

Voice Assistants for Health Self-Management: Designing for and with Older Adults

AMAMA MAHMOOD, Johns Hopkins University, USA

SHIYE CAO, Johns Hopkins University, USA

MAIA STIBER, Johns Hopkins University, USA

VICTOR NIKHIL ANTONY, Johns Hopkins University, USA

CHIEN-MING HUANG, Johns Hopkins University, USA




Fig. 1. In this work, we identify and address two main challenges in older adults' health self-management: 1) health **awareness** and 2) **adherence** to medical regimens. We co-designed an LLM-powered voice assistant with older adults that uses doctors' after-visit summary to provide debriefs and facilitates the creation of medication reminders.

Supporting older adults in health self-management is crucial for promoting independent aging, particularly given the growing strain on healthcare systems. While voice assistants (VAs) hold the potential to support aging in place, they often lack tailored assistance and present usability challenges. We addressed these issues through a five-stage design process with older adults to develop a personal health assistant. Starting with in-home interviews ($N = 17$), we identified two primary challenges in older adult's health self-management: health *awareness* and medical *adherence*. To address these challenges, we developed a high-fidelity LLM-powered VA prototype to debrief doctor's visit notes and generate tailored medication reminders. We refined our prototype with feedback from co-design workshops ($N = 10$) and validated its usability through in-home studies ($N = 5$). Our work highlights key design features for personal health assistants and provides broader insights into desirable VA characteristics, including personalization, adapting to user context, and respect for user autonomy.

CCS Concepts: • **Human-centered computing** → **Empirical studies in HCI**; • **Computing Methodologies** → **Artificial intelligence**.

Additional Key Words and Phrases: voice assistant, LLMs, voice interactions, ChatGPT, conversational assistants, self-management, health, aging adults, co-design

This is the author's version of the work. It is posted here for your personal use. Not for redistribution.

Authors' Contact Information: Amama Mahmood, amama.mahmood@jhu.edu, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Maryland, USA; Shiye Cao, scao14@jhu.edu, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Maryland, USA; Maia Stiber, mstiber@jhu.edu, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Maryland, USA; Victor Nikhil Antony, vantony1@jhu.edu, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Maryland, USA; Chien-Ming Huang, chienming.huang@jhu.edu, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Maryland, USA.

1 Introduction

Aging gracefully is everyone’s desire yet chronic health conditions often stand in the way. Nearly 95% of the older adult population suffers from at least one chronic ailment, and 80% endure two or more [49]. Managing multiple chronic conditions is a formidable task for the aging population [59, 65], especially for those who live in social isolation and lack a support system—a reality for 31% of women and 19% of men aged 65 and older [52]. Cognitive impairment, affecting one in five older adults [53], further hinders their ability to independently follow health management routines by impairing their understanding, memory, decision-making, and the ability to follow instructions. These challenges are made even more pressing by rapidly growing aging population—by 2030, one in six people globally will be over 60, and the number is expected to double by 2050 [68]. This demographic shift is straining caregivers and healthcare systems, which are increasingly overwhelmed by the demands of caring for older adults [2, 22, 46, 61].

In this landscape, promoting self-care and self-management is crucial for older adults’ well-being and for supporting aging in place [15, 20, 45]. The importance of self-management is underscored by WHO’s introduction of mAgeing (mobile aging), which aims to help older adults maintain functional ability and live as independently and healthily as possible through evidence-based self-management and self-care interventions at a national level [67]. These interventions can empower individuals to take charge of their health, promoting independence and better overall health [27]. While mobile health (mHealth) applications offer promise for supporting self-management, they often face significant usability issues. Many mHealth applications are overly complex and not designed with the needs and preferences of older adults in mind [66]. Voice assistants (VAs) are a promising alternative to support autonomy and improve quality of life [5, 62] as older adults prefer speech-based over text-based interfaces [34, 69]. Despite VAs’ potential to serve as health aids [6, 7, 11, 24, 58, 60], they are also not designed with older adults in mind [63]. Current VA technologies have two main gaps that limit their ability to effectively support self-management:

- *Usability issues*: older adults find it difficult to create and manage event-specific reminders, such as appointment and medication reminders, with voice assistants [6, 40, 60].
- *Lack of user health context*: currently, no commercial VA (e.g., Alexa, Siri) offers personalized medical assistance; these VAs can provide general Q&A about health but lack information tailored to the users’ specific health conditions.

