

# Multimodal mental health assessment with remote interviews using facial, vocal, linguistic, and cardiovascular patterns

Zifan Jiang, Salman Seyedi, Emily Griner, Ahmed Abbasi, Ali Bahrami Rad, Hyeokhyen Kwon, Robert O. Cotes, Gari D. Clifford

**Abstract— Objective:** The current clinical practice of psychiatric evaluation suffers from subjectivity and bias, and requires highly skilled professionals that are often unavailable or unaffordable. Objective digital biomarkers have shown the potential to address these issues. In this work, we investigated whether behavioral and physiological signals, extracted from remote interviews, provided complimentary information for assessing psychiatric disorders.

**Methods:** Time series of multimodal features were derived from four conceptual modes: facial expression, vocal expression, linguistic expression, and cardiovascular modulation. The features were extracted from simultaneously recorded audio and video of remote interviews using task-specific and foundation models. Averages, standard deviations, and hidden Markov model-derived statistics of these features were computed from 73 subjects. Four binary classification tasks were defined: detecting 1) any clinically-diagnosed psychiatric disorder, 2) major depressive disorder, 3) self-rated depression, and 4) self-rated anxiety. Each modality was evaluated individually and in combination.

**Results:** Statistically significant feature differences were found between controls and subjects with mental health conditions. Correlations were found between features and self-rated depression and anxiety scores. Visual heart rate dynamics achieved the best unimodal performance with areas under the receiver-operator curve (AUROCs) of 0.68-0.75 (depending on the classification task). Combining multiple modalities achieved AUROCs of 0.72-0.82. Features from task-specific models outperformed features from foundation models.

**Conclusion:** Multimodal features extracted from remote interviews revealed informative characteristics of clinically diagnosed and self-rated mental health status.

**Significance:** The proposed multimodal approach has the potential to facilitate objective, remote, and low-cost assessment for low-burden automated mental health services.

**Index Terms—**Telehealth, Machine Learning, Digital Biomarker, Multimodal, Depression, Anxiety Disorder, Mental Health, Computer Vision, Acoustic, Foundation model, remote photoplethysmography

Z. Jiang and G. D. Clifford are with the Department of Biomedical Informatics, Emory University School of Medicine and the Department of Biomedical Engineering, Emory University and Georgia Institute of Technology.

S. Seyedi, A. B. Rad, and H. Kwon are with the Department of Biomedical Informatics, Emory University School of Medicine.

A. Abbasi is with the Department of IT, Analytics, and Operations, University of Notre Dame.

E. Griner and R. O. Cotes are with the Department of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences, Emory University School of Medicine.

This research was supported by funding from in part by Imagine, Innovate and Impact Funds from the Emory School of Medicine and through a Georgia Clinical & Translational Science Alliance National Institutes of Health award (UL1-TR002378).

## I. INTRODUCTION

The World Health Organization estimated in 2019 that 13% of the world population, or close to one billion people worldwide, live with a mental disorder, where most of them do not have access to effective care [1]. Since the COVID-19 pandemic, those numbers have been rising rapidly, and the pandemic continued to impede access to already underserved psychiatric health services [2]–[4]. In addition to being the second most common cause of years of life lived with disability worldwide [5], this crisis of psychiatric disorders translates to an economic burden of \$280 billion every year in the United States alone [6]. To reduce the high yearly cost and to delay the transition into often chronic or life-long psychiatric conditions, it is critical to gain a better understanding and to provide objective, fast, and accessible detection of those disorders to enable early and effective interventions. However, the present diagnosis and phenotyping of psychiatric disorders fail to fully satisfy this dire need due to its subjectivity and biases, and access to psychiatric care is limited even in high-income countries such as the US [7].

Currently, psychiatric disorders such as depression and anxiety disorder are diagnosed through the subjective clinical evaluation of signs and symptoms established by the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (DSM-5) [8] or the International Classification of Diseases, 10th revision [9]. These diagnostic criteria often suffer from low inter-rater reliability. In the DSM-5 field trials [10], inter-rater reliability (Cohen’s kappa,  $\kappa$ ) was just 0.28 for a diagnosis of major depressive disorder (MDD) and 0.20 for general anxiety disorder (GAD). The reliability for a diagnosis of MDD was even lower ( $\kappa = 0.16$ ) when interviews were carried out by general practitioners [11], who perform large percent of diagnoses worldwide [12] and in the US as well due to the decline of supply of psychiatrists [13]. Factors such as differences in training, biases (race, gender, culture), and interview style were the most common explanations for discrepancies between raters [14], [15]. Self-rated questionnaires such as General Anxiety Disorder-7 (GAD-7) [16], and Patient Health Questionnaire-9 (PHQ-9) [17] are also widely used in practice for initial screening and symptom monitoring purposes. Naturally, these scales are highly subjective as they are self-reported: the symptoms reported tend to be over-reported and more severe than observer ratings and highly depend on the subjective response processes [18].

The rapid development of objective automated digital assessment tools has the potential to aid clinicians in the diagnosis and evaluation of mental illness and to limit the impact of these illnesses on patients and on society [19]. Research groups have developed tools using various types of data modality, validated in numerous mental health populations, including depression [20], [21], anxiety disorder [22], schizophrenia [23], posttraumatic stress disorder (PTSD) [24], and almost all common psychiatric disorders. Diverse modalities of signals have been investigated, including behavioral signals, such as facial and body movements [20], [21], [25], speech acoustics [26]–[28], verbal or written content [29], sleep [30] and activity [24], [31] patterns, as well as physiological signals such as cardiovascular (heart rate [24], [32], electrocardiogram [28], [33], etc. ) and neural signals (electroencephalogram [34], [35], functional magnetic resonance imaging [36], [37] and functional near-infrared spectroscopy [38]). The multimodal approach, or the combination of multiple types of signals, has been widely adopted to improve the accuracy and robustness of those automated assessments [39], [40]. For example, [41], [42] combined behavioral signals, including cues from video, audio, and text, while others [24], [43] found the combination and interaction between physiological and behavioral signals were also useful in evaluating disorders.

While the findings in the above studies were promising, there remain unsolved challenges: data in most of them were collected within a lab-controlled environment and/or with specialized hardware, which prohibits potential future access and might not be able to generalize to actual clinical practice. The increasing use of telemedicine in psychiatry in recent years, even further accelerated by the COVID-19 pandemic [44], provided a promising approach to improve the access and effect of psychiatric care [45]–[47], while at the same presented an unprecedented opportunity of data collection for objective psychiatric assessments development without the limitation of geographical location and specialized hardware [48]. This begs the question of whether data collected remotely, such as in [49], [50], and in our previous research protocol [19], can provide a similar level of information as the data collected in a lab-controlled environment.

To address those challenges, we investigated whether each and the combination of behavioral and physiological signals, extracted from audio-visual recordings of remote telehealth interviews, which were collected using heterogeneous generic electronic devices (laptops, tablets, or smartphones) from the patients, were informative in assessing the multiple facets of psychiatric disorders of control subjects and subjects with mental health conditions (MHC).

The main contributions of this work are as follows: (1) We showed that audio-visual recordings of remote interviews collected fully remotely and without device limitation could be used to assess mental health states, with similar performance compared to the performance shown in previous studies where data were collected from lab-controlled environments. (2) We proposed a multimodal machine learning analysis framework, where we extracted both hand-crafted features and self-supervised-learned representations of facial, vocal, linguistic, and remote photoplethysmography (rPPG) patterns using sig-

nal processing approaches and state-of-the-art deep learning models, including convolutional neural networks (CNN) and transformer-based [51] foundation models. (3) Using those features and derived temporal dynamics, we compared the performance of features extracted from different modalities, with different models, and the performance of the combined features of multiple modalities, in classifying states of depression, anxiety, and whether mentally healthy (i.e., without any diagnosed disorder) using both self-reported scales (PHQ-9, GAD-7) and diagnoses made by clinicians.

## II. DATASET

### A. Participants

The overall recruitment protocol can be found in Cotes et al. [19], where we planned to recruit three outpatient groups: (1) 50 patients with schizophrenia, (2) 50 patients with unipolar major depressive disorder, and (3) 50 individuals with no psychiatric history. Due to the difficulty of recruiting enough in-person schizophrenia subjects during COVID-19, in this work, we focused on analyzing subjects recruited as control and depressed subjects. A total of 84 subjects were recruited as of July 17th, 2023, excluding schizophrenia subjects. The Emory University Institutional Review Board and the Grady Research Oversight Committee granted approval for this study (IRB# 00105142). Interviewees were recruited from Research Match ([researchmatch.org](https://www.researchmatch.org)), a National Institutes of Health-funded online recruitment strategy designed to connect potential participants to research studies, and through Grady’s Behavioral Health Outpatient Clinic utilizing a database of interested research participants. Participants were aged 18–65 and were native English speakers. For the initial screening, interviewees were recruited for either a control group (no history of mental illness within the past 12 months) or a group currently experiencing depression. All diagnoses and group categorizations were verified and finalized by the overseeing psychiatrist and clinical team after the semi-structured interview.

