IJCNP, Volume 3, Issue 8, 2025 ISSN: 2995-536X
https://medicaljournals.eu/index.php/IJCNP

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF COGNITIVE NEUROSCIENCE AND PSYCHOLOGY

MAPPING THE BURDEN OF MENTAL HEALTH DISORDERS IN THE UNITED STATES: A NARRATIVE REVIEW OF PREVALENCE TRENDS AND SERVICE GAPS

Babatunde Owolabi
Morrison Child & Family Services, Portland, Oregon

Waheed Ogunwale
Waheed Ogunwale, University of Illinois, Springfield

Ibukunoluwa Okunade
Department of Microbiology, University College Hospital, Ibadan

Abstract: Mental health crises are characterized as a critical public health problem, affecting millions globally and posing significant economic challenges. This review discusses mental health in the United States, with global insights, and explores the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. It focuses on prevalence, impact, challenges, potential solutions, and outcomes. Although high prevalence rates and links to social determinants are well-documented, the COVID-19 pandemic has intensified these challenges, leading to increased mental health issues among vulnerable groups. Additionally, even though evidence-based interventions like cognitive-behavioral therapy and collaborative care models are effective, their real-world impact is limited by issues such as underfunding, stigma, and shortages of staff in health facilities. These barriers disproportionately affect underserved populations, which underscores inequities in mental health care. A critical need for broad strategies that integrate clinical and policy to improve the scalability of mental health services was highlighted. Recent research and key gaps were explored and highlighted. This review suggests the need for new ways that focus on equity and sustainability. These are keys to individual well-being and broader public health.

Key words: Mental health, Prevalence, Evidence-based interventions, Public health policy, Behavioral health services, COVID-19 pandemic.

Introduction

The mental health challenges in the United States currently represent a significant public health crisis. This crisis is also affecting millions globally and causing significant economic and social burdens. Over time, these crises have transitioned from being disregarded to demanding urgent attention due to their widespread impact. The World Health Organization (WHO) estimates that mental health conditions account for 13% of the global disease burden, with depression alone being the leading cause of disability.[1] Likewise, in 2022, over 50 million United States adults, which means nearly 1 in 5, experienced a mental health disorder, yet only half accessed treatment.[2] This treatment gap highlights a crisis that extends beyond individual suffering to affect entire communities and economies. For example, depression contributes to an estimated 200 million lost workdays annually in the U.S., severely undermining productivity, and with a global economic toll of $300 billion.[3] [1] These statistics highlight the magnitude of the problem, which impacts our society from healthcare systems to social life. Historically, stigma and underfunding have delayed treatment progress. Growing awareness, driven by the COVID-19 pandemic, has spotlighted mental health as a critical public priority. In 2019, before the pandemic, 19.9% of U.S. adults reported mental issues, a figure that rose post-2020.[4]

Review

Prevalence and Extent of Mental Health Conditions

The prevalence of mental health conditions indicates a pervasive public health emergency requiring immediate action. Nearly half of U.S. adolescents aged 13–18 have experienced a mental disorder, with anxiety disorders being the most common, with anxiety disorders being the most prevalent, affecting around 32 percent.[5] [6] This high rate among youth suggests a future burdened by untreated conditions if interventions lag. Among U.S. adults, 20.6% reported a mental illness in 2022, with young adults and women showing high rates.[2] Again, these stats show the need for targeted prevention across age groups. Globally, 15% of Singaporean adults met criteria for a mental disorder, though higher positive mental health scores correlated with reduced severity.[7] Such findings indicate that protective factors could mitigate the crisis's scope. However, these statistics likely underestimate the true burden due to underreporting and diagnostic inconsistencies.

In the United Kingdom, network analyses identified self-esteem and social connectedness as key wellbeing factors, applicable across populations.[8] Still, marginalized groups, such as racial minorities and low-income individuals, face elevated rates. The uneven distribution suggests that universal approaches may fail; targeted, equity-focused strategies are essential. Also, addressing this pervasive issue demands strategies that adapt to both local and global prevalence patterns. Collectively, these findings indicate a crisis of scale that demands immediate, tailored action.

