition of mental health, and addressing substance
96 abuse, workforce development, and peer support among youth. The same year, we hosted a
97 multistakeholder roundtable discussion at the University of Washington to identify priorities and
98 opportunities for supporting youth mental health in Seattle. The current study aims to ascertain
99 in greater detail the kinds of support across the mental health care continuum recommended by
100 young people and key stakeholders who could assist with implementation. We examine,
101 quantitatively and qualitatively, the feasibility, acceptability of specific mental health
102 interventions for youth in Seattle.

103 **Methods**

104 **Design**

105 We used a mixed methods study design to survey public policy informants, young people,
106 and adults in Seattle/King County a) on the contextual, structural, and individual level factors
107 that place young people at risk for poor mental health and deter access to care, b) to identify
108 opportunities for interventions, and c) to determine feasibility and acceptability of interventions
109 that could support youth mental health.

110 We employed these methods:

- 111 1. Qualitative key-informant interviews with 15 research participants representing youth
112 and public policymakers and
- 113 2. A cross-sectional, quantitative anonymous survey, distributed electronically, of 117
114 young people and youth allies in the Seattle region with the option for open-ended
115 feedback.

116 The research study received approval from the University of Washington Human Subjects
117 protocols STUDY00007988 and STUDY00008904. Qualitative research participants received a
118 study information sheet and provided verbal informed consent (adults) or assent without
119 parental consent (participants under age 18). Verbal consent was documented on audio
120 recordings of adults and with gift card payment of youth informants. Consent for quantitative
121 survey participants was embedded in the online survey; participants under the age of eighteen
122 assented without parental consent. The UW research team had access to data with identifiers
123 for the qualitative sample and the quantitative study participants.

124 **Qualitative study design and sample**

125 We interviewed participants with knowledge of mental health employed in public service
126 (city and county government) and young people (17 years and older) living in King County by
127 recruiting a convenience sample of 15 key informants between September and December 2019.
128 We recruited five adult key-informants in public service during a series of meetings to orient
129 local policy makers and mental health experts to citiesRISE activities and aims. We used snow-
130 ball sampling through youth networks known to the research team members to recruit youth
131 key-informants from two different groups: 1) young people engaged in youth-focused initiatives
132 in Seattle (N= 4) and 2) young people working or studying in the Seattle community (N=6).

133 To ensure consistency, we conducted all interviews in English using a standardized
134 interview guide that posed similar questions to each participant. The topics covered mental

135 health needs among young people, common mental health problems, gaps in mental health
136 services, opportunities for intervention, and opportunities for youth engagement. Youth
137 participants received a \$50 gift card for their participation. Participants completed one interview.
138 All interviews were recorded and transcribed for analysis.

139 **Qualitative data analysis**

140 We conducted a thematic analysis of the interview data driven by our research question:
141 what are the gaps and opportunities for youth mental health interventions in Seattle/King
142 County? After reading the transcripts multiple times, we created case summaries and conducted
143 an in-depth indexing of the interviews, organizing them according to the primary themes of the
144 interview guide. We used this guide to develop a deductive code list. The research team met
145 several times to conduct open coding, review data coded, introduce new codes, and to resolve
146 discrepancies in coding. We created a codebook based on these discussions and coded the
147 remaining interviews. The current paper presents findings on mental health risks and needs,
148 gaps in care, intervention opportunities, and youth engagement.

149 **Quantitative study design and sample**

150 *Sample and Data Collection*

151 We invited young people and adults in the Seattle/King County area to complete brief,
152 structured, online questionnaires from February through March 2020. Questionnaires took
153 approximately fifteen minutes to be complete and were available in English. Participants were
154 recruited through fliers and links that were disseminated through school- and community
155 organization-based mailing lists and through an Instagram promotion targeting young people in
156 the Seattle/King County region aged 17-24. Adults over the age of 24 were also eligible to
157 participate. Informed by output from the roundtable discussion and preliminary qualitative data
158 findings, we designed a twenty-five-item questionnaire. We assessed participants'
159 sociodemographic characteristics (i.e., gender, race/ethnicity, age, education, and employment),

160 priorities and unmet needs related to mental health, barriers to mental health, and preferences
161 for novel services and interventions for mental health (S1 Appendix). An error in the REDCap
162 survey meant that data on age in years are missing for n=65 participants, though all participants
163 self-reported being over the age of 16, and all self-identified as “youth” or “non-youth.”

164 *Measures*

165 Demographic information included participant age (in years), gender identity (woman,
166 man, nonbinary), race or ethnicity (Alaska Native, American Indian/Native American, Asian,
167 Asian – South Asian, Asian – Southeast Asian, Black/African American, Black African,
168 Hispanic/Latinx/Chicanx, Middle Eastern, Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander, White/European
169 American, as well as any racial/ethnic identity not listed), youth identity status (youth or non-
170 youth), birth year, employment status (studying, employed, self-employed/freelance, interning,
171 part-time, unemployed-looking for work, unemployed-not looking for work, homemakers,
172 military, retired, not able to work, or other), education level (no formal education, pre-school to
173 8th grade, some high school with no diploma, high school graduate with a diploma or equivalent
174 (e.g., GED), some college credit with no degree, trade/technical/vocational training, associate
175 degree, Bachelor's degree, Master's degree, Professional degree, Doctorate degree), South
176 Seattle residence (yes or no), and zip code.

177 *Mental Health Priority Issues and Satisfaction.* Relative priority of nine different mental
178 health-related issues (overall mental health, alcohol and substance use, depression, anxiety
179 and stress, schizophrenia and severe mental illness, suicide and self-harm, homelessness,
180 poverty, racism and inequality, and social connectedness) was assessed with a three-level
181 Likert scale, where each issue was rated as not important, somewhat important, or very
182 important. Satisfaction with these same nine mental health-related issues was assessed with a
183 three-level Likert scale, where respondents rated their perception of efforts to address each
184 issue as not satisfied, somewhat satisfied, or very satisfied.

185 *Barriers to Mental Health.* Participants were presented with a list of potential barriers to
186 youth mental health and asked to choose the three most important barriers. The barriers
187 included lack of support from peers, lack of support from parents/guardians and family, lack of
188 future economic opportunity (e.g., jobs), lack of future educational opportunity (e.g., college),
189 lack of after-school activities, lack of support from the school system, lack of access to quality
190 health care, lack of awareness and skills related to mental health, exposure to violence,
191 exposure to racism and social injustice, unstable or unavailable housing (housing insecurity),
192 and other barriers not listed above as identified by participants.

193 *Mental Health Intervention Platforms.* Preferences for mental health intervention platforms
194 and approaches to improve youth mental health were assessed by asking respondents to select
195 two ideal platforms and two priority services. The following mental health intervention platforms
196 were presented: schools, community centers, churches, online platforms, workplaces, clinics
197 and other health care settings, in public/on the street, or other places not listed above as
198 identified by participants. Participants selected from the following priority services: positive
199 youth-led mental health messaging developed by youth for youth, training in resilience and self-
200 care, training in awareness and peer support, provision of safe spaces, access to counseling
201 and treatment aligned with the values and traditions of the community, housing and social
202 services, employment opportunities and career counseling, or other services, programs, or
203 activities not listed above as identified by participants.