Two subjects did not meet the inclusion criteria based on the information shared during the interview. Interviews from four subjects were accidentally interrupted or unrecorded due to technical issues with the subjects’ devices, and the recorded audio or video files from five subjects were corrupted or led to signal extraction errors in certain modalities (for example, rPPG extraction error due to large percentage of facial occupation due to large yaw angle). Hence, data from 73 subjects were included in the analyses. Table I shows the demographics of those included participants.

### B. Interviews and measurements

The study team created the interview guide and protocol and have components that simulate a psychiatric intake interview [19]. All interviews were conducted remotely via Zoom’s secure, encrypted, HIPAA-compliant telehealth platform. Both Video and Audio were recorded. The remote interview was divided into three parts: 1) A semi-structured interview composed of a series of open-ended questions, a thematic apperception test [52], phonetic fluency test [53], and

**TABLE I: Demographics of the 73 subjects grouped by diagnoses**  $\pm$  indicates the standard deviation of the measured variable. Subjects with current mental health conditions or a history of diagnosis within 12 months were grouped as “MHC”, while the rest were considered “Controls”. For gender, “M” refers to male, “F” refers to female, “NB” refers to non-binary, and “NA” refers to subjects who refused to answer. For race, “W” refers to White, “B” refers to Black, “A” refers to Asian, “H” refers to Hispanic, “O” refers to subjects who identify to more than one race, and “NA” refers to subjects who refused to answer. The year of education indicates the number of academic years a person completed in a formal program provided by elementary and secondary schools, universities, colleges, or other formal post-secondary institutions. High school completion usually corresponds to 12 years of education, whereas college completion usually corresponds to 16 years. † Education levels from two subjects were not recorded, and therefore the last entry is based on 22 Controls and 49 MHC individuals. No significant differences (Mann-Whitney,  $p > 0.05$ ) were found in ages and years of education between Controls and MHC.

	Controls	MHC
Number of Subjects	22	51
Age (Years)	42.7 $\pm$ 14.0	36.6 $\pm$ 13.2
Gender (M/F/NB/NA)	9/13/0/0	10/38/2/1
Race (W/B/A/H/O/NA)	10/7/2/0/2/1	28/10/9/2/2/0
Years of Education†	17.3 $\pm$ 4.6	16.7 $\pm$ 2.5

semantic fluency test [54], 2) a sociodemographic section, and 3) clinical assessments which included the Mini-International Neuropsychiatric Interview (MINI) 6.0 [55], McGill Quality of Life Questionnaire [56], General Anxiety Disorder-7 [16], and Patient Health Questionnaire-9 [17].

### C. Categorization

Subjects were categorized into four different two-class categorizations based on self-rated scales or clinicians’ diagnoses to evaluate feature performances in classifying categorizations generated from under different assessment procedures.

- 1) The first and primary categorization is control (n=22) vs. subjects with mental health conditions (MHC, n=51) based on diagnoses as shown in Table I. The latter included subjects diagnosed with any mental health condition currently or a history of diagnosis within 12 months, including disorders like MDD, major depressive episode (MDE), comorbid or primary GAD, PTSD, panic disorder, social anxiety, agoraphobia, psychotic disorder, manic illness, personality disorder, and obsessive-compulsive disorder. The control group included the remaining subjects, who could have mild suicidality, mild agoraphobia, mild substance abuse and dependence, or a remote history (not in the previous 12 months) of MDD/MDE and are not currently on an antidepressant medication.

The following three categorizations only included a subset of subjects due to inclusion/exclusion criteria

and missing self-rating results.

- 2) The second categorization is non-MDD-control (n=18) vs. MDD (n=38, past or current). Since both groups in the first categorization are heterogeneous, we used this categorization to assess further whether differences could be found between controls and subjects with past or current MDD. In this case, we defined non-MDD-control as subjects with no lifetime history of MDD or other mental health conditions (but could have mild suicidality, mild agoraphobia, mild substance abuse and dependence), while the MDD subjects have primary diagnoses of MDD but could include comorbid GAD, PTSD, panic disorder, social anxiety, agoraphobia, and substance use disorder.
- 3) The third categorization is moderately depressed (PHQ-9 scores  $> 10$ , n=24) vs. rest (PHQ-9 scores  $\leq 10$ , n=43). PHQ-9 scores were not reported for six subjects, resulting in 67 subjects in this categorization. To evaluate performance in classifying the severity of self-rated depression symptoms, we used a PHQ-9 score-based categorization and adopted a cutoff of 10, which indicates moderate depression [17].
- 4) The fourth categorization is moderate GAD severity (GAD-7 scores  $> 10$ , n=16) vs. rest (GAD-7 scores  $\leq 10$ , n=49). GAD-7 scores were not reported for 8 subjects, resulting in 65 subjects in this categorization. Similar to the third categorization, we used a GAD-7 score-based categorization and adopted a cutoff of 10, which indicates moderate anxiety and a reasonable cut for identifying cases of GAD [16], to evaluate performance in classifying the severity of self-rated anxiety symptoms.

## III. METHODS

### A. Multimodal feature extraction

Figure 1 shows the proposed multimodal analysis framework that extracts visual, vocal, language, and rPPG time series signals at the frame or segment level, summarizes those time series with statistical and temporal dynamic features at the subject level (except for text embedding from the large language model, where the model directly generated subject-level embedding), and evaluates the performance of these features in clinical diagnoses or self-rated severity classification tasks described in section. II-C.

- 1) *Facial expressions and visual patterns:* We followed the CNN-based facial expression analysis framework we proposed in our previous work [20], [57]. For each frame of the recordings sample at 1 Hz (one frame per second), the face of the participant is detected with RetinaFace [58] using a ResNet-50 [59] backbone network trained on the “WIDER” face dataset [60]. The face detector achieved an accuracy of 95.5% on the “Easy” validation set in WIDER face dataset, where the faces were already much more difficult to detect than the faces in our use case. After segmentation, the face is fed into another CNN with VGG19 [61] structure, which was trained on the “AffectNet” dataset [62], to estimate the

Synthesized faces in Fig. 1 were removed per medRxiv requirement.




Fig. 1: **Overview of the processing pipeline.** Colored dashed-boxes denote features from different modalities, including physiological, visual, audio, and language features.

probabilities of the facial emotion expressed being into seven categories, namely neutral, happiness, sadness, surprise, fear, disgust, and anger. This facial emotion classifier was tested on the evaluation set in the AffectNet dataset and on a subset of the Radboud Faces Database (RaFD) [63]. It achieved an accuracy of 63.3% in the AffectNet evaluation set and 90.1% on the front-facing subset of the RaFD, while the accuracy of a random guess approach is 14.4%. and the agreement between two human annotators on the test set of AffectNet is only 60.7%.

To include facial behaviors less affected by cultural differences, we adopted JAA-Net [64] to recognize 49 facial landmarks and 12 facial action units [65] (AUs, or the individual components of facial muscle movement) expressed in the frame. JAA-Net is a deep learning model that combines CNN and adaptive attention module, and it achieved an average AU detection accuracy of 78.6% (including AU1, 2, 4, 6, 7, 10, 12, 14, 15, 17, 23, 24) and face alignment mean error of 3.8% inter-ocular distance on BP4D dataset [66] with three-fold cross-validation.

In addition to manually-defined facial expression signals, including facial emotions, AUs, and facial landmark movements, a self-supervised large vision foundation model named “DINOv2” [67] was also used to extract general visual embedding of the segmented facial area. While video foundation models have better performance in short-video clips, the image foundation model was used because the average length of the video recorded in this study was significantly longer (one hour vs. a few seconds). DINOv2 is a vision transformer (ViT) [68] with one billion parameters trained on 1.2B unique images that

achieved decent performance on video classification tasks with linear evaluation, including an accuracy of 90.5% on “UCF-101” dataset [69]. A 1024-dimensional visual embedding was generated from frames sampled at 1 Hz using the “ViT-L/14” [68] model.