To address these issues in VAs for health self-management, we conducted a five-stage design study with older adults. We started with in-home interviews ($N = 17$) to learn more about older adults’ perspectives on health management, identifying two primary challenges: staying aware of their health status and adhering to health regimens. Based on these insights, we designed and developed a high-fidelity prototype VA by integrating a large language model (GPT-4) into a commercial VA (Alexa), focusing on three key phases: 1) processing patient’s after-visit summary to understand their medical context; 2) debriefing user on the information from the after-visit summary to enhance awareness; and 3) creating tailored medication reminders to improve adherence. To further refine the prototype, we held three co-design workshops ($N = 10$) where participants provided actionable considerations based on their interaction with the initial prototype. We used the insights gathered to refine the VA prototype. Finally, we evaluated the usability and effectiveness of this refined VA using older adults’ personal health data ($N = 5$), finding a high mean usability score of 85 as measured by the System Usability Scale (SUS) [9], with all participants successfully navigating the after-visit debrief (phase 2) and medication reminder creation (phase 3). Our work has the following contributions:

- From in-home interviews, we identified challenges and breakdowns the aging population faces in self-management of chronic diseases (Section 3).

- Through a multi-stage design process, we developed an LLM-powered personal health assistant to address *awareness* and *adherence* challenges to support older adults in self-management (Section 4, 5, and 6).
- Through an in-home validation study, we found empirical evidence demonstrating the effectiveness and usability of our personal health assistant in debriefing the after-visit summary, handling personal health-related queries and setting personalized reminders (Section 7).

2 Related Work

There are various ways to support older adults in health self-management to facilitate aging in place. In this work, we focus on voice assistants and review prior research on their roles in supporting older adults' health management.

2.1 Current Voice Assistants to Support Older Adults' Health

Voice user interfaces (VUIs) show promise in supporting older adults by offering a natural, hands-free way to interact with digital information [35]. Speech input is three times faster and has a 20% lower error rate than typing [57], which is especially beneficial for older adults as they may have physical or technological limitations. Hence, older adults prefer speech-based over text-based interfaces [34, 69]. VAs have shown significant potential in various aspects of health self-management, offering the potential to enhance older adults' quality of life and autonomy [5, 62]. They assist in medical information seeking [7, 24, 58] and setting reminders for management of pain and other medical conditions [6, 6, 11, 30, 60]. Despite their potential in healthcare applications, commercial VAs are not specifically designed for older adults [63], leading to two major challenges that hinder their effectiveness: 1) usability and 2) lack of user context.

2.1.1 Usability challenges. Voice assistants are marketed and designed to mimic human-like conversations [21, 26]. Therefore, users may treat VAs as if they are engaging in human dialogue [13, 17], specifically older adults [40]. The inaccurate user mental model of VA capabilities emerging from the notion of humanlike interactions results in users overestimating the VAs' conversational abilities, leading to communication breakdowns when the technology falls short of these expectations [36, 39, 48]. Such misconceptions have been shown to impact older adults' health-related queries [7, 40]. For instance, a detailed analysis of health information-seeking behaviors has shown that such human-like expectations result in various conversational breakdowns *e.g.*, VA not being able to answer or giving a wrong off-topic answer to user queries [7]. These usability challenges are exacerbated for marginalized populations *e.g.*, people with cultural differences [25] and physical disabilities [56].

Usability challenges are also prevalent in available functional features such as setting reminders. Although commercial VAs offer reminder setting functionality, it is sub-optimal [40]. For instance, older adults often struggle to set daily reminders for medications, resulting in the need to set a new reminder each morning [40], which defeats the purpose as they still have to rely on their memory every day. Thus, having users set VA reminders themselves [6, 40, 60] leaves considerable room for error that can be detrimental to crucial tasks such as remembering to go to doctors' appointments or taking medications. While reminder features exist, they are not intuitive or clearly tailored for specific tasks, leaving them wanting a dedicated medication reminder function [11]. A voice assistant that automatically creates reminders for older adults could be highly beneficial. For example, the Snips VA provides reminders for medications and doctor's appointments based on health information, but it requires medical professionals and care providers to manually input this data [30]. This process not only increases the workload for care providers but also makes older adults dependent on their healthcare providers for yet another task, which may be neither desirable nor practical. Thus, no current VA supports tailored reminder creation for medication and appointment self-management.