204 *Acceptability of Intervention Measure (AIM).* Four specific evidence-based interventions or
205 services were described in detail, and acceptability of each intervention or service was
206 assessed using the 4-item Acceptability of Intervention Measure (AIM) (18). These interventions
207 included the Friendship Bench psychosocial support model, the provision of safe spaces, peer
208 navigation and support services, and arts-based mental health promotion and suicide
209 prevention in schools. Items assess level of approval (e.g., "Friendship Bench would meet my
210 approval"), appeal (e.g., "Friendship Bench would be appealing to me"), liking (e.g., "I would like

211 Friendship Bench"), and willingness to welcome (e.g., "I would welcome Friendship Bench") the
212 interventions. Participants rated their level of agreement or disagreement with each statement
213 using a 5-point Likert scale, ranging from "completely disagree" to "completely agree." The
214 scale provides a numerical rating that reflects the participant's perception of the intervention's
215 acceptability.

216 **Quantitative Data Analysis**

217 Descriptive analyses, including t tests and χ^2 tests, were conducted to summarize and
218 compare participant characteristics stratified by age group (i.e., self-reported youth vs non-
219 youth). Proportions were calculated for categorical responses. AIM summary scores were
220 created by averaging respective item responses and compared across age strata using t tests.
221 In addition to the age-related data missingness identified above, there was a moderate amount
222 of missingness due to incomplete survey responses by participants. Given that only descriptive
223 statistical approaches were used, complete case analysis was deemed appropriate. All
224 analyses were performed in Stata and RStudio 2022.07.2 (19, 20).

225 **Results**

226 **Context**

227 Seattle, the 22nd largest city in the United States, is notable for rapid population growth
228 over the past decade, largely attributed to an expanding workforce required by technology
229 companies in the region. These factors yielded an increasing median household income (21),
230 gentrification, and a growing epidemic of homelessness. The urban landscape continues to shift
231 as developers design higher density communities and as lower income residents move
232 southward and northward to escape the rising cost of living. In the context of these rapid social
233 changes, concerns about youth mental health in the region have intensified in recent years.

234 The data collection for the current study was underway when the University of
235 Washington (UW) Global Mental Health Program, citiesRISE, and the UW Population Health
236 Initiative hosted a roundtable discussion of factors in the city that affect adolescent mental
237 health and wellbeing. The participants were 38 invitees from UW (students, faculty, staff), local
238 non-governmental organizations, and city government. They identified action steps for youth
239 mental health intervention (**Table 1**), some of which could inform the implementation of
240 individual level interventions.

Interpersonal/Family	Community/Organizational/Policy	Environment and Society
<p><u>YOUTH LEADERSHIP AND PEER SUPPORT</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure process justice in designing any interventions (i.e., youth leadership, community based designs) • Peer coaching for mental health, and potentially reimburse this coaching • Peer groups for parents and teens (“PEPS” for teens)/peer and near peer mentoring • Empowering youth • Youth breakfasts for all: encouraging convening, connection, sustenance, community • Empower teens: ask teens what safe/inclusive spaces look like • Subsidized positions for youth in government agencies and in media • Youth participatory budgeting 	<p><u>INVESTMENT IN SERVICES and INCENTIVES</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase wages for front-line workers • Reimburse clinicians for Evidence Based Practices at higher rates • Increase wraparound services • Incorporate Evidence Based Practices into licensure requirements • Increase investment in human welfare • Increase services for mental health promotion and mental health care provision • Provide a “golden credit card” to give access to non-clinical holistic care and treatment for mental health conditions • Establish flexible, 24 hour, full-time support systems • Give youth autonomy to choose own services • Give youth ability to access resources for their entire family • Provide universal 100% mental health coverage for adolescents • Build out mental health resources in spaces where people spend time <p><u>SCHOOLS AND EDUCATION</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Launch a campaign for mental health • Educate caregivers and the public about mental health • Teach emotional literacy: start early, and maintain consistent social-emotional learning from K-12 and university • Create demand for socioemotional learning among parents • Teach history, health, change coursework, include inclusive materials/topics • Establish restorative justice practices in all systems • Use Individualized Education Program (IEP)/504s/school accommodations • Learn from other cultures for successful models • Train first responders to manage mental health crises vs causing more trauma, learn de-escalation <p><u>TECHNOLOGY</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Create safe social networking spaces 	<p><u>BUILT AND NATURAL ENVIRONMENT</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Create systems and spaces of belonging • In-person microcommunities • Establish safe spaces for teens to “hang out”/environments to connect • Establish safe spaces for consumers of mental health services • Cluster youth spaces at transit hubs • Make transit free of cost

243 Most discussion groups raised the following threats to youth mental health in Seattle: lack of
244 connectedness and community spaces, discrimination and bias, cost of living pressures, and
245 lack of integrated services around mental health. Ideas for actions that could improve youth
246 mental health in Seattle were further discussed in several groups. Youth leadership was
247 considered to be central in devising any actions around adolescent mental health. Participants
248 viewed peer support and mentoring as impactful ways to support youth mental health. Likewise,
249 the groups identified families as having great potential to support youth, while recognizing that
250 parents require their own support systems and resources in order to be advocates for youth.
251 Additionally, group members noted that youth need environments where their emotional
252 development is viewed as important for success. Our qualitative interviews explored some of
253 these themes in depth.

254 **Qualitative interviews**

255 We conducted qualitative interviews with 15 key informants: 5 public service informants
256 and 10 young people or youth allies. Among the public service informants, all served in city or
257 county government roles. Youth participants ranged in age from 17 - 31, with 7 participants
258 under the age of 25. The group included 3 men and 7 women and represented young people
259 with multiple cultural identities.

260 **Perceived risks for poor mental health among youth in Seattle**

261 Public service participants identified homelessness, domestic violence, access to
262 weapons, risky home environments, substance abuse, harm by the criminal justice system,
263 suicide, and isolation or lack of connectedness as drivers and consequences of poor mental
264 health among youth in Seattle and King County. Youth participants and allies identified
265 depression and anxiety, gentrification, school competition, intergenerational challenges,
266 affordable housing, and exposure to adverse childhood events among the areas influencing

267 youth mental health. All participants highlighted the challenges of isolation and connectedness
268 as important factors.

269 ***Fighting hard to stay connected***

270 Public service and youth/ally participants identified lack of connectedness as the most
271 commonly reported risk factor for poor mental health among young people. A participant noted
272 that while loneliness is often recognized as a health problem for older adults, young people also
273 experience the “significant problem of isolation.” Gentrification was proposed as one
274 explanation. Several informants explained that the rapid pace of gentrification led to the
275 displacement of youth or their peers from communities where they had longstanding social
276 connections. According to one participant, “The kids you start off with in grade school are not
277 going to be the same kids that you end up with in high school,” as had been typical in the past.
278 “Part of that has to do with the affordability issue of being able to live in the city over the long
279 term,” another participant described. Participants highlighted the devastating impact of
280 gentrification on communities—people were “really fighting so hard to...stay connected to the
281 schools and communities they feel they have the most connection with.” As a result of this
282 displacement, families were often scattered across the southern part of the county, disrupting
283 informal support systems and exacerbating physical and emotional isolation.

284 Young people also attributed social isolation and lack of connectedness to the “Seattle
285 freeze,” a cultural trait marked by social reserve and a lack of engagement with others. Youth
286 participants from other regions of the country recounted the difficulty of making new friends and
287 bewilderment when their usual gestures of friendliness were not returned. One participant
288 confessed, “I didn’t understand why people were so distant...I remember I would like to smile at
289 people on the street and they would look confused...that kind of isolation is a detriment to
290 mental health and for youth for sure.”

291 Another youth participant linked isolation with self-blame, which reinforced young
292 people’s social withdrawal. “Folks are like, I’m the only person who’s struggling with this
293 and...I’m just doing it by myself...no one would...ever understand what I’m struggling with, you
294 know.” Public service participants, who alluded to recent increases in suicides among youth in
295 Seattle, linked risk with social isolation.