2) *Language sentiments and representations:* The patient-side audio files were transcribed into texts using Amazon Transcribe on HIPAA-compliant Amazon web services at Emory, following the protocol detailed in our previous study [70]. Similar to the audio analysis, only patient-side transcripts during the semi-structured interview section were used to avoid using subjects’ answers to sociodemographic or clinical assessment questions.

We have previously found different word use patterns in subjects with and without MDD using the linguistic inquiry and word count (version LIWC-22) dictionary [71]. Here large language models (LLMs) were used to identify the sentiments and extract general representations to better understand the subjects’ linguistic patterns. More specifically, three LLMs were used: (1) At the utterance level, a distilled RoBERTa model [72], [73] finetuned on 80% of 20k emotional texts (the rest 20% was used as the test set with an average accuracy of 66%) was used to recognize one of seven emotions including neutral, happiness, sadness, surprise, fear, disgust, and anger. (2) Also at the utterance level, another RoBERTa-based model finetuned on 15 diverse review datasets with a leave-one-dataset-out accuracy of 93.2% [74] was used to recognize positive or negative sentiment. Such fine-tuned utterance-level deep learning models have been found to generate effective representations in related contexts such as anxiety [75]. (3)

LLAMA-65B [76], one of the state-of-the-art open-sourced decoder-only transformer models with 65 billion parameters which were trained on over one trillion tokens of texts, was used to generate an 8196-dimensional text embedding for the entire transcripts during the semi-structured interview.

3) *Vocal features and representations*: Both manually defined acoustic features and general audio representations were extracted from audio files. Only patient-side audio during the semi-structured interview section was used to avoid the potential information leak directly from subjects' answers to sociodemographic or clinical assessment questions in MINI or in self-rated questionnaires described in section II-B.

For manually defined features, *PyAudioAnalysis* [77] package was used to extract acoustic features at each 100ms window with 50% overlap, including zero crossing rate, energy, entropy of energy, spectral centroid/spread/entropy/flux/rolloff, Mel frequency cepstral coefficients, and 12 chroma vector and corresponding standard deviations. WavLM [78], which is a self-supervised audio foundation model with 316M parameters ("WavLM Large") trained on 94k hours of audio, was used to extract general audio representations. It has shown state-of-the-art performance in the universal speech representation benchmark [79]. Recorded audio files were first resampled to 16k Hz and then segmented into non-overlapping 20ms segments following [78]. A 1024-dimensional audio embedding was generated for each 20ms segment using WavLM.

4) *Remote PPG cardiovascular features*: Remote PPG signals were extracted from the video recordings using the *pyVHR* package [80], [81]. The facial skin areas were recognized in each frame using a CNN, 100 regions of interests (ROIs) were sampled, and the pixel values were averaged across the pixels in each ROI for each RGB channel, respectively. Then, an unsupervised method, named orthogonal matrix image transformation [82], was used to transform RGB values in one ROI to an estimated 25 Hz rPPG signal based on QR decomposition. The power spectral density of rPPGs at each ROI was computed in six seconds windows sliding every second, and the medians of the inverse of peak frequency (60/peak frequency) were used to estimate heart rates at every second.

Lastly, the averaged estimated rPPGs at each ROI were used to extract cardiovascular dynamic features using *PhysioNet Cardiovascular Signal Toolbox* [83] with a 300s window and a 30s sliding window. The cardiovascular dynamic features included time and frequency domain heart rate variability, acceleration and deceleration capacity, entropy measures, and heart rate turbulence measures. Highly tolerant rejecting thresholds were set to avoid rejecting high percentage of data, including setting lowest tolerable mean signal quality index (as defined in [83]) to be 0.1, allowing certain R-R intervals to be longer than ten seconds, allowing two neighboring R-R intervals to have a length difference of more than one second, and allowing a 30 seconds gap at the beginning of the PPG signals.

### B. Subject-level features and temporal analyses

Statistics of the time series extracted above were used as subject-level features. Both average and standard deviations

over time were calculated for lower-dimensional ( $< 100$ ) time series, including time series of facial expressions (facial emotions, AUs, and facial landmark locations sampled at 1 Hz), acoustic features (sampled at 20 Hz), language sentiments (sampled at each utterance), and estimated heart rates (sampled at 1 Hz). Only averages were calculated for higher-dimensional ( $> 100$ ) time series, including time series of WavLM audio embedding and DINOv2 visual embedding. LLAMA-65B embedding of the entire semi-interviews was directly used as subject-level features.

In addition to nonparametric statistics, hidden Markov models (HMM) were used to model the dynamics of the low dimensional time series, and statistics (duration and frequency of inferred states) of the unsupervisedly learned HMMs were used as subject-level features. An HMM with a Gaussian observation model and four states was learned for each modality separately using *SSM* package [84]. The number of states was selected because it represents the smallest number of states needed to model known different states: asymptomatic, symptomatic, uncertain, and padding states. Each time series of one modality from one subject  $k$ ,  $X_k$ , was considered as one noisy observation, where it is padded with zeros to the maximum temporal length  $T_{max}$  found from  $X_1$  to  $X_N$  ( $N = 73$ ). i.e.,  $X_k$  is a  $T_k \times d$  with a feature dimension of  $d$  and a temporal length of  $T_k$  was padded  $(T_{max} - T_k) \times d$  zeros at the end, so all  $X_k$  has the same shape of  $T_{max} \times d$ . The modality-specific HMM was then fitted on  $X$ , and the most likely hidden states  $Z_k$  with the shape of  $T_{max} \times 4$  were inferred for each sequence  $X_k$ . Lastly, the time steps spent and the frequency (non-neighboring occurrences) of all four states were calculated for each subject and used as subject-level dynamic features.

### C. Classification analyses

We evaluated features generated from the above-described processes in four two-class classification tasks described in Section. II-C. Classification performances were measured by the average area under the receiver operating characteristic (AUROC) and the average accuracy in 100 repeated five-fold cross-validations, where subjects were randomly stratified into five approximately equally sized folds in each repetition.

1) *Demographic variables*: Demographic variables, including one-hot-encoded race, one-hot-encoded gender, age, and years of education, were combined into a demographic feature vector for each subject and also evaluated as a benchmark in unimodal classification. However, demographic features were not considered in the multimodal classification.

2) *Unimodal evaluation*: For each modality, statistics (averages and standard deviations) and HMM-derived features were evaluated separately using a logistic regression (LR) with  $l_2$  regularization or a gradient boosting decision tree (GBDT) classifier, depending on the dimensionality of the features, where LR was used for features with fewer than 100 dimensions.

3) *Multimodal fusion*: Both early and late fusion of different modalities were considered. For early fusion, features from all modalities were concatenated into a single feature vector

as the input to a GBDT classifier. For late fusion, the majority vote of each unimodal classifier was used as the multimodal classification results. To avoid noise from classifiers without classification power, we also compared the majority voting results from classifiers that showed non-random (defined as  $AUROC > 0.5$ ) performance in the validation set (a 20% subset within the training fold). The non-random classifiers were re-trained with all the data in the training fold before being used for testing.

#### D. Statistical Analyses

We used statistical tests to assess the differences in the probability distributions of features between different groups of subjects (such as groups described in Section II-C and demographic groups) and the differences in performance resulting from different features. Mann-Whitney rank tests were applied between features or characteristics of different subject groups to determine whether significant differences exist between the two groups. McNemar's test was used to evaluate the classification disagreement between pairs of classification settings. Wald Test was used to determine if a significant correlation was found between two variables. Significance was assumed at a level of  $p < 0.05$  for all tests.

### IV. RESULTS

#### A. Unimodal feature patterns across groups

Here we performed a selected array of analyses of the clinically relevant patterns found in different modalities in different groups of subjects, providing additional objective evidence to previous clinical observations.

1) *Blunted visual affect and increased sadness in language:* While "blunted affect" was mostly in the context of a negative symptom of schizophrenia, it has been widely reported in other mental disorders like MDD [85]–[87] and other non-psychotic disorders [88]. Measured by the sum of average AU intensities over the interview, we found that non-medicated subjects with current MDD had lower facial expressivity compared to non-MDD controls (Mann-Whitney,  $p = 0.04$ ), and subjects with mental health conditions also had lower facial expressivity compared to controls (Mann-Whitney,  $p = 0.03$ ). However, no differences in facial expressivity were found between subjects with past MDD and non-MDD controls, and no statistically significant linear correlations were found between facial expressivity and self-rated PHQ-9 or GAD-7 scores.