2.1.2 Lack of user context. The lack of user context in interactions leads to more usability issues, particularly with current commercial voice assistants that treat each user query as a standalone event [4, 32, 37]. These VAs do not account for even basic conversation history, which could serve as a minimalistic proxy for user context. Implementing multi-turn conversations with large language models (LLMs) has been shown to enable more robust and fluid interactions with users [10, 40, 41], especially in health information-seeking scenarios, and helps reduce conversational breakdowns. However, this level of context may still fall short of fully understanding and supporting the needs and expectations of older adults from VA to support self-management. To the best of our knowledge, no VA currently incorporates personal health data when responding to health information queries or when helping users set events and reminders. In this work, we explore how we may design a VA that integrates user context—including conversation history, the user’s daily routine, and the user’s personal health information—to effectively support older adults in health self-management.

2.2 Older Adults’ Vision for Voice Assistants in Health Self-Management

Older adults have expressed clear expectations for voice assistants in managing their health and well-being, particularly in the context of self-care and self-management. Older adults believe that VAs could offer a more comprehensive overview of their health, allowing them to access a “holistic health” summary that includes updates on their health progress [25, 44, 55]. Their expectations for VAs extend beyond basic know-how about their health to include preventive care, with a desire for VAs to play a proactive role in monitoring health indicators and offering timely advice [70]. For instance, older adults have noted that they would appreciate being “addressed by the smart speaker” proactively and having the VA implement a “watch-over” function to ensure their well-being [70].

VAs are also envisioned as tools that can simplify and enhance daily routines and health management tasks. Older adults emphasize the importance of VAs being easy to set up, intuitive to use, and robust enough to avoid frequent breakdowns [11]. They expect VAs to handle periodic health management tasks with minimal user effort, highlighting the importance of maintaining and utilizing conversation history and personal data shared by the user to reduce their workload over time [11]. Additionally, older adults value the ability to control and easily modify reminder settings, emphasizing the need for flexibility and personalization in these systems [64]. They also express a strong desire for control and agency in managing their health data and making informed decisions, along with increased transparency about how their data is being used [11, 58]. These expectations of older adults, as articulated through interviews and observational studies, provide valuable insights into their envisioned VA for self-management. However, these insights often lack focus on practical aspects of design and implementation. Therefore, in this work, we involved older adults as co-designers to create a voice assistant that meets their healthcare needs. We developed a working prototype of an LLM-powered VA to support older adults’ self-management by using their personal health data (after-visit summary) and preferences to provide tailored assistance with after-visit debriefs and medication reminder creation.

Research Overview

We involved older adults in a multi-stage design process (see Fig. 2) to develop a voice assistant to support self-management. The following sections detail the design process, which includes five stages: 1) in-home interviews with older adults to identify breakdowns and challenges in their current health management practices (Section 3), in-lab development of an initial voice assistant prototype to bring back to older adults for the co-design workshops (Section 4), 3) co-design workshops with older adults to gather design considerations for the VA (Section 5), 4) refining the initial prototype VA based on co-design findings (Section 6), and 5) an in-home validation study to assess the effectiveness and




Fig. 2. We designed personal health voice assistant to support older adults' self-management in 5-stages: stage 1—interviews with older adults; stage 2—initial prototyping; stage 3—co-design workshops with older adults; stage 4—refining the VA prototype; and stage 5—in-home validation study with older adults. All activities with participants were approved by our institutional review board.

usability of the refined VA interaction (Section 7). All activities with older adults were approved by our institutional review board and all participants were compensated at a rate of 15\$/hr.

3 Stage 1: In-Home Interviews with Older Adults

We conducted semi-structured interviews¹ to explore the challenges the aging population encounters in managing their health, focusing on remembering appointments, taking medications, and other critical aspects. The goal was to capture their personal narratives and perspectives on these challenges, excluding those of healthcare providers.

3.1 Participants

We interviewed 21 participants aged 66–94 ($M = 74.71, SD = 3.83$)—9 females, 4 males, and 4 heterosexual couples. Among them, nine lived in a community center that has both an independent ($n = 6$) and an assisted ($n = 3$) living community, and 12 were community-dwelling adults. Table 4 in appendix presents their demographics (P1–P17). We considered couples as single data point, since we interviewed them together, leading to 17 data points comprising of 3 hours 50 minutes of audio data.

3.2 Data Analysis

We transcribed all the interviews and conducted reflexive thematic analysis. Each transcript was analyzed independently by at least two members of the research team. The research team then convened to extensively discuss and reach consensus on the key breakdowns in participants' self-management and the design requirements needed to support it. Two key aspects of self-management, as detailed below, emerged: 1) awareness—understanding after-visit summaries and test results and 2) adherence—managing appointments and medications.