296 ***Mental health is taboo***

297 Given the taboo surrounding mental health and mental illness, young people were often
298 reluctant to discuss their symptoms, which further exacerbated their feelings of isolation. A
299 participant noted, “There weren’t a lot of people who are open to speaking about mental health,
300 and I think that’s also another barrier that leads people to closing everything in, not being able to
301 speak about it and realizing...like, there’s something wrong with me, but I don’t know what it is.”
302 Intergenerational differences in cultural understanding of mental health problems could elicit
303 similar feelings of isolation and increased stress. In some cases, parents who had immigrated to
304 Seattle and sought to establish a new life tended to prioritize “survival mode” over mental
305 health, leading to a perception that mental health concerns were less important and not to be
306 raised as a problem. Participants recognized consequences of this dismissal. A student
307 commented, “If at home you can’t express your emotions and at school you need to study,
308 study, work and work...then your emotions never come out...and they’re building, they’re
309 building, they’re building, and it turns into depression...”

310 **Gaps in responses to mental health needs**

311 ***No place to go***

312 “Not having a place to go” and “not reaching out” complicated young people’s ability to
313 access care, but the sense that services were siloed and that few options existed outside of
314 highly structured inpatient environments was viewed as problematic by some respondents.
315 “There is nothing really in between--a supportive program where they can, you know, relapse. If

316 you don't succeed, you're failing." A public service participant noted that the mental health
317 system's emphasis on numbers of beds and residential treatment conflicted with the aim to
318 divert youth from more restrictive environments. "We're striving to find opportunities to divert
319 youth from those places and to be able to seek help in communities." When youth accessed
320 outpatient formal mental health services, the challenges of payment and confidentiality within
321 the family arose. Some described the difficulty of not telling parents about seeking care, yet
322 needing access to parental insurance or other financial support. Some noted that few responses
323 outside of the health system existed and that youth would benefit from more holistic approaches
324 that "go beyond the individual" and that were not part of formal healthcare services.

325 Outside of formal services, several participants noted a lack of designated spaces for
326 young people to receive formal and informal support, to connect with each other, and to
327 experience community. A public service participant described the need for "a space where youth
328 can go...and connect with another youth who has perhaps gone through the system, is familiar
329 with the system and to be able to join with them..." A young participant's perspective supported
330 this view.

331 "Something you could benefit a lot from is just hav[ing] a safe place to to—having a safe
332 place...somebody that they can actually like, confide in and ...like, say whatever they need to,
333 just having a ...safe areas where they can ...go and not be afraid of the place being torn down or
334 being removed to put up something like condos."
335

336 A similar idea was expressed by a participant who acknowledged the need for "a space to
337 unload" amidst a community of people who "like, got your back," whereas another young person
338 missed the central gathering places for youth that an urban downtown could offer. Lack of easy
339 transport to a gathering place for youth in the central city challenged youth people, and the
340 absence of a "constant community," as the same participant described, "is really one of the
341 .biggest detriments to...youth mental health that I've seen or experienced just because I think
342 it's so important to ...make those kinds of connections, and it really takes a lot of ...initiative for
343 kids in Seattle to do that."

344 ***No one really knows how to help themselves***

345 Youth participants reiterated that most young people lacked basic information about
346 what to do if they experienced a problem with their mental health. School counseling services, in
347 high schools and colleges, were thought to be insufficient for young people with significant
348 needs and were often overwhelmed by demand. Several youth participants expressed the need
349 for increased outreach and information about mental health care. One youth noted that school
350 environments tend to be more reactive rather than proactive when communicating about mental
351 health resources. “There isn’t very active promotion anywhere about mental health
352 resources...word of mouth, I think is actually the biggest way of hearing about these
353 resources...but like active encouragement and using them is not really present.”

354 ***Cultural barriers***

355 Youth participants acknowledged the influence of cultural expectations on seeking help
356 for mental health problems. One participant explained the implications of visibility when
357 managing a mental health problem: “It’s very important that people know that if someone is
358 dealing with the mental health issue, they’re not only dealing with their mental health, but they’re
359 dealing with what people are going to say about them. They’re dealing with what their parents
360 are going to think about them, what their grandparents are going to think about them.”

361 Young people believed that social stigma attached to mental illness was prevalent across
362 most communities, but collectivist communities were also more likely to pull together to support
363 each other. In some settings, such as schools, being associated with mental health groups or
364 events could lead to stigmatization, causing young people to avoid them. One participant
365 described “cultural stigma of mental health” as a deterrent to seeking care, particularly when
366 mental health problems were not taken seriously. Relatedly, young people requested greater
367 availability of culturally sensitive mental health services. They reported a dearth of non-white
368 therapists and a missing “cultural connection” with therapists available to them. This included a

369 need for providers who understood differing generational perspectives around mental illness as
370 well as generational differences in exposure to mental health threats. A youth participant noted
371 that young people compared their lives to their immigrant parents' experiences and questioned,
372 "...like, what right do I have to be sad about this?" A public service participant identified the lack
373 of culturally appropriate community-based youth mental health support as a gap area,
374 particularly as alternatives to more restrictive forms of care.

375 **You need to hear from the kids: youth leadership and youth** 376 **participation**

377 Youth/ally participants in our study were actively involved in promoting or leading
378 projects, initiatives, or organizations interested in youth mental health. As such, they
379 emphasized the importance of youth involvement in the development and promotion of youth
380 mental health interventions or activities. For some community organizations, the value of youth
381 participation was built into the structure, with one participant describing an organization where
382 youth constituted 50% of the representatives on the board of directors. Others described youth-
383 led exercises and projects where youth creativity, energy, humor, and words defined the
384 intervention. They emphasized the importance of young people having the space and mandate
385 to invent ways to relate to each other, and several observed "brilliant" and "poignant" activities
386 resulting from these efforts. One participant, mused, "And when people see youth empowered in
387 that kind of way, I think it really changes their perspective on their expectations of what these
388 youth can do...in their life as well."

389 Another participant described the level of youth leadership and involvement required to
390 design shared spaces for youth mental health and a desire to see "without tokenizing...kids who
391 have struggled with mental health care in Seattle in on the conversation surrounding mental
392 health...they should be the ones working on the initiative...organizing employment and
393 organizing what the [space] should look like..." Youth being integrally involved in the

394 organization of the space was particularly significant because their pride in the project, i.e., their
395 sense of ownership, would enable them to reach out to more young people, inviting them to join
396 as organizers or co-creators of a shared space. Another participant emphasized the importance
397 of designing interventions for specific communities, explaining that “mental health isn’t cookie
398 cutter,” and ensuring a sense of belonging was a necessary part of design. This participant
399 described the process of piloting a program, collecting feedback, and tailoring the program to
400 meet the needs of participants.

401 Even with youth-led mental health activities, intentional outreach and a credible initiative
402 were required for youth participation. Social media and word of mouth were identified as
403 powerful and effective means for young people to inform others about mental health resources
404 or programs. One participant discussed the challenge of credibility when disseminating
405 information and encouraging participation in mental health activities, noting that the support of
406 adult experts could lend credibility to young people. Partnering with people with subject matter
407 expertise could safeguard against youths’ worries that they were leading conversations without
408 the required knowledge.