Through language sentiment analysis, neither was verbally blunted affect found in the MDD or MHC groups nor language expressivity correlate with self-rated scores. However, the average sadness level expressed in language was found to be higher in MDD groups compared to non-MDD-controls (Mann-Whitney,  $p = 0.02$ ) and was positively correlated with PHQ-9 (Wald test,  $\rho = 0.31, p = 0.01$ ) and GAD-7 (Wald test,  $\rho = 0.37, p = 0.002$ ) scores. In comparison, the sadness level expressed visually did not increase in MDD groups.

2) *Increased acoustic spectral flux:* The average spectral flux, defined as the squared difference between the normalized magnitudes of the spectra of the two successive frames averaged across the semi-structured interviews, was found to

be positively correlated with PHQ-9 (Wald test,  $\rho = 0.26, p = 0.03$ ) and GAD-7 (Wald test,  $\rho = 0.25, p = 0.04$ ) scores, indicating a faster change of acoustic tones in subjects with more severe depression and anxiety symptoms.

3) *Increased complexity in heartbeat intervals:* No significant alternation of average heart rate or standard deviation of heart rate during the interview was found between groups. The complexity of the heartbeat time series, measured by the area under the multiscale entropy curve, was significantly higher in non-medicated MDD groups compared to non-MDD-controls (Mann-Whitney,  $p = 0.01$ ), consistent with previous findings using electrocardiogram [89], [90].

4) *Effect of medication:* Compared to non-medicated MDD subjects, medicated MDD subjects showed a higher level of facial expressivity (Mann-Whitney,  $p = 0.05$ ) and sadness (Mann-Whitney,  $p = 0.04$ ), while only non-medicated subjects with current MDD showed a higher level of sadness through language compared to medicated subjects with current MDD (Mann-Whitney,  $p = 0.04$ ). In addition, decreased heartbeat interval complexity (Mann-Whitney,  $p = 0.02$ ) and increased standard deviation of heart rate (Mann-Whitney,  $p = 0.02$ ) were observed with medication in subjects with past and current MDD compared to non-medicated MDD subjects, while the average heart rate remained similar between both groups.


#### B. Dynamics inferred from HMM state duration and frequency

Dynamic features, including inferred HMM state duration and frequency, were found to be the most useful features in classification tasks, as shown in Table II, especially for facial expressions and rPPG modalities. Significant linear correlations were found between these dynamic features and PHQ-9/GAD-7 scores.

Figure 2 shows the correlation plots between the frequency of the states in emotion and heart rate time series. The padding states (described in section III-B) from rPPG and facial expression HMMs were omitted as they would only present once (frequency=1) as the padding in the end. Statistically significant positive correlations were found between all non-padding state frequency and self-rated scores except emotion state 2, indicating a higher switching rate between hidden states may be related to more severe depression and anxiety symptoms.

#### C. Classification performance

Table II shows the classification performance of both clinically diagnosed and self-rated mental health disorders using static and dynamic features from vision, audio, language, and physiology. Each column shows the performance of two-class classification using one of the four categorizations defined in Section II-C in the same order. The best-performing features achieved an AUROC of 0.68 to 0.75 in unimodal classification tasks, while the selected majority voting described in Section III-C3 achieved an AUROC of 0.82 in detecting current or recent (last 12-month) mental disorders, an AUROC of 0.77 in detecting past and current MDD, an AUROC of 0.82 in detecting PHQ-9 based moderate depression, and an AUROC



**Fig. 2: PHQ-9 and GAD-7 scores vs. rPPG and facial expression HMM state frequencies** Each subfigure shows the scatter plot between self-rated scores and the frequency of a learned HMM state, along with a linear regression model fit with the 95% confidence interval. The top row shows how those learned state correlate with PHQ-9 scores and the bottom row shows how they correlate with GAD-7 scores. Texts in each subfigure denote the Pearson correlation coefficient ( $\rho$ ) and the p-value using the Wald test.

of 0.72 in detecting GAD-7 based moderate anxiety disorder. Late fusion using selected majority voting (row “9.3”) outperformed early fusion with the direct concatenation of features (McNemar’s test,  $p \ll 0.01$ ) due to the extremely high dimensionality of the concatenated features.

While demographic variables achieved higher than random performance in all four tasks, we found they were not strong predictors of mental health disorders compared to the proposed features, as shown in row “1” in Table II.

1) *Moments and dynamics of facial expressions revealed mental states but general visual patterns did not:* While we also extracted facial landmarks as described in Section III-A1, we found adding static statistics of facial landmarks or including facial landmarks in the HMM modeling deteriorated the performance. Row “2” in Table II shows the performance using just the statistics of facial emotions and AUs. Interestingly, the average and standard deviation of facial expressions failed to classify clinical diagnoses but successes in classifying self-rated depression and anxiety. In comparison, the temporal properties derived from HMM resulted in significantly better (McNemar’s test,  $p \ll 0.01$ ) classification performance, except for self-rated depression detection. Lastly, using the temporal dynamics of facial expressions achieved the best performance in self-rated anxiety in all modalities.

In comparison, visual embedding generated from DINOv2 failed to generalize to this specialized dataset and did not achieve non-random classification in any of the tasks.

2) *Language sentiments beat general language representation in small and specialized dataset:* Compared to other modalities, language features were extracted at a lower sampling rate (at each utterance or the entire semi-structured interview), while LLMs were able to abstract the texts into much shorter sequences of features or even into a single vector when LLAMA-65B was used. The average and standard deviation of the language sentiments achieved the best performances compared to static features of other modalities.

Using HMM to model the sentiment dynamics did not improve performance, as shown in all other modalities (comparing rows “4.2” and “4.1”). These results showed that part of the dynamics expressed through the words was already captured by LLM and abstracted into utterance sentiments, and the sentiment dynamics over multiple utterances might not be as important.

Additionally, while using LLAMA-65B embedding showed decent performance compared to other non-language modalities, using language sentiments achieved similar or better results in all tasks. This showed that general language representation might not be as useful as disorder-related sentiment analysis, especially in smaller and highly-specialized datasets, as demonstrated in this study, and suggested in related work on text-based depression and personality detection [91], [92].

3) *Vocal features were under-performing compared to other modalities:* While many previous studies [26], [27], [93] have shown that vocal features are useful in detecting depression and anxiety disorder, in this study, other modalities outperformed both spectral/entropy-based acoustic features and general speech representation from WavLM except in self-rated depression detection.

4) *HMM modeled dynamics were more informative compared to cardiovascular features for highly noisy rPPG signals:* As shown in row “8.1” in Table II, using cardiovascular features yielded inferior performance compared to other modalities. The key reason is the estimated rPPG signals were highly noisy at each ROI or after averaging across all ROIs, which led to errors (such as peak detection error) in downstream cardiovascular feature calculations. On average, 25.8% of the estimated rPPGs were not used for downstream analyses even with highly tolerant rejecting thresholds as described in Section III-A4. Using HMM-derived features from modeling heart rate time series resulted in the best or second-best performance in all four tasks among all unimodal approaches, reaching AUROCs from 0.68 to 0.75.

TABLE II: **Classification performance of clinical diagnoses and self-rated depression/anxiety severity.** Each column shows the performance of two-class classification using one of the four categorizations defined in Section. II-C in the same order. The average and the standard deviation of AUROCs and accuracies (in brackets) from a hundred randomly-split five-fold cross-validations are reported. The term *avgs* denotes averages, and *stds* denotes standard deviations. “random” indicates that the classifier performed no significantly better (McNemar’s test,  $p > 0.05$ ) than random guessing (AUROC=0.5). The best classification performance in each task (column) achieved by a single modality was shown in bold text, while the second best was underlined. Multiple metrics were underlined or marked bold when no statistical significance (McNemar’s test,  $p > 0.05$ ) between classifiers was found. The best classification performance in each task (column) achieved by multimodal fusion was shown in bold text. “†” indicates significantly better performance (McNemar’s test,  $p < 0.05$ ) was achieved with the indicated feature type in this classification task (each column) compared to other unimodal features, where “‡” indicates significantly better performance (McNemar’s test,  $p < 0.05$ ) was achieved with multimodal voting compared to using any unimodal features.