3.3 Findings: Challenges in Health Self-Management

We identified two main challenges in participants' health self-management: 1) Awareness of health and 2) Adherence to medical regimens. The findings are summarized in Table 1.

¹Stage 1 interview guide: <https://tinyurl.com/bdfw8n5c>. The URL contains all supplementary materials labeled under respective stages 1–5.

Table 1. Findings of interviews: breakdowns in older adults health self-management.

	Breakdowns	Evidence from participant quotes
	Comprehending after visit summary and test results	
Awareness	1. Do not read or understand info	P8: <i>"I don't read the follow up information and sometimes when I talk to the doctor or I have a visiting nurse, it's something I should have done."</i>
	2. Reliance on medical professionals	P15: <i>"I also ask a lot of questions now because there was a time when the doctors ... were not that great about things like that. And I ended up having some health issues because they didn't and I didn't really take care of me..."</i>
	3. Incomplete information necessitates seeking additional info	P2: <i>"I've been put on some medicine recently that ... I recognize it's new medicine and so ... I googled it."</i>
	4. Deteriorating vision hinders interaction	P13: <i>"It's becoming more and more laborious to go through the ... visual material, whether it's in print or on the, on the tablet."</i>
	Managing doctor's appointments	
Adherence	1. Forgetfulness	P17: <i>"I was supposed to have the stress test, and I was already to go, and for some reason, I lollygag around or whatever. And I didn't get out the door in time. I was 20 minutes late. I didn't call to say I'd be late, but they didn't take me. So I had to reschedule that."</i>
	2. Errors in creating calendar events or forgetting to set reminders	P9: <i>"He [a friend] was headed for and he had borrowed his girlfriend's car to go to the appointment and he had a wreck. And so he called and said, I'm gonna be delayed... and they said that's ok. It isn't until tomorrow."</i>
	3. Rescheduling is hard	P11b: <i>"You have to wait a few months."</i>
	Managing medications	
Adherence	1. Trouble keeping track of intake	P10a: <i>"It's hard to do it. It's hard to keep track of that specific [medication]."</i>
	2. Forgetting doses outside of habitual routine	P14: <i>"Sometimes, I'll put it in my phone to remind me to take my acid reflex pill, for instance, because I usually don't take that in the morning. I usually take that during the afternoon and then sometimes I forget and then I get acid reflex, then I'll say, oh, I didn't take my pill. "</i>
	3. Hard to know and keep track of medication interactions	P5: <i>"I do run into trouble, like, when I have a complicated illness and I have to take multiple things that, because of counter interactions, I'm thinking of getting the nursing service here to come in and help me with that when it happens."</i>
	4. Dependence on nursing staff	P3: <i>"Well sometimes they're not on time"</i>

3.3.1 Awareness of health. Following are our findings on breakdowns in their awareness of health:

Accessing and comprehending after-visit summary and test results. In 2009, the United States began offering incentives to healthcare organizations to provide patients with clinical summaries after office visits, including personalized information on their diagnoses, medications, and upcoming appointments [54]. Since then, while providing patients with an after-visit summary is not a requirement, it has been widely adopted as a standard of care for outpatient visits [28]. Our participants highlighted the importance of these after-visit summaries when it comes to understanding their overall health, medications and lifestyle recommendations. However, we identified several challenges with how patient engagement with after-visit summaries and test results affect their awareness. First, participants may not read or fully comprehend important information within these summaries which can sometimes lead to adverse health outcomes. Second, they have to rely on doctors' explanations which, if inadequate, can cause health issues. Third, a

gap in information provided by the healthcare professionals provoked some participants to consult medical resources online such as Google or WebMD to understand their medications better. Fourth, participants' deteriorating vision may hinder their ability to read after-visit summaries and test results.

3.3.2 Adherence to health regimen. Following are the sub-themes identified for adherence to healthcare regimen:

Managing doctor's appointment. The interviews revealed a number of challenges faced by participants in managing their doctor's appointments, mainly revolving around the effective use of reminders and the efficient organization of appointment schedules. Participants missed appointments usually due to 1) forgetfulness and 2) errors in creating calendar events or forgetting to set reminders along with calendar event thus relying on manually checking the calendar everyday. Missing appointments often has high stakes, as it can take months to reschedule and adds significant costs to healthcare resources [18, 42, 51]. Different living conditions create logistical challenges, such as couples needing to avoid scheduling conflicts due to mutual reliance.