409 On the other hand, young people also experienced their perceived lack of expertise by
410 adults as a form of discrimination. Some participants spoke of youth input not being respected
411 or their qualifications to talk about mental health being questioned. These beliefs played out in
412 interactions in public spaces. “We would be at the table, but we would never get a chance to
413 speak. We would never really get a chance to share our input. We’re kind of there to just be like
414 a little model-- to show off like, ‘look we have kids on our side.’” Others questioned more
415 generally, “Do people actually want to hear our voice? Older people than us? Actually, want to
416 hear our voice? Then do they actually act upon them?”

417 **Interventions**

418 Challenges to youth mental health were most frequently attributed to social and relational
419 problems, and the suggested interventions corresponded to these perceived causes. These
420 ranged from creating positive and accepting environments that help “people feel wanted,
421 involved, engaged, and valued” to implementation of specific services. Services that addressed
422 family reconciliation after encounters with the criminal legal system or that worked to dismantle
423 the “school-to-prison pipeline” were relevant and were viewed as part of efforts to address the
424 harms of structural racism. Alternatives to therapy, like peer support, were also noted, as were
425 more general approaches to stabilizing and supporting families.

426 Community institutions, such as schools, despite their challenges, were seen as important
427 places to promote mental health. Youth leaders in the community actively engaged with schools
428 by conducting workshops, mobilizing peers, and educating students, teachers, counselors, and
429 educational personnel. They also explained how other community programs that engage young
430 people in activities such as sports, theater, or shared hobbies could be used to explicitly
431 introduce mental health themes or create communities that foster connection and support. For
432 these programs to succeed, it was essential for young people to be centrally involved in their
433 development and implementation, allowing them to contribute creatively. One participant
434 remarked on witnessing young people create what they needed for mental health, “I think young
435 people are so smart about making this stuff ...joyful...Really, it was the most brilliant thing I’ve
436 ever seen.” Youth participants articulated the nuance required for success: young people should
437 not be tokenized in partnerships with experts or other adults, and they should also have access
438 to people with knowledge and expertise they lack.

439 **Quantitative survey**

440 One-hundred and seventeen participants completed the quantitative survey of intervention
441 acceptability and feasibility (**Table 2**). Ninety-four (80%) identified as youth (e.g., under 35
442 years). Most (87, 74%) were women. Participants were broadly representative of the

443 Seattle/King County population in terms of race: 57 (49%) were white, 18 (15%) were Asian, 11
 444 (9%) were Southeast Asian, and 7 (6%) were Black American. Fifty (43%) were employed, and
 445 65 (56%) were currently studying.

446 **S2 Table: Questionnaire participant characteristics stratified by youth vs. non-youth**
 447 **(n=117)**

	Missing	Overall	Non-Youth	Youth	p
n		117	12	94	
Woman (%)	0	87 (74.4)	9 (75.0)	78 (83.0)	0.78
Non-Binary (%)	0	9 (7.7)	1 (8.3)	8 (8.5)	1
Age	65				
17-19 (%)		14 (26.9)	0 (0.0)	13 (31.0)	
20-24 (%)		29 (55.8)	5 (55.6)	24 (57.1)	
25-34 (%)		6 (11.5)	1 (11.1)	5 (11.9)	
45-54 (%)		1 (1.9)	1 (11.1)	0 (0.0)	
55-64 (%)		2 (3.8)	2 (22.2)	0 (0.0)	
Race/Ethnicity					
AI/AN (%)	0	1 (0.9)	0 (0.0)	1 (1.1)	1
Asian (%)	0	18 (15.4)	1 (8.3)	16 (17.0)	0.723
South Asian (%)	0	5 (4.3)	1 (8.3)	4 (4.3)	1
South-East Asian (%)	0	11 (9.4)	0 (0.0)	11 (11.7)	0.454
Black American (%)	0	7 (6.0)	2 (16.7)	5 (5.3)	0.382
Black African (%)	0	2 (1.7)	1 (8.3)	1 (1.1)	0.538
Latinx (%)	0	3 (2.6)	1 (8.3)	2 (2.1)	0.767
Middle Eastern (%)	0	5 (4.3)	0 (0.0)	5 (5.3)	0.924
Hawaiian (%)	0	2 (1.7)	0 (0.0)	2 (2.1)	1
Pacific Islander (%)	0	5 (4.3)	1 (8.3)	4 (4.3)	1
White (%)	0	57 (48.7)	5 (41.7)	52 (55.3)	0.558
Employed (%)	0	50 (42.7)	8 (66.7)	42 (44.7)	0.259
Studying (%)	0	65 (55.6)	5 (41.7)	59 (62.8)	0.274
Living in South Seattle (%)	0	21 (17.9)	6 (50.0)	15 (16.0)	0.016

448 *The table displays the demographic characteristics of the questionnaire participants, including their sex,*
 449 *age, race/ethnicity, employment status, education status, and residence status (i.e., living in south*
 450 *Seattle). Age data were missing for 65 participants who completed a REDCap version of the survey. T-*
 451 *tests and χ^2 tests were used to compare participant characteristics by age designation.*

452 **Figure 1** summarizes participant priorities regarding mental health, as well as their
 453 satisfaction with efforts to address those priorities. Almost all (97, 97%) endorsed that the
 454 overall mental health of young people in their community was ‘very important’. Similarly, almost
 455 all (94, 93%) endorsed the topic of depression as an important priority for young people in their
 456 community. There were notable differences between the perspectives of youth and non-youth
 457 participants. Youth participants placed a greater emphasis on the significance of social

458 connectedness in their communities, whereas non-youth participants noted alcohol/substance
459 use and suicide as problems in their communities. The satisfaction with efforts to address these
460 issues was low across the board. However, youth participants were marginally more content
461 with the efforts compared to non-youth participants. This distinction was most apparent
462 concerning the promotion of social connectedness.

463 Young participants identified the lack of mental health awareness (48%), family support
464 (46%), healthcare access (42%), and school support (39%) as the top barriers to positive
465 mental health in their communities. On the other hand, non-youth participants identified the lack
466 of economic opportunity (50%), mental health awareness, and the prevalence of violence (both
467 42%), as well as healthcare access, educational opportunity, and racism/discrimination (all
468 33%) as the top barriers.

469 Both youth and non-youth participants ranked schools as the highest priority location for
470 mental health interventions (70%). Youth participants also mentioned online platforms (45%),
471 community centers (22%), and health services (19%) as priority settings. Non-youth participants
472 highlighted community centers (50%), online platforms (42%), as well as work and health
473 services (both 8%) as priority settings. Churches/places of worship and public spaces were not
474 commonly suggested as appropriate intervention platforms.

475 Both youth and non-youth participants ranked counselling and treatment as the highest
476 priority service for young people (45%). Youth participants also identified other priority
477 interventions such as resilience training (33%), positive messaging (32%), safe spaces (25%),
478 awareness training (23%), housing and social services (21%), and employment (20%). In
479 contrast, non-youth noted other priority interventions including positive messaging and
480 housing/social services (both 33%).

481 Participants rated all four evidence-based interventions as highly acceptable (**Table 3**).
482 Youth participants had a narrow preference for school-based mental health promotion, while

483 non-youth participants rated both Friendship Bench and peer support services highly. There
484 were no statistically significant differences in intervention acceptability between the two groups.