Feature type	Metric	1. Control vs. MHC	2. Non-MDD-Control vs. MDD	3. PHQ-9 > 10?	4. GAD-7 > 10?
1. Demographic variables	AUROC	0.54 ± 0.04	0.54 ± 0.04	0.61 ± 0.03	0.57 ± 0.05
	Accuracy	0.56 ± 0.04	0.57 ± 0.04	0.58 ± 0.04	0.60 ± 0.04
2. Facial emotions + AUs					
2.1 Avgs and stds	AUROC	random	random	0.56 ± 0.06	0.55 ± 0.04
	Accuracy	random	random	0.60 ± 0.05	0.62 ± 0.04
2.2 HMM features	AUROC	0.65 ± 0.03	0.66 ± 0.04	0.61 ± 0.04	<b>0.68 ± 0.05</b>
	Accuracy	0.64 ± 0.03	0.66 ± 0.04	0.60 ± 0.04	<b>0.67 ± 0.03</b>
3. DINOv2 avgs and stds	Both	random	random	random	random
4. Language sentiment					
4.1 Avgs and stds	AUROC	0.69 ± 0.03	0.66 ± 0.04	0.64 ± 0.05	0.63 ± 0.04
	Accuracy	0.67 ± 0.04	0.68 ± 0.04	0.67 ± 0.05	0.64 ± 0.04
4.2 HMM features	AUROC	0.62 ± 0.03	0.64 ± 0.04	random	0.65 ± 0.05
	Accuracy	0.65 ± 0.03	0.60 ± 0.03	random	0.73 ± 0.04
5. LLAMA-65B					
	AUROC	0.64 ± 0.07	0.53 ± 0.08	0.68 ± 0.04	0.64 ± 0.05
	Accuracy	0.68 ± 0.05	0.59 ± 0.07	0.68 ± 0.03	0.70 ± 0.04
6. WavLM avgs and stds					
	AUROC	random	0.58 ± 0.05	0.60 ± 0.06	0.59 ± 0.02
	Accuracy	random	0.61 ± 0.05	0.64 ± 0.05	0.71 ± 0.02
7. Vocal acoustics					
7.1 Avgs and stds	AUROC	random	random	0.68 ± 0.05	random
	Accuracy	random	random	0.67 ± 0.05	random
7.2 HMM features	AUROC	0.57 ± 0.05	0.51 ± 0.06	0.51 ± 0.05	0.53 ± 0.05
	Accuracy	0.59 ± 0.04	0.53 ± 0.05	0.53 ± 0.05	0.60 ± 0.04
8. rPPG					
8.1 Cardiovascular features					
	AUROC	random	0.55 ± 0.07	0.65 ± 0.04	0.56 ± 0.05
	Accuracy	random	0.61 ± 0.05	0.60 ± 0.04	0.59 ± 0.04
8.2 HMM features	AUROC	<b>0.72 ± 0.05</b> †	<b>0.73 ± 0.05</b> †	<b>0.75 ± 0.03</b> †	<b>0.68 ± 0.04</b>
	Accuracy	<b>0.76 ± 0.04</b> †	<b>0.73 ± 0.05</b> †	<b>0.71 ± 0.03</b> †	<b>0.67 ± 0.03</b>
9. Fusion (row 2-8)					
9.1 Feature concatenation					
	AUROC	0.63 ± 0.07	random	0.59 ± 0.05	0.53 ± 0.05
	Accuracy	0.68 ± 0.05	random	0.61 ± 0.04	0.62 ± 0.04
9.2 Majority vote					
	AUROC	0.70 ± 0.05	0.68 ± 0.07	0.75 ± 0.05	0.71 ± 0.05
	Accuracy	0.73 ± 0.03	0.71 ± 0.04	0.71 ± 0.04	0.76 ± 0.03
9.3 Selected vote					
	AUROC	<b>0.82 ± 0.04</b> ‡	<b>0.77 ± 0.02</b> ‡	<b>0.82 ± 0.04</b> ‡	<b>0.72 ± 0.04</b> ‡
	Accuracy	<b>0.75 ± 0.03</b> ‡	<b>0.76 ± 0.01</b> ‡	<b>0.74 ± 0.04</b> ‡	<b>0.75 ± 0.03</b> ‡

## V. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

In this work, we performed a thorough multimodal analysis on 73 subjects using remotely-recorded telehealth interviews and showed that the facial, vocal, linguistic, and cardiovascular features extracted from these audiovisual recordings could reveal informative characteristics of both clinically diagnosed and self-rated mental health status. The results provided early evidence of the usefulness of multimodal digital biomarkers extracted from low-cost and non-lab-controlled data with minimal hardware limitations. Comparisons were made between different modalities and between features derived from the latest transformer-based foundation models and more defined features derived from traditional methods, offering insights on which modalities and methods might be most suited for automated remote mental health assessments.

### A. Performance of different modalities

When comparing the classification performance using features extracted from different modalities, it is clear that overall physiological characteristics outperformed other manually-defined or data-driven behavioral characteristics. Heart rate dynamics were highly relevant in classifying self-rated and clinician-diagnosed disorders, even though the heart rates were estimated indirectly from light changes on the face. While it is not surprising to find associations between cardiovascular dynamics and psychiatric disorders, as shown in previous studies of neurobiological mechanisms [94] and statistical analyses [95], [96], the results raised questions on the behavioral features extracted in this study. More investigations are needed to answer whether they underperformed because the current state-of-the-art models cannot capture enough information in remote interviews, or behavioral signals are not as useful as physiological signals in telehealth settings, even for human

experts.

Among behavioral modalities, overall facial and language patterns led to better classification performance than patterns derived from audio, although the latter resulted in a comparable performance in detecting self-rated depression. While overall facial and language patterns led to similar levels of performance, it is worth noting that they performed very differently in different tasks, suggesting the same modality might perform differently for different mental health assessment tasks. For example, facial expression dynamics were much more useful in detecting self-rated anxiety than self-rated depression, yet similarly useful in detecting clinical MDD. On the contrary, Language embedding was more powerful in detecting self-rated disorders than clinically diagnosed disorders. These findings caution us on translating and interpreting results found using self-rated or self-reported scales directly for clinical applications, where the categorization criteria and process are different, in addition to the subject distribution shift, which was not shown in this study (as they were evaluated on the same group of subjects).

### B. The use of foundation models

Foundation models have gained enormous popularity in the last few years with the rapid development of pre-training and self(semi)-supervised training methods [97], [98], especially since the release of OpenAI’s ChatGPT. LLMs, along with visual [67], audio [78], and multimodal [99] foundation models were widely applied in many disciplines, including the mental health domain, but primarily limited to language analyses and self-rated (self-reported) conditions [100], [101]. By comparing the direct use of unimodal foundation model-generated embedding to manually defined features from the same modalities, we showed how they perform in more clinically-relevant tasks under the telehealth settings.

The statistics of the visual embedding from DinoV2 were not at all useful in detecting mental health disorders. This finding was partially expected because the majority of extracted general visual representations would be more relevant to the texture and appearance of the face, especially after averaging, while the dynamics of the high-dimensional embedding would be hard to find with a limited number of recordings (discussed in more details in section V-C below). Preliminary results using other vision foundation models in this dataset did not show better classification performances either, including using models tuned for facial representation (“FaRL” [102]) and for facial video representations (“MARLIN” [103]).

Although audio embedding from WavLM only outperformed acoustic features slightly here, it showed the potential of using the general audio embedding from a more diversely pre-trained audio foundation model in datasets with more subjects. Interestingly, general text embedding of the entire semi-structured interview from LLAMA-65B performed similarly when compared to sentiment analyses considering the extremely high feature dimensionality and the small number of recordings. With the rapid development of LLMs and the inclusion of more diverse training texts, such as the recent release of LLAMA2 [104], general LLMs could potentially

outperform fine-tuned task-specific LLMs in mental health assessment tasks in the near future.

### C. Limitations and future directions

Several limitations of this study need to be acknowledged, as they provide valuable insights into the boundaries of our findings and potential directions for future studies.

First, the number of subjects (n=73) and their heterogeneity might limit our findings’ generalizability. While the number of subjects will grow as we keep collecting data following our previous protocol [19], the heterogeneity issue might not be easily addressed. Although we recruited subjects with clear inclusion/exclusion criteria and further excluded subjects after the interview if they did not fall into our criteria, the intrinsic nature of high comorbidity levels in different mental disorders makes it difficult to recruit a “clean” cohort of subjects with clear diagnoses of a single type of disorder. Another heterogeneity came from medication status, which has been known to affect both behaviors and physiology of the patients [105]–[107]. That said, we believe the heterogeneity could be partially addressed as the number of subjects grows because analyses of smaller and more well-defined groups, which do not have enough samples currently, could be performed. As the number of subjects grows, models used for feature extractions could be potentially fine-tuned on the targeted population instead of being only trained on open-access datasets, which could further close the gap in getting accurate features from the target population.