Medication management. Participants identified four key challenges in adhering to their medication intake regimen. First, they had trouble keeping track of whether they took medications. Second, tracking becomes more challenging with medication doses that fall outside of habitual morning or night routines. Third, for the complicated interaction effects between multiple medications they may need additional assistance. Lastly, participants in assisted living centers expressed concerns about inconsistent medication times administered by nursing staff, emphasizing the importance of maintaining control over their health management.

3.4 From Challenges to Design Requirements for Personal Health Assistant

Prior work identifies three key underlying challenges to effective self-management in older adults: 1) limited health literacy, 2) aging-related issues, and 3) health system shortcomings [16, 50]. Older adults with low health literacy are more prone to chronic diseases and adverse health behaviors [12]. Aging-related issues, such as cognitive and physical impairments, further hinder their ability to manage their health effectively [3, 14]. Additionally, healthcare systems often fail to provide the necessary support for self-management in this population [46, 50]. Our interviews reveal how these underlying challenges affect older adults' health self-management in practice (see Fig. 3). For instance, limited health literacy manifests as difficulty in understanding their health information, while aging issues result in forgetting appointments and medications. Based on these findings, we identified design requirements (DR) to inform the prototype of the envisioned personal health assistant (see Fig. 3):

- **DR1 : Supporting non-vision modality.** Our findings show that an abundance of visual materials (*e.g.*, after-visit summary, medication instructions, and test results) hinders older adults from engaging with their health information, and deteriorating vision further limits their ability to read. Thus, the assistant should support non-vision modality such as voice interactions.
- **DR2 : Supporting health awareness and literacy through consultation.** The assistant should improve older adults' awareness of their health by making medical information accessible and understandable. Through consultation, it should enable personalized health-related queries. To achieve this, the assistant must access patient data.
- **DR3 : Supporting aging-related forgetfulness through reminders and tracking.** The assistant should support aging-related forgetfulness through regular reminders for events such as appointments and medications to enhance adherence. Additionally, it should enable users to track their health status over time.




Fig. 3. We present the interview findings alongside their underlying causes. Based on these findings, we outline the design requirements and demonstrate their implementation in our initial prototype.

- **DR4 Supporting user autonomy.** Participants expressed a desire for control and autonomy in managing their health; consistent with prior work [11, 58]. Therefore, the assistant should not compromise user autonomy when providing guidance and support.
- **DR5 : Supporting customization.** Participants struggled with taking medications outside of their morning and night routines. With varying daytime routines, fixed assistance may not be effective. Therefore, the assistant should support customization, for instance, tailoring reminders to each user's schedule and medical needs.

4 Stage 2: Initial Prototyping of Envisioned Personal Health Assistant

To support older adults' health self-management, we developed the *envisioned* personal health assistant based on the design recommendations (Fig. 3) and prior work [23, 29, 40, 41]. As established by DR1 and older adults inherent preference for voice assistants over text-based systems [34, 69], we chose to design a personal health VA. VAs have also shown potential as health aides, supporting aging in place [6, 7, 11, 24, 58, 60], offering hands-free, intuitive interfaces ideal for those with physical or cognitive limitations [66]. Furthermore, our interview study revealed that older adults often make errors when creating calendar events and frequently forget to set reminders. Prior research also highlights

these usability challenges with general-purpose VAs while creating medication reminders [6, 40, 60]. To reduce errors in these sensitive tasks, guidance is crucial. By leveraging LLMs' contextual understanding [10, 41]—proven effective in health contexts for older adults [31, 71]—we implemented an LLM-powered VA to enable a guided interaction.

The end-to-end prototype is developed by integrating GPT-4 into Amazon's Alexa via a custom Alexa skill hosted on an Echo Dot smart speaker to enable a guided interaction. The purpose of the initial prototype is to present it to the older adults in the next stage—the co-design workshop. Next, we describe three phases of the designed interaction (see Fig. 3): 1) health data sharing, 2) after-visit debrief, and 3) medication reminder creation. To achieve the desired behavior, each phase was implemented within ChatGPT Alexa skill using prompt engineering; the associated prompts are provided in supplementary materials.

4.1 Phase 1 Health Data Sharing

Phase 1 targets capturing patient health data. In the envisioned system, users would provide a photo of an after-visit summary through web app. However, for the initial prototype, we use a mock after-visit summary to simulate the interaction instead of using a real summary.