485 **S3 Table: Intervention acceptability stratified by youth vs. non-youth (n=117)**

Youth Mental Health Interventions	Missing	Mean (SD)		p
		Non-Youth	Youth	
Friendship Bench	26	4.18 (0.72)	4.14 (0.62)	0.843
Gathering/Safe Spaces	26	3.64 (1.05)	3.98 (0.81)	0.201
Peer Navigation	26	4.25 (0.62)	4.10 (0.78)	0.547
Arts School-based Mental Health Promotion and Suicide Prevention	26	4.09 (0.78)	4.43 (0.74)	0.159

486 *Means, standard deviations (SDs), and t-test comparison p-values are reported for participant acceptability of*
487 *intervention measure (AIM) scores for each mental health intervention across self-reported youth strata (range: 1-*
488 *5).*

489 **Open-ended feedback**

491 Participants had the option to provide additional context to their positive or negative
492 reactions, as well as options to adapt the interventions in the survey (**Table 4**). Suggested
493 adaptations included adding a training component on social justice for individuals delivering
494 psychological interventions (e.g., the Friendship bench); ensuring that spaces reserved for
495 youth to gather were safe places for Black people as well as people of color; and encouraging
496 the recruitment of people with lived experiences of adversities to participate in peer support
497 programs.

S4 Table: Open text comments on interventions described in the cross-sectional quantitative survey of youths and adults

Approve	Against	Adapt
<p><i>Friendship bench</i></p> <p>“Great model that would offer a great space for youth to learn problem solving skills from a peer”</p> <p>“When I was a teenager I really struggled with my own ability to solve problems. I was very reliant on adult figures in my life to make decisions, which made the transition to adulthood way harder. A program like Friendship Bench really would’ve helped me learn how to deal with stressful situations in my daily life.”</p>	<p><i>Friendship bench</i></p> <p>“A lot of people know they have a problem, but don’t want to bother someone else about it. This would go widely unused because everyone would think they’re being a bother.”</p>	<p><i>Friendship bench</i></p> <p>“It would be important for folks to still have training around social justice and not just mental health or empowerment because often the two areas intersect.”</p>
<p><i>Gathering Spaces</i></p> <p>“One of the best things that my university has offered me is a safe space and community of students like me with similar backgrounds but all diverse in race, age, ethnicity, gender and sexuality who all have experiences or are currently dealing with mental health issues. We all provide each other advice, tell our stories and experiences and we don’t feel alone in what we’re going through. It’s especially empowering when you have safe gathering space for POCs to share that elevated level of mental health issues from being a minority and minoritized background.”</p>	<p><i>Gathering Spaces</i></p> <p>“I’m worried they’d be abused – in my high school we tried this and right-wing kids started coming into meetings and calling other people snowflakes, SJWs, cucks, derogatory stuff like that.</p> <p>“I personally would dislike this because it puts you in a very vulnerable space and it’s hard to share sensitive topics like this to others. Others really thrive from these situations and are helped by it so I don’t see it as a bad thing. However, it is a nice way to show that no one is alone in this and that they’re others who may have some insight on how to help”</p>	<p><i>Gathering Spaces</i></p> <p>“How would someone ensure that these are safe spaces for POC and black people? More often than not, when universities create diversity centers, it is overtaken by those who are not people of color and not black. Gathering spaces are a good idea, but I think there needs to be more to the idea than just a gathering space.”</p> <p>“The only thing that you’d need to be wary of with this is confidentiality within the group and ensuring that all members remain respectful (maybe have a brief training session at the beginning). Other than that, I think this would be a wonderful way to help those going through hard times.”</p>
<p><i>Peer support</i></p>	<p><i>Peer support</i></p>	<p><i>Peer support</i></p>

<p>“I think that peer support programs would benefit students, but what’s more important is giving access of peer support to students who would benefit from it the most.”</p> <p>“I absolutely love this program. This would allow resources that are the most important (for those who are oftentimes overlooked on a daily basis) to be accessed. I 100% support this and hope that this is/will be successful!”</p>	<p>“To me this may seem a little strange and personally wouldn’t use it but I could see it being great to help people learn more about their situation and maybe how to improve it. The idea that it’s a peer is great too because it seems less condescending than if it was some other person who was just lecturing you.”</p>	<p>“It would be especially helpful if at least some peer mentors had gone through the foster system, or dealt with legal issues to better discuss topics and relate. It’d be great to have both older (more professional advice like legal) and fellow youth who’ve settled a bit more (to be more relatable) to balance out the kinds of experiences from the program...”</p>
<p><i>School based mental health</i></p> <p>“Yes, yes, YES. It should be seen as a necessity to care for your own mental health, and implementing activities like this and talking about it like its health care (because it is) is so helpful in understanding the importance of mental health care - and coming to the realization that caring for your mental health is and should be normal - just as important as exercise, eating, and sleep.”</p> <p>“I also love this idea. UW has something similar with the Peer Health Educators program and I can see this going well. Sometimes students need to release endorphins and engage in social bonding to feel that support system; of course, everyone is different, but this will cater to those who yearn for that community and need it.”</p>	<p><i>School based mental health</i></p> <p>“We did suicide prevention training at my school and people meme-d it and brushed it off”</p> <p>“Something like this is pretty risky because you have to keep in mind it could be triggering to some people who aren’t open about their mental illness, especially in a school setting.”</p>	<p><i>School based mental health</i></p> <p>“ADD MEDITATION TO THAT LIST. It doesn't just have to be art. Also, this should be implemented in our disciplinary system.”</p> <p>“The art would help some people find a way to relieve stress and anxiety but specifically the suicide prevention training should already be in the school system now. Teaching people how to pay attention and understand how some people may cope or change because of their mental health is so important. I feel that it could save many lives by being put in place. At the same time people will need to be careful because sometimes people don’t want to be smothered in times like these and sometimes when people see someone that needs help, they can overcompensate and push people farther than feeling better.”</p>

499 This table provides a summary of three reaction categories (i.e., Approve, Against, Adapt) in response to the interventions described in the quantitative survey.
500 These interventions include the Friendship Bench psychosocial support model, the provision of safe spaces, peer navigation and support services, and arts-based
501 mental health promotion and suicide prevention in schools. The bolded text highlights which segment of the quote align with each reaction category.

502 **Discussion**

503 This study identified gaps in youth mental health services and opportunities for intervention
504 and assessed the feasibility and acceptability of interventions that could support youth mental
505 health in Seattle. Our qualitative key informants--young people/youth allies and public servants--
506 emphasized unmet needs to reduce social isolation and lack of connectedness as key
507 contributors to poor mental health among youth in Seattle. Quantitative survey data confirmed
508 the need for greater access to mental health services and revealed differences in perceived
509 acceptability of specific interventions between youth and non-youth participants. While both
510 groups viewed evidence-based mental health interventions as highly acceptable, youth
511 preferred interventions promoting social connectedness, peer support, and holistic approaches
512 to care, while non-youth were more concerned with interventions focused on suicide, alcohol
513 and substance abuse prevention. Youth participants also emphasized the significance of their
514 active involvement in the development and implementation of mental health interventions, as it
515 would improve relevance of the interventions to their needs. Given the regionally specific
516 context of our study, generalizability to other populations may be limited. Nonetheless, our
517 findings shed light on the concerns voiced by young individuals in Seattle, which align with
518 those expressed by young people in other studies involving peer support, school-based
519 interventions, and digital mental health interventions as well as the need for safe spaces for
520 building connections in urban environments.

521 **Preferred Platform: Schools**

522 Consistent with previous studies (Parikh et al. 2019; Arora and Algios 2019), participants in
523 both the quantitative and qualitative studies identified schools as a priority setting for mental
524 health interventions. School-based mental health programming has been effective in improving
525 social skills, overall well-being, and reducing depressive and anxiety symptoms in some
526 samples (22-25). Schools offer a built-in social community for young people and an opportunity

527 to promote mental health awareness and provide counseling services. Connectedness to school
528 is significantly associated with positive outcomes, including decreased risk of depressive and
529 anxiety symptoms among young people (26). However, stigma is perceived as a significant
530 barrier to accessing school-based mental health services, which was also emphasized by youth
531 in our qualitative study. Nevertheless, schools provide a platform to involve students, teachers,
532 school administrators, family and community members as potential stakeholders in the
533 intervention design, as well as stigma reduction. In fact, “whole school” approaches that aim to
534 integrate skill development into daily interactions and practices through collaborative efforts
535 including all staff, teachers, families, and children have been found to improve the school
536 ecosystem related to mental health (27-29).