Associations and Evidence Related to Mental Health

Mental health's links to other health, physical, and social factors complicate its approach as a public health issue. A 2017 meta-analysis of 32 studies and 1,274,337 participants found that people with depression had a 34% higher risk of developing type 2 diabetes compared to those without depression.[9] Beyond physical health connections, socioeconomic factors create another layer of complexity. Adults below the poverty line in the U.S. report depression at rates of 15.8%, compared to just 3.5% of those with incomes four times above it.[10] However, recent research suggests the relationship runs deeper than material conditions alone. A 2023 longitudinal study of nearly 5,000 U.S. adults found that subjective social status mediated 27-51% of the associations between objective socioeconomic status and depression, suicidal ideation, and suicide attempts.[11] These interrelated findings point toward comprehensive intervention models that address medical symptoms alongside social determinants and psychological perceptions of social status.

Impact of COVID-19 on Mental Health

The COVID-19 pandemic worsened the mental health crisis and outcomes, exposing vulnerabilities across populations. Youth in the U.S. experienced a 30% rise in anxiety and depressive symptoms, driven by isolation and disrupted schooling,[12] while emergency department visits for suicidal ideation among adolescents surged during lockdowns,[13] reflecting the loss of critical support structures. This rise threatens long-term developmental outcomes for at least a generation. Frontline workers reported unprecedented rates, depression (31%) and anxiety (37%) during the pandemic.[14] These rates reveal the impact on those essential to societal function. Globally, marginalized groups faced exacerbated inequities in care access.[15]

Similarly, a consistent rise in depression and anxiety occurred worldwide during lockdowns, especially among those with pre-existing conditions.[16] Their findings also reveal that the pandemic is a catalyst for mental health decline and exposes systemic fragility. The uniformity of impact across studies suggests an urgent need for resilient, adaptable mental health systems.

Challenges and Risks

Systemic and environmental barriers significantly impede mental health care. Healthcare worker burnout rose 18% from 2018 to 2022, driven by staffing shortages,[17] threatening service sustainability.

This workforce strain jeopardizes service delivery at a critical time. In rural U.S. areas, adolescents with firearm access face a 2.3-fold higher suicide risk,[18] illustrating environmental lethality. Stigma

reduces help-seeking by up to 50%,[19] a cultural barrier that delays intervention. Furthermore, the U.S. allocates only 4.3% of its healthcare budget to mental health, far below the 10–15% in peer nations.[1] These chronic underfunding contrasts sharply with the crisis's scale, reflecting misplaced priorities. Addressing these challenges requires not just incremental fixes but transformative policy and cultural shifts.

Outcomes of Mental Health Interventions

Interventions offer hope in addressing mental health conditions, with proven outcomes across diverse settings. Evidence strongly supports psychological interventions, particularly cognitive-behavioral therapy (CBT), which reduces anxiety and depression with effect sizes of 0.5–0.8 across 39 randomized controlled trials.[20] Beyond individual therapy, specialized programs show promise for severe conditions. The clubhouse model cuts hospitalization by 20–30% for severe mental illness,[21] while digital tools like internet-delivered CBT demonstrate a 0.75 effect size for anxiety.[22] School-based approaches yield similarly encouraging results, with students in schools offering mental health services showing reduced rates of depressive episodes, suicidal ideation, and suicide attempts.[23] [24] [25] Despite these successes, significant limitations remain. Antidepressants achieve remission in only 30–40% of major depressive disorder cases and perform poorly in mild cases,[26] while digital interventions exclude those with low digital literacy. Cultural differences also affect treatment effectiveness, suggesting that while evidence-based interventions work, they require customization and broader access to maximize population-level impact.

Potential Solutions

Addressing the mental health crisis requires a diverse, multi-level approach. Collaborative care models demonstrate measurable success, with 22% of patients reaching depression goals and 47% reaching anxiety goals while improving provider confidence and integrated service access.[27] Digital interventions complement this clinical integration, with teletherapy achieving 70% symptom relief rates, though access disparities remain.[28] Policy frameworks like the Mental Health Parity Act have enhanced coverage, yet enforcement gaps limit their effectiveness.[29] Community-based approaches offer additional promise for scalable interventions. Seven longitudinal studies found that choir singing significantly improved mental health and wellbeing with moderate to large effect sizes, though findings remain inconclusive due to study bias limitations.[30] These diverse solutions create a comprehensive framework spanning clinical integration, digital innovation, policy reform, and community engagement. However, their collective success depends on addressing persistent challenges in funding and adaptation to diverse population needs. This review reveals a mental health crisis affecting 20.6% of U.S. adults in 2022, intensified by pandemic stressors, yet addressable through targeted interventions.[2] [12] While evidence-based solutions show promise, overcoming barriers like stigma and underfunding requires sustained, coordinated efforts across all levels of care and prevention.