Second, potential bias in the feature extraction process might exist. The facial expression model used in this study was evaluated in our previous research [57], but the features from other modalities were extracted using open-access models that may bias towards certain demographic groups, leading to potential skew in the findings. For example, LLAMA is reported to be biased in religion, age, gender, and other aspects as it was trained with internet-crawled data [76]. A thorough bias analysis must be performed in a future study before applying it clinically.

Third, the unimodal and multimodal classification and fusion methods used in this study could be improved given a larger and more densely labeled dataset. Only one label (per task) was available for the entire recording, which made it difficult to apply temporal models such as recurrent neural networks or transformers to directly classify high-dimensional time series with thousands to tens of thousands of steps. A potential solution is augmenting the labels by segmenting the recordings into shorter clips and assigning the same labels for all the clips from the same subjects. However, this process may lead to many false positives as the symptoms or cues relevant to mental health might only appear a few times. Similarly, a multimodal transformer could be potentially used for fusion, provided the label sparsity challenge is addressed. A potential future direction is to label the entire recording more frequently in time. For example, simple measurements like self-rated or clinician-rated levels of distress could be adopted. Another potential direction is to utilize the potential improvement in pre-trained foundation models. For instance,

LLMs with larger context windows might enable few-shot classification by including a few examples of transcripts and categorizations in the prompt.

### D. Potential clinical applications

With larger and more diverse samples, we see considerable potential clinical utility for the proposed multimodal objective assessment approach (and future applications informed by this technology) in several areas: 1) deepening understanding of psychopathology and outward manifestations of symptoms, 2) utility for diagnostic purposes, 3) assessing changes in symptoms longitudinally for the same patient, and 4) for patient self-report, engagement, and empowerment. First, this technology has the potential to better objectify and quantify core signs and symptoms of certain mental health conditions, like affective flattening or tangential speech. Second, this technology has the potential to augment the initial diagnostic process for clinicians in both research and clinical settings. Developing real-time reporting of digital biomarker outputs in the form of a dashboard may help clinicians hone into a certain line of clinical questions to better help establish a diagnosis. This technology may have a role in reducing bias and discrimination in the diagnostic process, as currently, the preponderance of evidence suggests that Black/African American individuals and Hispanic individuals are disproportionately diagnosed with psychotic disorders [108]. In time, combining digital biomarkers in addition to other blood-based and imaging markers, could play a potential role in subtyping mental health conditions according to treatment response or identifying individuals at risk who might develop the condition [109]. Third, applications of this technology can help clinicians and researchers to assess changes in symptoms over time for the same patient. This is crucial for the health care team to understand if the treatment plan is working and may help to accelerate measurement-based care efforts and overcome some of the barriers to implementation [110]. Additionally, accurate assessment is the cornerstone of clinical research studies which ultimately determines whether new treatments are approved, and unreliable assessments can have significant consequences to the study and to the field more broadly [111]. Finally, future applications informed by this technology can play an important role in empowering patients to participate in self-assessment and ongoing monitoring of their symptoms. Such applications may help to improve the accessibility/timeliness of assessments and even reduce stigma around mental health [112].

### REFERENCES

- [1] F. Charlson *et al.*, “New WHO prevalence estimates of mental disorders in conflict settings: A systematic review and meta-analysis,” *The Lancet*, vol. 394, no. 10194, pp. 240–248, Jul. 2019.
- [2] “Mental health and COVID-19: Early evidence of the pandemic’s impact: Scientific brief, 2 March 2022.” Tech. Rep., Mar. 2022.
- [3] M. Soto-Añari *et al.*, “Prevalence of dementia and associated factors among older adults in Latin America during the COVID-19 pandemic,” *Dementia and Geriatric Cognitive Disorders Extra*, vol. 11, no. 3, pp. 213–221, Sep. 2021.
- [4] A. Tsapanou *et al.*, “The impact of COVID-19 pandemic on people with mild cognitive impairment/dementia and on their caregivers,” *International Journal of Geriatric Psychiatry*, vol. 36, no. 4, pp. 583–587, Apr. 2021.

- [5] T. Vos *et al.*, “Global burden of 369 diseases and injuries in 204 countries and territories, 1990–2019: A systematic analysis for the global burden of disease study 2019,” *The Lancet*, vol. 396, no. 10258, pp. 1204–1222, 2020.
- [6] “Projections of national expenditures for treatment of mental and substance use disorders, 2010–2020,” Tech. Rep.
- [7] Mental Health America. (2022) Mental health in America - Access to care data 2018. <https://mhanational.org/issues/2022/mental-health-america-access-care-data>. Accessed: Jul 23, 2023.
- [8] V. N. Vahia, “Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders 5: A quick glance,” *Indian Journal of Psychiatry*, vol. 55, no. 3, p. 220, 2013.
- [9] *International Statistical Classification of Diseases and related health problems: Alphabetical index*. World Health Organization, 2004, vol. 3.
- [10] D. E. Clarke *et al.*, “DSM-5 field trials in the United States and Canada, part I: Study design, sampling strategy, implementation, and analytic approaches,” *American Journal of Psychiatry*, vol. 170, no. 1, pp. 43–58, 2013.
- [11] A. Fernández *et al.*, “Is major depression adequately diagnosed and treated by general practitioners? Results from an epidemiological study,” *General Hospital Psychiatry*, vol. 32, no. 2, pp. 201–209, 2010.
- [12] P. Huxley, “Mental illness in the community: the Goldberg-Huxley model of the pathway to psychiatric care,” *Nordic Journal of Psychiatry*, vol. 50, no. sup37, pp. 47–53, 1996.
- [13] “Behavioral health workforce projections, 2017–2030.” accessed Jul 23, 2023.
- [14] A. Aboraya, “Clinicians’ opinions on the reliability of psychiatric diagnoses in clinical settings,” *Psychiatry (Edgmont)*, vol. 4, no. 11, p. 31, 2007.
- [15] H. N. Garb, “Race bias and gender bias in the diagnosis of psychological disorders,” *Clinical Psychology Review*, vol. 90, p. 102087, 2021.
- [16] R. L. Spitzer *et al.*, “A brief measure for assessing generalized anxiety disorder: the GAD-7,” *Archives of Internal Medicine*, vol. 166, no. 10, pp. 1092–1097, 2006.
- [17] K. Kroenke, R. L. Spitzer, and J. B. Williams, “The PHQ-9: Validity of a brief depression severity measure,” *Journal of General Internal Medicine*, vol. 16, no. 9, pp. 606–613, 2001.
- [18] E. I. Fried, J. K. Flake, and D. J. Robinaugh, “Revisiting the theoretical and methodological foundations of depression measurement,” *Nature Reviews Psychology*, vol. 1, no. 6, pp. 358–368, 2022.
- [19] R. O. Cotes *et al.*, “Multimodal assessment of schizophrenia and depression utilizing video, acoustic, locomotor, electroencephalographic, and heart rate technology: Protocol for an observational study,” *JMIR Res Protoc*, vol. 11, no. 7, p. e36417, Jul 2022.
- [20] Z. Jiang *et al.*, “Classifying major depressive disorder and response to deep brain stimulation over time by analyzing facial expressions,” *IEEE Transactions on Biomedical Engineering*, pp. 1–1, 2020.
- [21] G. Stratou *et al.*, “Automatic nonverbal behavior indicators of depression and PTSD: the effect of gender,” *Journal on Multimodal User Interfaces*, vol. 9, no. 1, pp. 17–29, 2015.
- [22] E. G. Pintelas *et al.*, “A review of machine learning prediction methods for anxiety disorders,” in *Proceedings of the 8th International Conference on Software Development and Technologies for Enhancing Accessibility and Fighting Info-exclusion*, 2018, pp. 8–15.
- [23] Z. Jiang *et al.*, “Utilizing computer vision for facial behavior analysis in schizophrenia studies: A systematic review,” *PLOS ONE*, vol. 17, no. 4, p. e0266828, Apr. 2022.
- [24] E. Reinertsen *et al.*, “Continuous assessment of schizophrenia using heart rate and accelerometer data,” *Physiological Measurement*, vol. 38, no. 7, p. 1456, 2017.
- [25] S. Harati *et al.*, “Classifying depression severity in recovery from major depressive disorder via dynamic facial features,” *IEEE Journal of Biomedical and Health Informatics*, vol. 24, no. 3, pp. 815–824, 2020.
- [26] S. Harati *et al.*, “Depression severity classification from speech emotion,” in *Proc. Annual Int. Conf. of the IEEE Engineering in Medicine and Biology Society (EMBC)*, 2018, pp. 5763–5766.
- [27] D. J. France *et al.*, “Acoustical properties of speech as indicators of depression and suicidal risk,” *IEEE transactions on Biomedical Engineering*, vol. 47, no. 7, pp. 829–837, 2000.
- [28] A. Qayyum *et al.*, “High-density electroencephalography and speech signal based deep framework for clinical depression diagnosis,” *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Computational Biology and Bioinformatics*, 2023.