4.2 Phase 2 After-Visit Debrief (Consultation)

Phase 2 targets DR2. The VA drives the debrief by summarizing key information from the after-visit summary, including conditions discussed, medication changes, lifestyle recommendations, and upcoming appointments. As after-visit summaries can be information-dense, it is important to avoid overwhelming users with verbose responses that disrupt conversational flow [41]. To balance concise yet comprehensive responses to maintain a natural flow [23, 29, 40], we implement a hierarchical structure [41] where the VA presents one aspect of the summary (e.g., medical conditions) and allows the user to ask questions. The VA then provides relevant information before moving to the next aspect (e.g., medication changes), proceeding step-by-step until the document is fully summarized. Users can interrupt the VA and ask questions at any time DR4; with the VA primarily referencing the after-visit summary and using the LLM to augment responses as needed, achieved through prompt engineering.

4.3 Phase 3 Medication Reminder Creation

Phase 3 targets DR3. Given the diverse needs of older adults for medication management (e.g., varying numbers of medications and irregular routines) and their desire for control and autonomy in healthcare, we chose to bring various interaction designs to the co-design workshops with older adults to give them alternatives to think about. Therefore, we developed three different interaction designs for medication reminder creation varying in degree of user autonomy DR4 and customization DR5:

4.3.1 Design 1: VA-driven default reminders. This design takes a proactive approach, with the VA suggesting reminders based on the medication details in the after-visit summary, without considering the user's routine. It assumes standard routines (e.g., common meal times) to set reminder timings, then reviews them with the user. Users can ask to adjust the reminders. This design gives the VA most control, allowing only for post-hoc personalization by the user.

4.3.2 Design 2: User-driven customized reminders. The VA prompts the user to create a profile that maps their routine and reminder preferences. It gathers detailed information about wake-up and bedtimes, meal times, and other periods when the user is typically home to take medication. The VA also inquires about preferred reminder times outside the

routine and any other specific preferences for medication-related events. This approach gives the user control over reminder timings, allowing the VA to suggest customized reminders based on the user profile.

4.3.3 Design 3: Hybrid tailored reminders. The third design adopts a hybrid approach, asking about user routines only when relevant to specific medications. For instance, if a medication must be taken with dinner, the VA asks about dinner time before suggesting a reminder (*VA-driven*). This design focuses on efficiency, requesting only essential information to customize reminders and avoiding unnecessary questions. However, while it reduces upfront queries to build a user profile, it may miss broader preferences, as the decision to provide additional details is up to the user (*user-driven*).

5 Stage 3: Co-design Workshops with Older Adults

We conducted three co-design workshops with older adults to identify key design considerations for a personal health assistant. In these workshops, we presented an initial prototype to facilitate hands-on interactions, allowing participants to visualize potential solutions to their challenges and offer feedback on improving the design.

5.1 Procedure

The co-design workshops followed this procedure:

- (1) *Introduction.* The participants were introduced to the envisioned personal health VA that could debrief a summary of a doctor's visit, answer related questions, and set medication reminders based on the after-visit summary.
- (2) *Personas.* The participants were shown five personas¹, created from the demographics and characteristics of our interview participants, representing different health management practices, technological proficiency, and lifestyles. The purpose of introducing personas is to encourage participants to consider different perspectives, including those of others they know and the presented personas, alongside their own viewpoint.
- (3) *Group discussion.* Participants then engaged in an open group discussion to outline their initial impressions of the envisioned VA, their preferences for its features, and potential barriers they might encounter. They also utilized collaborative map-making to develop concrete solutions for possible breakdowns.
- (4) *Interaction with high-fidelity VA prototypes.* To further the discussion, participants then took turns interacting with the VA prototype for after-visit debrief (phase 2) and medication reminder creation (phase 3; three alternatives) using a mock after-visit summary. Afterward, they provided detailed feedback on various aspects of the interaction and discussed improvements.

5.2 Participants

We recruited a total of 10 participants aged 65–88 ($M = 77.60$, $SD = 6.45$) for 3 workshops—four community dwelling adults for the first workshop (2 male, 2 female), three independent living community center dwelling adults (3 female) for the second workshop, and three immigrants to the United States for the third workshop. Taking into account the comfort of the participants, the third workshop was run in two parts—one individual (female, W3-B) and one couple (female, W3-N and male, W3-Y). We deliberately recruited participants with varying living conditions to capture diverse perspectives on potential challenges influenced by different aging environments. Immigrant participants were included to explore additional challenges, such as unfamiliarity with the healthcare system and language barriers, and how VAs might address them. Detailed demographics, participants' use of VA technology and current health management practices are presented in Tables 4 and 5 (Appendix). The workshops resulted in about 8 hours 40 minutes of audio data.