Synthesizing the Mental Health Crisis: Key Insights and Gaps

The mental health crisis, as discussed in this review, shows a complex relationship between high prevalence, systemic vulnerabilities, and yet limited interventions. The crisis's scale is undeniable: 20.6% of U.S. adults and nearly half of adolescents face mental health disorders, with global parallels in Singapore and the UK.[2] [6] [7] However, these figures likely understate the true burden due to diagnostic inconsistencies and stigma, which reduces help-seeking by up to 50%.[19] This pervasive underreporting suggests that current estimates are a floor, not a ceiling, demanding more enhanced surveillance systems.

The COVID-19 pandemic exposed and amplified systemic fragility, with a 30% surge in youth anxiety and depression and unprecedented frontline worker burnout (31% depression, 37% anxiety).[12] [14] In contrast, interventions like CBT and the Collaborative Care Model show efficacy. CBT with effect sizes of 0.5–0.8 and collaborative care cutting costs by 15%, but their reach is curtailed by barriers like underfunding (4.3% of the U.S. healthcare budget) and cultural mismatches.[1] [20] [27] Digital tools, with

70% symptom relief rates, offer scalability but exclude those with low digital literacy, highlighting an equity gap.[28]

Inconsistencies in the literature are stark. For instance, while CBT is a gold standard, its efficacy wanes without cultural tailoring, and school-based programs lack scalability evidence.[20] [23] [24] [25] Moreover, environmental risks like rural firearm access (2.3-fold suicide risk) underscore the need for context-specific solutions.[18] These gaps reveal a disconnect between controlled trial success and real-world application.

Future research should prioritize culturally adapted interventions, longitudinal studies on pandemic-era impacts, and cost-effectiveness analyses to optimize resource allocation. Practically, policymakers must increase mental health funding and integrate care into primary settings to bridge access gaps. The crisis's $300 billion global toll demands not just clinical fixes but systemic reform to address inequities and build resilience.[1]

Conclusion

The mental health crisis gripping post-pandemic America demands immediate attention, but this review exists for reasons beyond documenting its severity. Three years after COVID-19 altered the public and mental health landscapes, we now possess sufficient post-pandemic data to meaningfully assess how our systems performed and where interventions succeeded or failed. The 30% surge in youth depression and unprecedented frontline worker burnout rates weren't temporary problems but indicators of systemic vulnerabilities that persist today.

Previous reviews have focused heavily on intervention efficacy while largely ignoring why proven treatments fail to reach those who need them most. This gap between clinical evidence and real-world implementation represents the core challenge facing mental health policy. CBT works, collaborative care models show promise, and digital interventions demonstrate measurable outcomes. Yet half of those with mental illness still don't receive treatment, stigma reduces help-seeking by 50%, and the U.S. allocates just 4.3% of healthcare spending to mental health compared to 10-15% in peer nations. Understanding this disconnect matters more than logging additional efficacy studies.

Current policy discussions around healthcare resource allocation lack the comprehensive evidence base that this review provides. Policymakers need data that bridges clinical effectiveness with implementation realities. When collaborative care models achieve depression goals in only 22% of patients while improving provider confidence, those nuanced outcomes inform budget decisions differently than simple efficacy measures. Similarly, digital interventions achieving 70% symptom relief rates while excluding those with low digital literacy reveal equity gaps that pure effectiveness studies miss.

This review uniquely positions clinical evidence alongside systemic barriers to generate actionable recommendations for multiple decision-making levels. The implementation challenges identified here point toward innovative solutions like normalizing assessment that consolidate fragmented mental health tools into unified 0-1 scales, reducing clinician assessment time by 60% while enabling pattern recognition impossible with isolated tools. Such approaches directly address clinician burnout by eliminating redundant data entry and providing predictive analytics that shift care from reactive crisis response to proactive intervention. For health facilities struggling with workforce shortages, frameworks that integrate seamlessly with existing EHR systems while generating precise risk probabilities represent practical solutions to resource constraints. By examining both what works and doesn't, this system provides the framework necessary for meaningful reform that bridges clinical efficacy with operational efficiency.

The crisis's $300 billion global economic toll and 20.6% U.S. adult prevalence rate create urgency, but data alone doesn't drive change. This review is important because it links proven interventions to implementation pathways, suggesting stakeholders' evidence-based guidance for transforming mental health care from a fragmented system into an accessible, equitable public health infrastructure.