- [29] U. Ahmed, J. C.-W. Lin, and G. Srivastava, "Graph attention-based curriculum learning for mental healthcare classification," *IEEE Journal of Biomedical and Health Informatics*, 2023.
- [30] A. S. Cakmak *et al.*, "Classification and prediction of post-trauma outcomes related to ptsd using circadian rhythm changes measured via wrist-worn research watch in a large longitudinal cohort," *IEEE journal of biomedical and health informatics*, vol. 25, no. 8, pp. 2866–2876, 2021.
- [31] "Detecting bipolar depression from geographic location data," *IEEE Transactions on Biomedical Engineering*, vol. 64, no. 8, pp. 1761–1771, 2016.
- [32] G. Valenza *et al.*, "Wearable monitoring for mood recognition in bipolar disorder based on history-dependent long-term heart rate variability analysis," *IEEE Journal of Biomedical and Health Informatics*, vol. 18, no. 5, pp. 1625–1635, 2013.
- [33] J. A. Boscarino and J. Chang, "Electrocardiogram abnormalities among men with stress-related psychiatric disorders: Implications for coronary heart disease and clinical research," *Annals of Behavioral Medicine*, vol. 21, no. 3, pp. 227–234, 1999.
- [34] U. R. Acharya *et al.*, "Computer-aided diagnosis of depression using EEG signals," *European Neurology*, vol. 73, no. 5-6, pp. 329–336, 2015.
- [35] Y. Zhang *et al.*, "Identification of psychiatric disorder subtypes from functional connectivity patterns in resting-state electroencephalography," *Nature Biomedical Engineering*, vol. 5, no. 4, pp. 309–323, 2021.
- [36] J. H. Yoon *et al.*, "Automated classification of fMRI during cognitive control identifies more severely disorganized subjects with schizophrenia," *Schizophrenia Research*, vol. 135, no. 1-3, pp. 28–33, 2012.
- [37] Y. Du *et al.*, "NeuroMark: An automated and adaptive ICA based pipeline to identify reproducible fMRI markers of brain disorders," *NeuroImage: Clinical*, vol. 28, p. 102375, 2020.
- [38] H. Song *et al.*, "Automatic schizophrenic discrimination on fNIRS by using complex brain network analysis and SVM," *BMC Medical Informatics and Decision Making*, vol. 17, pp. 1–9, 2017.
- [39] I. Moura *et al.*, "Digital phenotyping of mental health using multimodal sensing of multiple situations of interest: A systematic literature review," *Journal of Biomedical Informatics*, p. 104278, 2022.
- [40] E. Garcia-Ceja *et al.*, "Mental health monitoring with multimodal sensing and machine learning: A survey," *Pervasive and Mobile Computing*, vol. 51, pp. 1–26, 2018.
- [41] R. Gupta *et al.*, "Multimodal prediction of affective dimensions and depression in human-computer interactions," in *Proc. ACM Int. Workshop on Audio/Visual Emotion Challenge*, 2014, pp. 33–40.
- [42] S. Ghosh, M. Chatterjee, and L.-P. Morency, "A multimodal context-based approach for distress assessment," in *Proc. ACM Int. Conf. Multimodal Interaction*, 2014, pp. 240–246.
- [43] X. Zhang *et al.*, "Multimodal depression detection: Fusion of electroencephalography and paralinguistic behaviors using a novel strategy for classifier ensemble," *IEEE Journal of Biomedical and Health Informatics*, vol. 23, no. 6, pp. 2265–2275, 2019.
- [44] D. M. Mann *et al.*, "COVID-19 transforms health care through telemedicine: Evidence from the field," *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association*, vol. 27, no. 7, pp. 1132–1135, 2020.
- [45] J. J. Moffatt and D. S. Eley, "The reported benefits of telehealth for rural Australians," *Australian Health Review*, vol. 34, no. 3, pp. 276–281, 2010.
- [46] N. R. Cunningham *et al.*, "Addressing pediatric mental health using telehealth during coronavirus disease-2019 and beyond: A narrative review," *Academic Pediatrics*, vol. 21, no. 7, pp. 1108–1117, 2021.
- [47] S. Sultana and J. A. Pagán, "Use of telehealth to address depression and anxiety in low-income us populations: A narrative review," *Journal of Primary Care & Community Health*, vol. 14, p. 21501319231168036, 2023.
- [48] J. Wright-Berryman *et al.*, "Virtually screening adults for depression, anxiety, and suicide risk using machine learning and language from an open-ended interview," *Frontiers in Psychiatry*, vol. 14, p. 1143175, 2023.
- [49] A. Abbas *et al.*, "Computer vision-based assessment of motor functioning in schizophrenia: Use of smartphones for remote measurement of schizophrenia symptomatology," *Digital Biomarkers*, vol. 5, no. 1, pp. 29–36, 2021.
- [50] F. Matcham *et al.*, "Remote assessment of disease and relapse in major depressive disorder (RADAR-MDD): Recruitment, retention, and data availability in a longitudinal remote measurement study," *BMC Psychiatry*, vol. 22, no. 1, p. 136, 2022.
- [51] A. Vaswani *et al.*, "Attention is all you need," *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 30, 2017.
- [52] R. J. Moretti and E. D. Rossini, *The Thematic Apperception Test (TAT)*, ser. Comprehensive handbook of psychological assessment, Vol. 2: Personality assessment. Hoboken, NJ, US: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 2004, pp. 356–371.
- [53] A. L. Benton, K. deS, and A. B. Sivan, *Multilingual aphasia examination*. AJA Associates, 1994.
- [54] H. Goodglass and E. Kaplan, *The assessment of aphasia and related disorders*. Lea & Febiger, 1972.
- [55] D. V. Sheehan *et al.*, "The mini-international neuropsychiatric interview (MINI): the development and validation of a structured diagnostic psychiatric interview for DSM-IV and ICD-10," *Journal of Clinical Psychiatry*, vol. 59, no. 20, pp. 22–33, 1998.
- [56] S. R. Cohen *et al.*, "Measuring the quality of life of people at the end of life: The McGill quality of life questionnaire-revised," *Palliative Medicine*, vol. 31, no. 2, pp. 120–129, 2017.
- [57] Z. Jiang *et al.*, "Automated analysis of facial emotions in subjects with cognitive impairment," *PLOS ONE*, vol. 17, no. 1, p. e0262527, Jan. 2022.
- [58] J. Deng *et al.*, "Retinaface: Single-stage dense face localisation in the wild," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1905.00641*, 2019.
- [59] K. He *et al.*, "Deep residual learning for image recognition," in *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2016, pp. 770–778.
- [60] S. Yang *et al.*, "WIDER face: A face detection benchmark," in *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2016, pp. 5525–5533.
- [61] K. Simonyan and A. Zisserman, "Very deep convolutional networks for large-scale image recognition," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1409.1556*, 2014.
- [62] A. Mollahosseini, B. Hasani, and M. H. Mahoor, "Affectnet: A database for facial expression, valence, and arousal computing in the wild," *IEEE Transactions on Affective Computing*, vol. 10, no. 1, pp. 18–31, 2017.
- [63] O. Langner *et al.*, "Presentation and validation of the Radboud Faces Database," *Cognition and Emotion*, vol. 24, no. 8, pp. 1377–1388, 2010.
- [64] Z. Shao *et al.*, "JAA-Net: Joint facial action unit detection and face alignment via adaptive attention," *International Journal of Computer Vision*, vol. 129, pp. 321–340, 2021.
- [65] P. Ekman and W. V. Friesen, "Facial action coding system," *Environmental Psychology & Nonverbal Behavior*, 1978.
- [66] X. Zhang *et al.*, "BP4D-spontaneous: A high-resolution spontaneous 3D dynamic facial expression database," *Image and Vision Computing*, vol. 32, no. 10, pp. 692–706, 2014.
- [67] M. Oquab *et al.*, "DINOv2: Learning robust visual features without supervision," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.07193*, 2023.
- [68] A. Dosovitskiy *et al.*, "An image is worth 16x16 words: Transformers for image recognition at scale," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.11929*, 2020.
- [69] K. Soomro, A. R. Zamir, and M. Shah, "UCF101: A dataset of 101 human actions classes from videos in the wild," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1212.0402*, 2012.
- [70] S. Seyed *et al.*, "A comparison of HIPAA-compliant transcription services for psychiatric interviews," *under review, available at <https://psyarxiv.com/vyz9p/>*, 2023.
- [71] L. Corbin *et al.*, "A comparison of linguistic patterns between individuals with current major depressive disorder, past major depressive disorder, and those without major depressive disorder in a virtual, psychiatric research interview," *Journal of Affective Disorders Reports*, 2023.
- [72] Y. Liu *et al.*, "RoBERTa: A robustly optimized bert pretraining approach," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1907.11692*, 2019.
- [73] J. Hartmann, "Emotion english DistilRoBERTa-base," <https://huggingface.co/j-hartmann/emotion-english-distilroberta-base/>, 2022.
- [74] J. Hartmann *et al.*, "More than a feeling: Accuracy and application of sentiment analysis," *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, vol. 40, no. 1, pp. 75–87, 2023.
- [75] F. Ahmad *et al.*, "A deep learning architecture for psychometric natural language processing," *ACM Transactions on Information Systems (TOIS)*, vol. 38, no. 1, pp. 1–29, 2020.
- [76] H. Touvron *et al.*, "LLAMA: Open and efficient foundation language models," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.13971*, 2023.
- [77] T. Giannakopoulos, "pyAudioAnalysis: An open-source python library for audio signal analysis," *PLoS One*, vol. 10, no. 12, 2015.
- [78] S. Chen *et al.*, "WavLM: Large-scale self-supervised pre-training for full stack speech processing," *IEEE Journal of Selected Topics in Signal Processing*, vol. 16, no. 6, pp. 1505–1518, 2022.
- [79] S.-w. Yang *et al.*, "SUPERB: Speech processing universal performance benchmark," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2105.01051*, 2021.

