**Link 1:**

* AI models create algorithms to treat therapy patients at varying degrees of accuracy.
* AI models collect data to evaluate a person's physiological state.
* Data examples:
  + Facial expressions
  + Speech
  + Eye blinks
  + Heart beats
  + Etc.
* AI models analyze processed data to identify a person’s emotional profile and advises care accordingly.
* AI models struggle because people are unique.
* AI models heighten biases in its training data.
* In 2020, 60% of people diagnosed with a mental illness went on untreated.
* The United States government expedited the process of developing wellness apps.
  + This was done by obfuscating or omitting the way the app collects data.
  + This lack of transparency is a breach of privacy for users.
* FDA regulations barely monitor health related software.
* Users tend to abandon most health and wellness apps.
* These health and wellness apps are not held by the “Liability and Accountability” act.
* Scientists refute the claims of accuracy advertised by these health and wellness apps.

**Link 2:**

* People’s reliance on AI modals to conversate sometimes loose grip to reality.
  + Almost as though prolonged exposure warps a perception of reality.
* Due to situations like this, OpenAI’s ChatGPT acted as a ‘suicide coach’ to ‘help’ a 16-year-old kill themselves.
* Healthy people are also at risk, not just mentally unstable individuals.
* AI exacerbates delusions.
  + E.g. “find evidence that supports <Delusion>”
* “MIT study found AI LLM encourages delusional thinking. Likely due to their tendency to flatter and agree with users rather than pushing back or providing objective information.”
* It is argued that this is not a flaw, but rather a design to make them addictive for users, and profitable for the organization.

**Link 3:**

* Very few laws exist for minimizing racial profiling in current AI models.
* People use AI to help them right resumes, but company’s also use AI to help with the recruitment process.
  + This trend is on a growth
  + Need systems so that there is no racial profiling/discrimination. We need equal opportunity, but AI fails at that.
  + Private companies claim their AI is getting better at not discriminating, but companies offer little to no evidence to support their claim.
* How is racial profiling tested on open-source models?
  + Ask to reduce the list of applicants to the best suited for the job.
  + Some applications are identical except for name and racial profiling features. (How common a name is to be associated with a race, gender, etc.)
  + System fails at remaining unbiased.
* The result of the research showed evidence supporting significant discrimination based on gender, racial identities, and their intersection.
* Men and women were selected at equal rate in 37% of scenarios:
  + In the rest, men were favored 51.9% of the time and women 11.1% of the time.
* Racial discrimination is even worse:
  + Black and white associated names were selected at equal rate only about 6.3% of the time.
  + White associated names were preferred 85.1% of cases.
  + Black associated names were only preferred in 8.6% of cases.
  + From 37% to 6.3% of equal preferred rates from gender to racial bias highlights the problematic nature of our reliance on current AI models.
* These factors increase disparity in the hiring process
* Any history an applicant has relating to awards concerning disabilities will be less favored and thus is less likely to get employment due to these AI modals.
* It is proposed that developers and employers should adapt policies at various levels of government.
  + The idea is to offer transparency for the “Who”, “What”, “When”, “Where”, and “How” these modals are trained and utilized.
* Need to make information more available about AI’s inferred and exploitation of people based on identity.