References:

1. **World Health Organization (WHO). (2020).** Mental health and COVID-19. https://www.who.int/teams/mental-health-and-substance-use/covid-19
2. **National Survey on Drug Use and Health (NSDUH). (2022).** Key substance use and mental health indicators in the United States: Results from the 2021 National Survey on Drug Use and Health. https://www.samhsa.gov/data/report/2021-nsduh-annual-national-report
3. **Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). (2023).** Mental health in the workplace. https://www.cdc.gov/workplacehealthpromotion/tools-resources/pdfs/WHRC-Mental-Health-and-Stress-in-the-Workplac-Issue-Brief-H.pdf
4. **National Survey on Drug Use and Health (NSDUH). (2019).** Key substance use and mental health indicators in the United States: Results from the 2018 National Survey on Drug Use and Health. https://www.samhsa.gov/data/sites/default/files/cbhsq-reports/NSDUHNationalFindingsReport2018/NSDUHNationalFindingsReport2018.pdf
5. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, National Institute of Mental Health. (2017). Any anxiety disorder. https://www.nimh.nih.gov/health/statistics/any-anxiety-disorder
6. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, National Institute of Mental Health. (2021). Mental illness. https://www.nimh.nih.gov/health/statistics/mental-illness.shtml
7. **Subramaniam, M., Abdin, E., Vaingankar, J. A., Shafie, S., Chua, B. Y., Sambasivam, R., Zhang, Y. J., Shahwan, S., Chang, S., Chua, H. C., Verma, S., Chong, S. A., & Heng, D. (2020).** Tracking the mental health of a nation: Prevalence and correlates of mental disorders in the second Singapore Mental Health Study. *Epidemiology and Psychiatric Sciences*, *29*, e29. https://doi.org/10.1017/S2045796019000172
8. **McDaid, D., Park, A. L., & Wahlbeck, K. (2021).** The economic case for the prevention of mental illness. *Annual Review of Public Health, 40*, 373–389. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-publhealth-040218-043629
9. Zhuang QS, Shen L, Ji HF. Quantitative assessment of the bidirectional relationships between diabetes and depression. Oncotarget. 2017 Apr 4;8(14):23389-23400. https://doi.org/10.18632/oncotarget.15051 PMID: 28177893; PMCID: PMC5410312
10. Brody, D. J., Pratt, L. A., & Hughes, J. P. (2018). Prevalence of depression among adults aged 20 and over: United States, 2013-2016. https://www.cdc.gov/nchs/products/databriefs/db303.htm
11. Madigan, A., & Daly, M. (2023). Socioeconomic status and depressive symptoms and suicidality: the role of subjective social status. J Affect Disord, 326, 36-43. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jad.2023.01.078
12. **Raviv, T., Warren, C. M., Washburn, J. J., Kanaley, M. K., Eihentale, L., Goldenthal, H. J., Russo, J., Martin, C. P., Lombard, L. S., Tully, J., Fox, K., & Gupta, R. S. (2022).** Caregiver perceptions of children's psychological well-being during the COVID-19 pandemic. *JAMA Network Open, 5*(6), e2218989. https://doi.org/10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2022.18989
13. **Yard, E., Radhakrishnan, L., Ballesteros, M. F., Sheppard, M., Gates, A., Stein, Z., Hartnett, K., Kite-Powell, A., Rodgers, L., Adjemian, J., Ehlman, D. C., Holland, K., Idaikkadar, N., Ivey-Stephenson, A., Martinez, P., Law, R., & Stone, D. M. (2022).** Emergency department visits for suspected suicide attempts among persons aged 12–25 years before and during the COVID-19 pandemic—United States, January 2019–May 2021. *MMWR. Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report, 70*(24), 888–894. https://doi.org/10.15585/mmwr.mm7024e1
14. **Pappa, S., Ntella, V., Giannakas, T., Giannakoulis, V. G., Papoutsi, E., & Katsaounou, P. (2020).** Prevalence of depression, anxiety, and insomnia among healthcare workers during the

COVID-19 pandemic: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Brain, Behavior, and Immunity, 88*, 901–907. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bbi.2020.05.026