537 **Preferred Platform: Digital**

538 Young people are avid users of digital platforms in most parts of the world. In recent years,
539 digital mental health interventions have become increasingly popular for early identification and
540 treatment of mental health conditions given their utility for expanded access and youth-friendly
541 nature. (30, 31). Our research found that young people in Seattle expressed a strong preference
542 for online mental health platforms, which qualitative respondents emphasized as an important
543 tool for engaging with and delivering mental health education, awareness, and potentially
544 interventions. However, previous studies on youth preferences for online mental health
545 platforms have yielded conflicting results, suggesting that different young people may have
546 different needs and preferences (32). Some studies have found that young people prefer online
547 mental health services due to the anonymity, privacy, and confidentiality they offer, as well as
548 the reduced stigma associated with seeking care online (33-36). Other studies have found that
549 young people prefer face-to-face services, or may not seek care at all (37).

550 **Preferred Mental Health Intervention: Psychological**

551 **Interventions**

552 Our quantitative analysis revealed that psychological interventions were the most preferred
553 mental health interventions among young people. Youth participants rated the Friendship Bench
554 problem-solving therapy intervention, which is currently being tested and implemented with
555 adolescents in southern Africa (38, 39), as highly acceptable. Our key informants also stressed
556 the need for improved access to standard mental health services that are culturally appropriate.
557 Consistent with our findings, other studies have shown positive views of therapy among young
558 people (40). While youth may be uncertain about their preferences for specific therapeutic
559 approaches, they expressed a strong preference for meeting with a therapist alone, without
560 parental involvement (41).

561 **Safe Space**

562 Youth participants in our study emphasized the need for designated physical community
563 gathering spaces and incentives such as free transit to increase access to safe public spaces.
564 This aligns with prior research that highlights the effectiveness of safe and inclusive spaces in
565 promoting youth mental health, social connections, and a sense of belonging. Establishing safe
566 spaces in urban areas, such as downtown Seattle, could serve as a safe haven for many young
567 people, promoting adolescent development, socialization, and mental health (42), as well as
568 fostering social connectedness (43, 44).

569 **Peer-to-Peer Support**

570 The availability of support from peers who share similar experiences was a key component
571 of safe spaces in urban areas, as evidenced by the desire expressed by youth in our qualitative
572 study for peer coaching, mentoring, and support. Peer-to-peer support can be integrated across
573 various platforms, including schools, online venues, and safe spaces, and has the potential to

574 address the barrier of stigma related to mental health identified in our study (45). While peer
575 coaching for mental health has been studied in adults with mental illness, (46), fewer studies
576 have focused on youth. However, online peer-to-peer support platforms for youth have been
577 studied more extensively (47-51), and have shown positive mental health outcomes, including
578 increased feelings of connectedness and reduced feelings of isolation. School-based peer-led
579 mental health interventions have also been shown to be effective (52). Further research on peer
580 coaching, mentoring, and support for youth mental health is necessary to determine its potential
581 benefits for youth seeking mental health care and information.

582 **Upstream Mental Health Interventions**

583 Improvement in youth mental health and well-being in Seattle will also require upstream
584 interventions that promote structural and intersectoral responses and engage multiple
585 stakeholders. Action steps from our roundtable discussion (**Table 1**) primarily focused on
586 structural and upstream interventions, which merit further attention in Seattle, including how to
587 implement such interventions and their feasibility. For instance, social and criminal justice
588 actions such as reducing youth incarceration could change the trajectory of life for youth at risk
589 for justice involvement and improve mental health in the long-term. A recent study on integrated
590 youth services as an emerging model of care pointed to the need for flexible models of service
591 delivery (53). Such interventions cannot solely rely on the feedback and input of mental health
592 professionals, advocates, and policymakers, but also equally benefit from engaging young
593 people. Consistent with our study, the researchers suggested co-designing interventions with
594 the youth in the target population (53). The citiesRISE platform could play an instrumental role
595 connecting young people and key stakeholders, establishing a systematic way to engage youth
596 in shaping implementation of interventions in Seattle (17).

597

598 **Youth Engagement in Intervention Design**

599 Young people in our study expressed a desire to be actively involved in the design,
600 development, and implementation of mental health interventions, feeling excluded from the
601 decision-making process. Researchers and mental health experts recognize the importance of
602 engaging young people in discussions about their mental health and well-being as essential for
603 their social and emotional development (54). A recent study found that young people aspire to
604 be actively involved in their mental health initiatives but lack mental health literacy and
605 awareness to participate fully (55). Policymakers and youth service providers can support
606 meaningful participation by providing mental health literacy training and opportunities for raising
607 awareness in schools and community settings. Personalizing interventions could significantly
608 improve the nature of mental health care and the benefits provided to young people and families
609 (56). Enabling young people as co-designers and incorporating their perspectives into mental
610 health interventions could increase uptake by youth and improve mental health outcomes (56).
611 Research and policy approaches can integrate youth perspectives using methods such as user-
612 centered design (57, 58), community-based participatory research (59) and youth integration
613 into policy settings (60). A recent Australian study on youth collaborative engagement in mental
614 health intervention design highlighted the importance of building trusting relationships with key
615 stakeholders and service providers to facilitate rapid policy change (61). Embracing youth-
616 designed mental health interventions fosters shared participation and empowers young people
617 to drive solutions that address their mental health needs.

618 **Limitations**

619 There are several limitations to our study. First, our quantitative sample size was relatively
620 small, with a total of 117 participants. As such, our findings may not be representative of
621 broader views on youth mental health intervention feasibility and acceptability across Seattle.
622 Participants in our quantitative study were recruited through mental health networks and digital

623 platforms and were likely to have a particular interest in mental health, raising concerns of
624 selection bias. Second, our quantitative assessment centered on a limited number of evidence-
625 based interventions (EBIs) and did not include social and structural interventions that youth also
626 valued. Despite the limitations, our quantitative sample captured the racial and ethnic diversity
627 of Seattle, possibly enhancing the diversity of perspectives. Our mixed method approach and
628 triangulation of data and contextual information (e.g., roundtable discussion) served as the
629 primary efforts to address bias. The multistakeholder participants in this study displayed
630 considerable agreement across findings that reinforced intervention directions for youth at
631 greater risk of mental health disparities in an urban setting.

632 **Conclusion**

633 This study highlights the need for interventions that support youth mental health in Seattle,
634 particularly those that reduce social isolation and increase social connectedness. These
635 problems have intensified during the years of the pandemic, and cities play a role in meeting
636 these mental health needs. Schools and digital platforms were identified as preferred platforms
637 for interventions, while psychological interventions and peer-to-peer support were the preferred
638 mental health interventions. Engaging multiple sectors in the implementation of mental health
639 interventions (e.g., education and health) and social interventions that can support mental
640 health is a starting point.

641 Equally important, involving young people in the design and implementation of these
642 interventions can improve their acceptability and uptake. Policymakers and mental health
643 service providers should prioritize mental health literacy training and awareness-raising
644 opportunities to support meaningful youth participation in mental health initiatives. Embracing
645 youth-designed mental health interventions fosters shared participation and empowers young
646 people to drive solutions that address their mental health needs.

