

# AI in Elderly Care: Understanding the Implications for Independence and Social Interaction

Daniela Gottschlich<sup>1</sup>, Nadereh Saadati<sup>2\*</sup>, Seyed Alireza Saadati<sup>3</sup>, Ayşe Şahin<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Faculty of Health Sciences, Simon Fraser University, Vancouver, BC, Canada

<sup>2</sup> Department of Psychology and Counseling, KMAN Research Institute, Richmond Hill, Ontario, Canada

<sup>3</sup> Rehabilitation Department, York Rehab Clinic, Toronto, Canada

<sup>4</sup> Department of Counseling & Psychology, Ibn Haldun University, Istanbul, Türkiye

\* Corresponding author email address: danielagottschlich@wayne.edu

---

Editor	Reviewers
Cain C. T. Clark Faculty of Health, Education, and Life Sciences, Birmingham City University, Birmingham, B15 3TN, U.K. scain.clark@coventry.ac.uk	Reviewer 1: Farhad Namjoo Department of Psychology and Counseling, KMAN Research Institute, Richmond Hill, Ontario, Canada. Email: farhadnamjoo@kmanresce.ca Reviewer 2: Hooman Namvar Assistant Professor, Department of Psychology, Saveh Branch, Islamic Azad University, Saveh, Iran. Email: hnamvar@iau-saveh.ac.ir

---

## 1. Round 1

### 1.1 Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

Some sections could be rewritten for clarity, ensuring that all terms are consistently used throughout the manuscript. Technical jargon should be defined when first used.

Tighten the discussion to more directly tie your findings back to the research questions and objectives stated at the outset. Highlight how your study contributes to the existing body of knowledge.

Briefly expand on the ethical considerations section, providing specific examples of ethical dilemmas encountered during your research and how they were resolved.

Elaborate slightly more on the technological challenges theme, particularly on how participants envision overcoming these challenges. This could include mentioning specific technological solutions or approaches suggested by participants.

Enhance the conclusion to more succinctly summarize key findings and their implications for practitioners and policymakers in the field of elderly care and AI integration.

Author revised the manuscript and uploaded the updated document.

## 1.2 Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

The review could benefit from a broader and more critical examination of existing studies on AI in elderly care. This could include contrasting viewpoints and discussing gaps that your study aims to fill.

Provide more detailed justification for the chosen qualitative method and thematic analysis approach. Clarify the criteria used for participant selection and how these criteria ensure a comprehensive exploration of the research questions.

Enhance the explanation of how themes were derived from the data. Adding examples of coding and theme development processes could improve transparency and trustworthiness.

Each theme identified requires a deeper discussion, connecting findings to existing literature. Specifically, the "Technological Challenges and Solutions" theme could be expanded to discuss how these challenges compare with those identified in other settings or studies.

Given the emphasis on ethical and privacy concerns in your findings, a more thorough examination of these aspects, including potential solutions and frameworks from literature, would strengthen the study.

The manuscript would benefit from a more detailed discussion on practical implications, specifically how caregivers and healthcare providers can apply these findings in real-world settings.

While mentioned, this section could be expanded to critically reflect on the study's limitations and its implications for the validity and generalizability of the findings. Suggestions for future research could be more specific, outlining potential studies that could build on your work.

Ensure all references are current and relevant, including recent studies that have advanced the understanding of AI in elderly care post your study's data collection phase.

Author revised the manuscript and uploaded the updated document.

## 2. Revised

Editor's decision after revisions: Accepted.

Editor in Chief's decision: Accepted.