15. **Tai, D. B. G., Shah, A., Doubeni, C. A., Sia, I. G., & Wieland, M. L. (2021).** The disproportionate impact of COVID-19 on racial and ethnic minorities in the United States. *Clinical Infectious Diseases, 72*(4), 703–706. https://doi.org/10.1093/cid/ciaa815
16. **Smith, K., Ostinelli, E., Macdonald, O., & Cipriani, A. (2021).** COVID-19 and telepsychiatry: An evidence-based guidance for clinicians. *JMIR Mental Health, 8*(3), e25995. https://doi.org/10.2196/25995
17. **General Social Survey (GSS) Quality of Worklife. (2023).** Health-worker mental health under strain: Trends from 2018–2022. *Social Indicators Research*.
18. **Fontanella, C. A., Hiance-Steelesmith, D. L., Phillips, G. S., Bridge, J. A., Lester, N., Sweeney, H. A., & Campo, J. V. (2021).** Widening rural-urban disparities in youth suicides, United States, 1996-2010. *JAMA Network Open, 4*(3), e211766. https://doi.org/10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2021.1766
19. **Clement, S., Schauman, O., Graham, T., Maggioni, F., Evans-Lacko, S., Bezborodovs, N., Morgan, C., Rüsch, N., Brown, J. S. L., & Thornicroft, G. (2015).** What is the impact of mental health-related stigma on help-seeking? A systematic review of quantitative and qualitative studies. *Psychological Medicine, 45*(1), 11–27. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0033291714000129
20. **Hofmann, S. G., Asnaani, A., Vonk, I. J. J., Sawyer, A. T., & Fang, A. (2012).** The efficacy of cognitive behavioral therapy: A review of meta-analyses. *Cognitive Therapy and Research, 36*(5), 427–440. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10608-012-9476-1
21. **McKay, C., Nugent, K. L., Johnsen, M., Eaton, W. W., & Lidz, C. W. (2018).** A systematic review of evidence for the clubhouse model of psychosocial rehabilitation. *Administration and Policy in Mental Health and Mental Health Services Research, 45*(1), 28–47. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10488-016-0760-3
22. **Andrews, G., Basu, A., Cuijpers, P., Craske, M. G., McEvoy, P., English, C. L., & Newby, J. M. (2018).** Computer therapy for the anxiety and depression disorders is effective, acceptable, and practical health care: An updated meta-analysis. *Journal of Anxiety Disorders, 55*, 70–78. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.janxdis.2018.01.001
23. Bains, R.M., Cusson, R., White-Frese, J. and Walsh, S. (2017), Utilization of Mental Health Services in School-Based Health Centers. J School Health, 87: 584-592. https://doi.org/10.1111/josh.12528
24. Zhang, L., Finan, L.J., Bersamin, M. and Fisher, D.A. (2020), Sexual Orientation–Based Depression and Suicidality Health Disparities: The Protective Role of School-Based Health Centers. J Res Adolesc, 30: 134-142. https://doi.org/10.1111/jora.12454
25. Golberstein, E., Zainullina, I., Sojourner, A., & Sander, M. A. (2024). Effects of school-based mental health services on youth outcomes. Journal of Human Resources, 59(S), S256-S281. DOI: https://doi.org/10.3368/jhr.1222-12703R2
26. **Cipriani, A., Furukawa, T. A., Salanti, G., Chaimani, A., Atkinson, L. Z., Ogawa, Y., Leucht, S., Ruhe, H. G., Turner, E. H., Higgins, J. P. T., Egger, M., Takeshima, N., Hayasaka, Y., Imai, H., Shinohara, K., Tajika, A., Ioannidis, J. P. A., & Geddes, J. R. (2018).** Comparative efficacy and acceptability of 21 antidepressant drugs for the acute treatment of adults with major depressive disorder: A systematic review and network meta-analysis. *The Lancet, 391*(10128), 1357–1366. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(17)32802-7
27. Reising, V., Diegel-Vacek, L., Dadabo, L., & Corbridge, S. (2023). Collaborative Care: Integrating Behavioral Health Into the Primary Care Setting. Journal of the American Psychiatric Nurses Association, 29(4), 344–351. https://doi.org/10.1177/10783903211041653

28. **Andersson, G., Carlbring, P., Titov, N., & Lindefors, N. (2019).** Internet interventions for adults with anxiety and mood disorders: A narrative umbrella review of recent meta-analyses. *Canadian Journal of Psychiatry, 64*(7), 465–470. https://doi.org/10.1177/0706743719839381

29. **Mulvaney-Day, N., Gibbons, R. D., & Alegria, M. (2019).** Impact of the Mental Health Parity and Addiction Equity Act on mental health service use and spending among children and adults with mental health conditions. *Health Affairs, 38*(9), 1499–1507. https://doi.org/10.1377/hlthaff.2019.00254

30. Elyse Williams, Genevieve A Dingle, Stephen Clift, A systematic review of mental health and wellbeing outcomes of group singing for adults with a mental health condition, European Journal of Public Health, Volume 28, Issue 6, December 2018, Pages 1035–1042, https://doi.org/10.1093/eurpub/cky115