5.3 Data Analysis

We conducted thematic analysis on the transcribed audio data to identify existing and potential breakdowns in their current practices and capture solutions proposed by participants for these breakdowns. Additionally, we coded their interactions with the prototype VA. Second part of third workshop was conducted predominately in Mandarin since participants (W3-N and W3-Y) felt more comfortable speaking in Mandarin. The conversations were facilitated by a member of the research team and later translated into English. The first author coded all the workshop transcripts and classified the codes into themes and sub-themes. Two researchers who were present at the workshops fully agreed on the outcomes of coding. The themes are: 1) consultation, 2) medication reminders, 3) health tracking, and 4) general considerations for VA design. For each sub-theme, we present challenge-solution pairs and user preferences for the VA.

5.4 Findings: Consultation

We identified four themes under consultation as illustrated in Fig. 4 and Table 2:

5.4.1 Personal health queries. During the *after-visit debrief* Phase 2 with the prototype VA, we noted participants' questions, revealing their interests in specific health information. They asked questions related to the doctor's visit such as changes to medication doses and life style recommendations. The participants appreciated and found benefit in the VA's capability to facilitate personalized Q/A about their health during the after-visit debrief.

5.4.2 Auxiliary medication-related queries. Participants discussed how the extensive information provided with medications, such as side effects and interactions with other medications or foods, is often overwhelmingly complex and thus largely ignored ($n = 2$). They suggested that VAs could alleviate this cognitive burden by summarizing and extracting key details about medications. Another issue raised involved the inadequate communication by doctors regarding the side effects of medications and their potential interactions with other health conditions ($n = 3$). W2-L shared her frustrations: "Usually, they kind of explain it; they say okay, I am gonna change you from this medicine to that medicine because of this, and I am like fine. But then you actually get the medicine, and they give you a three-page thing with it. It's just easier sometimes to ask Alexa—like, tell me, I wanna know, can this medicine really harm me? Because usually, the doctor will tell you, I am changing you because of this, but they don't go through and [warm to] watch out for these things. For instance, one of the medications they put me on, it [Alexa] told me that my blood sugar may rise, so I was actually looking for it to rise, while the doctor only told me: This medication is better for [some condition]... but then Alexa told me my blood sugar may rise, and I was like, I don't want my kidneys to go bad, but I don't want my blood sugar to go up either. So, kind of okay, drop the ice cream because the medicine's gonna make your blood sugar go up." Such gaps in doctor-patient communication can leave patients confused and frustrated. VAs can serve as a secondary source of information, as W2-L noted, providing details on side effects that may impact existing conditions. W2-L also preferred using Alexa for medication information over traditional methods (healthcare portals and internet search) due to the convenience of speech interaction. Additionally, the VA can suggest actions to manage side effects, as seen when it motivated W2-L to make lifestyle changes by simply providing relevant information.

5.4.3 Medical advice in emergencies. Participants explored potential of VAs to act as surrogates for quick medical advice during emergency situations, especially, when immediate access to a doctor is unavailable ($n = 3$). For instance, consulting a VA can be convenient for an initial assessment if someone misses a dose or confuses their medications, as W1-P mentioned "I accidentally took XYZ... 'not to worry' that sort of thing. You know sometimes you cannot get to your




Fig. 4. Findings of co-design workshop for consultation, reminder and tracking. Note that our prototype does not focus on tracking.

doctor.” They also recognized that they can consult the VA during event-driven self-diagnosis, similar to typical internet searches, W1-B mentioned, “Can be as simple as Alexa, I have a bruise on my hand why is that. General medical advice...”

5.4.4 Facilitate communication with neutral advice. Participants discussed that VAs can be consulted as neutral third parties to facilitate communication between spouses or family members ($n = 4$). For instance, W1-R suggested that Alexa could resolve disputes between caregivers by providing neutral, unbiased, yet tailored patient medical information.

5.5 Findings: Reminder

Below we discuss various possible breakdowns and their solutions in creating medication reminders [Phase 3](#). The findings are summarized in Fig. 4 and Table 2.