- [80] G. Boccignone *et al.*, “pyVHR: A python framework for remote photoplethysmography,” *PeerJ Computer Science*, vol. 8, p. e929, 2022.
- [81] —, “An open framework for remote-PPG methods and their assessment,” *IEEE Access*, pp. 1–1, 2020.
- [82] C. A. Casado and M. B. López, “Face2PPG: An unsupervised pipeline for blood volume pulse extraction from faces,” *IEEE Journal of Biomedical and Health Informatics*, 2023.
- [83] A. N. Vest *et al.*, “An open source benchmarked toolbox for cardiovascular waveform and interval analysis,” *Physiological Measurement*, vol. 39, no. 10, p. 105004, 2018.
- [84] S. Linderman *et al.*, “SSM: Bayesian learning and inference for state space models,” Oct. 2020.
- [85] H. Ma, M. Cai, and H. Wang, “Emotional blunting in patients with major depressive disorder: A brief non-systematic review of current research,” *Frontiers in Psychiatry*, vol. 12, p. 792960, 2021.
- [86] F. Trémeau *et al.*, “Facial expressiveness in patients with schizophrenia compared to depressed patients and nonpatient comparison subjects,” *American Journal of Psychiatry*, vol. 162, no. 1, pp. 92–101, 2005.
- [87] L. M. Bylsma, B. H. Morris, and J. Rottenberg, “A meta-analysis of emotional reactivity in major depressive disorder,” *Clinical Psychology Review*, vol. 28, no. 4, pp. 676–691, 2008.
- [88] H. Davies *et al.*, “Facial expression to emotional stimuli in non-psychotic disorders: A systematic review and meta-analysis,” *Neuroscience & Biobehavioral Reviews*, vol. 64, pp. 252–271, 2016.
- [89] G. Valenza *et al.*, “Mood states modulate complexity in heartbeat dynamics: A multiscale entropy analysis,” *Europhysics Letters*, vol. 107, no. 1, p. 18003, 2014.
- [90] L. Zhao *et al.*, “Cardiorespiratory coupling analysis based on entropy and cross-entropy in distinguishing different depression stages,” *Frontiers in Physiology*, vol. 10, p. 359, 2019.
- [91] K. M. Hasib *et al.*, “Depression detection from social networks data based on machine learning and deep learning techniques: An interrogative survey,” *IEEE Transactions on Computational Social Systems*, 2023.
- [92] K. Yang, R. Y. Lau, and A. Abbasi, “Getting personal: a deep learning artifact for text-based measurement of personality,” *Information Systems Research*, vol. 34, no. 1, pp. 194–222, 2023.
- [93] J. W. Weeks *et al.*, ““The sound of fear”: Assessing vocal fundamental frequency as a physiological indicator of social anxiety disorder,” *Journal of Anxiety Disorders*, vol. 26, no. 8, pp. 811–822, 2012.
- [94] A. J. Grippo and A. K. Johnson, “Stress, depression and cardiovascular dysregulation: A review of neurobiological mechanisms and the integration of research from preclinical disease models,” *Stress*, vol. 12, no. 1, pp. 1–21, 2009.
- [95] S. Byun *et al.*, “Detection of major depressive disorder from linear and nonlinear heart rate variability features during mental task protocol,” *Computers in Biology and Medicine*, vol. 112, p. 103381, 2019.
- [96] X. Zang *et al.*, “End-to-end depression recognition based on a one-dimensional convolution neural network model using two-lead ECG signal,” *Journal of Medical and Biological Engineering*, vol. 42, no. 2, pp. 225–233, 2022.
- [97] J. Devlin *et al.*, “BERT: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.04805*, 2018.
- [98] T. Brown *et al.*, “Language models are few-shot learners,” *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 33, pp. 1877–1901, 2020.
- [99] OpenAI, “GPT-4 technical report,” 2023.
- [100] C. Lau, X. Zhu, and W.-Y. Chan, “Automatic depression severity assessment with deep learning using parameter-efficient tuning,” *Frontiers in Psychiatry*, vol. 14, p. 1160291, 2023.
- [101] N. Farruque *et al.*, “Depression symptoms modelling from social media text: A semi-supervised learning approach,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2209.02765*, 2022.
- [102] Y. Zheng *et al.*, “General facial representation learning in a visual-linguistic manner,” in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2022, pp. 18 697–18 709.
- [103] Z. Cai *et al.*, “MARLIN: Masked autoencoder for facial video representation learning,” in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2023, pp. 1493–1504.
- [104] H. Touvron *et al.*, “LLAMA 2: Open foundation and fine-tuned chat models,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.09288*, 2023.
- [105] W. K. Goodman, T. K. Murphy, and E. A. Storch, “Risk of adverse behavioral effects with pediatric use of antidepressants,” *Psychopharmacology*, vol. 191, pp. 87–96, 2007.
- [106] J. S. Buyukdura, S. M. McClintock, and P. E. Croarkin, “Psychomotor retardation in depression: Biological underpinnings, measurement, and treatment,” *Progress in Neuro-Psychopharmacology and Biological Psychiatry*, vol. 35, no. 2, pp. 395–409, 2011.
- [107] J. P. Halper and J. J. Mann, “Cardiovascular effects of antidepressant medications,” *The British Journal of Psychiatry*, vol. 153, no. S3, pp. 87–98, 1988.
- [108] R. C. Schwartz and D. M. Blankenship, “Racial disparities in psychotic disorder diagnosis: A review of empirical literature,” *World Journal of Psychiatry*, vol. 4, no. 4, p. 133, 2014.
- [109] D. R. Goldsmith *et al.*, “An update on promising biomarkers in schizophrenia,” *Focus*, vol. 16, no. 2, pp. 153–163, 2018.
- [110] C. C. Lewis *et al.*, “Implementing measurement-based care in behavioral health: A review,” *JAMA Psychiatry*, vol. 76, no. 3, pp. 324–335, 2019.
- [111] S. Berendsen *et al.*, “Burying our heads in the sand: the neglected importance of reporting inter-rater reliability in antipsychotic medication trials,” *Schizophrenia Bulletin*, vol. 46, no. 5, pp. 1027–1029, 2020.
- [112] M. E. Rodríguez-Rivas *et al.*, “Innovative technology-based interventions to reduce stigma toward people with mental illness: Systematic review and meta-analysis,” *JMIR Serious Games*, vol. 10, no. 2, p. e35099, 2022.