647

648 **ACKNOWLEDGMENTS**

649 We are grateful for the contributions of Dr. Meher Antia, through the University of Washington
650 Population Health Initiative, to the roundtable gathering of key stakeholders in urban youth
651 mental health. We thank Ms. Nissana Nov for her contributions to recruitment and data
652 collection activities and Dr. Suresh Kumar for insightful comments on this manuscript.

653 REFERENCES

- 654
- 655 1. Office of the Surgeon G. Publications and Reports of the Surgeon General. Protecting
656 Youth Mental Health: The US Surgeon General’s Advisory. Washington (DC): US Department of
657 Health and Human Services; 2021.
- 658 2. Furfaro H. Washington students are facing a mental health crisis. Here’s why schools
659 are on the front lines. The Seattle Times. 2021.
- 660 3. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. *Multiple Cause of Death Files, 2018-2020:*
661 *CDC WONDER* [Online Database]; 2022 [Available from:
662 <https://wonder.cdc.gov/wonder/help/mcd-expanded.html>].
- 663 4. Institute for Health Metrics and Evaluation. Global Health Data Exchange, Global Burden
664 of Disease Study 2019 Seattle: Institute for Health Metrics and Evaluation 2020 [
- 665 5. Health Resources & Services Administration. BHW Footprint Map [Data file and
666 interactive map] 2022 [Available from: [https://data.hrsa.gov/topics/health-workforce/bhw-](https://data.hrsa.gov/topics/health-workforce/bhw-footprint)
667 [footprint](https://data.hrsa.gov/topics/health-workforce/bhw-footprint)].
- 668 6. Green SJ. ‘Disheartening’ rise in King County gun violence has already surpassed
669 2020’s record toll. Seattle Times. 2021.
- 670 7. Public Health Seattle & King County. Mental Health Among Youth and Young Adults in
671 King County, WA: January 2019 – October 2021 2022 [Available from:
672 [https://kingcounty.gov/depts/health/covid-19/data/impacts/~media/depts/health/communicable-](https://kingcounty.gov/depts/health/covid-19/data/impacts/~media/depts/health/communicable-diseases/documents/C19/report-YYA-behavioral-health.ashx)
673 [diseases/documents/C19/report-YYA-behavioral-health.ashx](https://kingcounty.gov/depts/health/covid-19/data/impacts/~media/depts/health/communicable-diseases/documents/C19/report-YYA-behavioral-health.ashx)].
- 674 8. Cullati S, Courvoisier DS, Burton-Jeangros C. Mental health trajectories and their
675 embeddedness in work and family circumstances: a latent state-trait approach to life-course
676 trajectories. *Sociol Health Illn*. 2014;36(7):1077-94.
- 677 9. King County. Best Starts for Kids 2021 [Available from:
678 <https://kingcounty.gov/depts/community-human-services/initiatives/best-starts-for-kids.aspx>].
- 679 10. McKendry C, Janos N. Greening the industrial city: equity, environment, and economic
680 growth in Seattle and Chicago. *International Environmental Agreements: Politics, Law and*
681 *Economics*. 2015;15(1):45-60.
- 682 11. Gruebner O, Rapp MA, Adli M, Kluge U, Galea S, Heinz A. Cities and Mental Health.
683 *Deutsches Arzteblatt international*. 2017;114(8):121-7.
- 684 12. Fleckney P, Bentley R. The urban public realm and adolescent mental health and
685 wellbeing: A systematic review. *Social science & medicine* (1982). 2021;284:114242.
- 686 13. Buttazzoni A, Doherty S, Minaker L. How Do Urban Environments Affect Young People’s
687 Mental Health? A Novel Conceptual Framework to Bridge Public Health, Planning, and
688 Neighbourhood Urbanism. *Public Health Rep*. 2022;137(1):48-61.
- 689 14. Feda D, Seelbinder A, Baek S, Raja S, Yin L, Roemmich J. Neighbourhood parks and
690 reduction in stress among adolescents: Results from Buffalo, New York. *Indoor and Built*
691 *Environment*. 2014;24.
- 692 15. Saxena A, Dodell-Feder D. Explaining the Association Between Urbanicity and
693 Psychotic-Like Experiences in Pre-Adolescence: The Indirect Effect of Urban Exposures. *Front*
694 *Psychiatry*. 2022;13:831089.
- 695 16. Pykett J, Campbell N, Fenton S-J, Gagen E, Lavis A, Newbigging K, et al. Urban
696 precarity and youth mental health: An interpretive scoping review of emerging approaches.
697 *Social Science & Medicine*. 2023;320:115619.
- 698 17. Sinha M, Collins P, Herrman H. Collective action for young people’s mental health: the
699 citiesRISE experience. *World Psychiatry*. 2019;18(1):114-5.
- 700 18. Weiner BJ, Lewis CC, Stanick C, Powell BJ, Dorsey CN, Clary AS, et al. Psychometric
701 assessment of three newly developed implementation outcome measures. *Implementation*
702 *Science*. 2017;12(1):1-12.


- 703 19. StataCorp. Stata Statistical Software: Release 14. StataCorp, LP; 2015.
- 704 20. R Core Team. R: A language and environment for statistical computing 2017 [Available
705 from: <http://www.r-project.org>.
- 706 21. U.S. Census Bureau. QuickFacts Seattle city, Washington. 2020 [Available from:
707 <https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/fact/table/seattlecitywashington/PST045219>.
- 708 22. Ronés M, Hoagwood K. School-Based Mental Health Services: A Research Review.
709 Clinical Child and Family Psychology Review. 2000;3(4):223-41.
- 710 23. Ibabe I, Arnoso A, Elgorriaga E, Asla N. Evaluation report of early intervention program
711 in situation of child-to-parent abuse: parents and children as participants. Journal of Family
712 Studies. 2021:1-20.
- 713 24. Gronholm PC, Nye E, Michelson D. Stigma related to targeted school-based mental
714 health interventions: A systematic review of qualitative evidence. Journal of Affective Disorders.
715 2018;240:17-26.
- 716 25. García-Carrión R, Villarejo-Carballido B, Villardón-Gallego L. Children and Adolescents
717 Mental Health: A Systematic Review of Interaction-Based Interventions in Schools and
718 Communities. Front Psychol. 2019;10:918.
- 719 26. Whitlock JL. Youth perceptions of life at school: Contextual correlates of school
720 connectedness in adolescence. Applied Developmental Science. 2006;10:13-29.
- 721 27. Goodman A, Joshi, H., Nasim, B. & Tyler, C. Social and emotional skills in childhood
722 and their long-term effects on adult life. 2015.
- 723 28. Rowe F, Stewart D, Patterson C. Promoting school connectedness through whole school
724 approaches. Health Education. 2007;107:524-42.
- 725 29. Goldberg JM, Sklad M, Elfrink TR, Schreurs KMG, Bohlmeijer ET, Clarke AM.
726 Effectiveness of interventions adopting a whole school approach to enhancing social and
727 emotional development: a meta-analysis. European Journal of Psychology of Education.
728 2019;34(4):755-82.
- 729 30. Iorfino F, Cross SP, Davenport T, Carpenter JS, Scott E, Shiran S, et al. A Digital
730 Platform Designed for Youth Mental Health Services to Deliver Personalized and Measurement-
731 Based Care. Front Psychiatry. 2019;10:595-.
- 732 31. Uhlhaas P, Torous J. Digital tools for youth mental health. npj Digital Medicine.
733 2019;2:104.
- 734 32. Kauer SD, Mangan C, Sanci L. Do Online Mental Health Services Improve Help-Seeking
735 for Young People? A Systematic Review. J Med Internet Res. 2014;16(3):e66.
- 736 33. Horgan A, Sweeney J. Young students' use of the Internet for mental health information
737 and support. J Psychiatr Ment Health Nurs. 2010;17(2):117-23.
- 738 34. Kummervold PE, Gammon D, Bergvik S, Johnsen JA, Hasvold T, Rosenvinge JH. Social
739 support in a wired world: use of online mental health forums in Norway. Nord J Psychiatry.
740 2002;56(1):59-65.
- 741 35. Bradley KL, Robinson LM, Brannen CL. Adolescent help-seeking for psychological
742 distress, depression, and anxiety using an Internet program. International Journal of Mental
743 Health Promotion. 2012;14(1):23-34.
- 744 36. Davis-McCabe C, Winthrop A. Davis-McCabe, C. & Winthrop, A. (2010) Computerised
745 CBT: University students experiences of using an online self-help programme. Counselling
746 Psychology Review. 25(4). Counselling Psychology Review. 2010;25.
- 747 37. Bradford S, Rickwood D. Adolescent's preferred modes of delivery for mental health
748 services. Child Adolesc Ment Health. 2014;19(1):39-45.
- 749 38. Brooks MJ, Phetogo BK, Schwennesen H, Phoi O, Tshume O, Matshaba M, et al.
750 Building a Community Based Mental Health Program for Adolescents in Botswana: Stakeholder
751 Feedback. Community Ment Health J. 2022;58(6):1068-75.

- 752 39. Simms V, Weiss HA, Chinoda S, Mutsinze A, Bernays S, Verhey R, et al. Peer-led
753 counselling with problem discussion therapy for adolescents living with HIV in Zimbabwe: A
754 cluster-randomised trial. *PLoS Med.* 2022;19(1):e1003887.
- 755 40. Watsford C, Rickwood D. Young people's expectations, preferences and actual
756 experience of youth mental health care. *International Journal of Adolescence and Youth.*
757 2015;20(3):284-94.
- 758 41. Langer DA, Kritikos TK, Asarnow JR, Tompson MC. Parent and Youth Preferences in
759 the Treatment of Youth Depression. *Child Psychiatry & Human Development.* 2021;52(2):236-
760 47.
- 761 42. Layla M, Bremer I, Endale T, Jannati M, Yi J. *Urban Design and Mental Health.* 2017. p.
762 1-24.
- 763 43. Foster CE, Horwitz A, Thomas A, Opperman K, Gipson P, Burnside A, et al.
764 Connectedness to family, school, peers, and community in socially vulnerable adolescents.
765 *Child Youth Serv Rev.* 2017;81:321-31.
- 766 44. Törrönen M. Social relationships and their connection to mental health for young people
767 who have been in the care system. *The British Journal of Social Work.* 2021;51(3):927-44.
- 768 45. Sun J, Yin X, Li C, Liu W, Sun H. Stigma and Peer-Led Interventions: A Systematic
769 Review and Meta-Analysis. *Front Psychiatry.* 2022;13:915617.
- 770 46. Cohen A, Chrystal J, Young A. Peer Wellness Coaches for Adults With Mental Illness.
771 *Psychiatric services (Washington, DC).* 2014;65:129-30.
- 772 47. Alvarez-Jimenez M, Gleeson JF, Rice S, Gonzalez-Blanch C, Bendall S. Online peer-to-
773 peer support in youth mental health: seizing the opportunity. *Epidemiol Psychiatr Sci.*
774 2016;25(2):123-6.
- 775 48. Ali K, Farrer L, Gulliver A, Griffiths KM. Online Peer-to-Peer Support for Young People
776 With Mental Health Problems: A Systematic Review. *JMIR Ment Health.* 2015;2(2):e19.
- 777 49. Prescott J, Rathbone AL, Brown G. Online peer to peer support: Qualitative analysis of
778 UK and US open mental health Facebook groups. *Digit Health.* 2020;6:2055207620979209.
- 779 50. Griffiths KM, Reynolds J, Vassallo S. An Online, Moderated Peer-to-Peer Support
780 Bulletin Board for Depression: User-Perceived Advantages and Disadvantages. *JMIR Ment*
781 *Health.* 2015;2(2):e14.
- 782 51. Sharma A, Choudhury M, Althoff T, Sharma A. Engagement Patterns of Peer-to-Peer
783 Interactions on Mental Health Platforms. *Proceedings of the International AAAI Conference on*
784 *Web and Social Media.* 2020;14(1):614-25.
- 785 52. King T, Fazel M. Examining the mental health outcomes of peer-led school-based
786 interventions on young people aged between 4 and 18 years old: a systematic review protocol.
787 *Syst Rev.* 2019;8(1):104.
- 788 53. Henderson J, Hawke LD, Iyer SN, Hayes E, Darnay K, Mathias S, et al. Youth
789 Perspectives on Integrated Youth Services: A Discrete Choice Conjoint Experiment. *Can J*
790 *Psychiatry.* 2021:7067437211044717.
- 791 54. Patton GC, Sawyer SM, Santelli JS, Ross DA, Afifi R, Allen NB, et al. Our future: a
792 Lancet commission on adolescent health and wellbeing. *Lancet.* 2016;387(10036):2423-78.
- 793 55. Pavarini G, Booyen C, Jain T, Lai J, Manku K, Foster-Estwick A, et al. Agents of
794 Change for Mental Health: A Survey of Young People's Aspirations for Participation Across Five
795 Low- and Middle-Income Countries. *J Adolesc Health.* 2022.
- 796 56. Ng MY, Weisz JR. Annual Research Review: Building a science of personalized
797 intervention for youth mental health. *J Child Psychol Psychiatry.* 2016;57(3):216-36.
- 798 57. Bae JY. [Development of a user centered web site for mental health management in
799 adolescents]. *Taehan Kanho Hakhoe Chi.* 2007;37(1):14-25.
- 800 58. Oti O, Pitt I. Online mental health interventions designed for students in higher
801 education: A user-centered perspective. *Internet Interv.* 2021;26:100468-.

- 802 59. Mulvaney-Day NE, Rappaport N, Alegría M, Codianne LM. Developing systems
803 interventions in a school setting: an application of community-based participatory research for
804 mental health. *Ethn Dis.* 2006;16(1 Suppl 1):S107-17.
- 805 60. Kutcher S, Perkins K, Gilberds H, Udedi M, Ubuguyu O, Njau T, et al. Creating
806 Evidence-Based Youth Mental Health Policy in Sub-Saharan Africa: A Description of the
807 Integrated Approach to Addressing the Issue of Youth Depression in Malawi and Tanzania.
808 *Front Psychiatry.* 2019;10:542.
- 809 61. Wright M, Brown A, Dudgeon P, McPhee R, Coffin J, Pearson G, et al. Our journey, our
810 story: a study protocol for the evaluation of a co-design framework to improve services for
811 Aboriginal youth mental health and well-being. *BMJ Open.* 2021;11(5):e042981.

SUPPORTING INFORMATION

S1 Figure 1: Priorities and unmet needs with regard to mental health (n=117)



This figure presents participant ratings of the importance of various mental health-related issues as well as ratings of satisfaction with current approaches to addressing those issues. Circle size and color correspond with the relative proportion of participant responses endorsing each importance or satisfaction level. Larger and lighter circles correspond with a greater proportion of participant endorsement. Responses are stratified by youth self-identification.