5.5.1 Support regular medication reminders. Some participants ($n = 3$) explicitly mentioned their need for medication reminders while others expressed their openness to it. The reasons identified for requiring medication reminders include: 1) managing multiple medications ($n = 1$), 2) uncertain timing for taking medications, often leading to irregular intake ($n = 2$), and 3) the likelihood of forgetting to take medications when engaged in other tasks ($n = 3$). These align with our interview (stage 1) findings. As a solution, participants discussed how having regular reminders could serve as back up and effectively support their existing medication management strategies ($n = 7$). Additionally, participants discussed that reminders might need to become more intrusive, repetitive, and detailed upon cognitive decline ($n = 4$).

5.5.2 Cluster medications. While creating reminders with the prototype VA, we found that participants often preferred grouped reminders for morning and evening medications ($n = 7$). Reasons included: 1) convenience of pill boxes ($n = 5$), 2) cumbersome nature of setting individual reminders ($n = 2$), and 3) benefits for people with disabilities—as noted by W1-B regarding his visually impaired friend, their medications are grouped and pre-packaged according to intake times. Therefore, they wanted VAs to group medications into single reminders for specific times of or events during the day.

5.5.3 Reminders for unusual and event driven medications. Participants noted challenges with medications that require unusual timing or frequency ($n = 2$), such as those taken every other day (W1-P) or in the evening outside the regular morning and night schedules (W1-L). For example, W1-L reported disrupted sleep due to delayed medication intake, which she mitigates by using Alexa to provide repeated reminders until she confirms intake. This underscores the need for precise and assertive reminders for irregular medication schedules. Additionally, some medications are event-driven ($n = 1$). For example, W1-P highlighted the need for allergy medication in response to high pollen counts, which she is usually unaware of, *“Alexa could say: Pollen count is high today. You should take some Claritin... cause half the time I don’t realize until I’m already choking.”* This finding highlights the potential for VAs to proactively notify users about environmental factors impacting their health and the necessity for certain medications.

5.5.4 Capture and adapt to irregular user routine. A potential breakdown identified is that some people might not have a consistent “routine” at all so creating regular reminders would be challenging. Different solutions were discussed to address this challenge: 1) implementing persistent reminders that repeat until the user confirms medication intake as evident from W1-L personal experience with unusual medication times (*“To give you a possible solution, not only can I tell Alexa when it is a certain time for me to take a medication... if I don’t tell it I took my medication to remind me again in an hour... It’s gonna keep reminding me every hour, until I take my medication.”*), 2) reinforcing a better routine with wake-up and bedtime reminders, particularly for medications that must be taken at specific times, and 3) designing adaptable reminders that adjust based on the user’s reported wake-up time each day (most favored).

5.5.5 Accommodate for temporary routine changes. Participants highlighted forgetting medications while traveling, suggesting VAs should synchronize with personal calendars for packing reminders and adjust to time zones, sending notifications to mobile phones as smart speakers may not always be available ($n = 4$). This need for adaptability was evident during interactions with the VA prototype, where participants ($n = 3$) asked about its functionality across locations and automatic time zone adjustments. Concerns were also raised about handling minor *one-off* routine changes, such as lunch outside or staying out late ($n = 2$). They proposed three solutions: 1) integrating the personal calendar with the VA to remind them to take medications before commitments, 2) allowing the VA to adapt reminders for different daily schedules, and 3) enabling user-initiated conversations with the VA to update one-time schedule changes and adjust reminders accordingly.

At the end of the workshop, participants shared their preferences for medication reminder designs (Phase 3). Most favored Designs 2 and 3 over Design 1, seeing them as more “personalized” ($n = 8$). W1-R and W2-L preferred Design 3 for its focus on gathering only essential information. W2-L valued the efficiency, stating, *“Relevant questions. Just what do you need to know to help me do what I need to do.”* However, the majority in the first two workshops ($n = 5$) favored Design 2 for its practical approach in building a user profile once before addressing medications. Preferences reflected participants’ medication management needs. For example, W1-R and W3-B, who take fewer medications, preferred the simpler Design 3, while W1-P and W1-L, managing multiple medications, found the comprehensive routine setup in Design 2 more useful and adaptable. All participants emphasized the importance of a flexible, context-aware VA (W1-B: *“Certainly, it should be oriented to time and place”*). W2-N and W2-Y, who faced language barriers, could not establish a preference but acknowledged the system’s benefits for older adults living alone. W3-Y noted, *“I feel like this design was pretty good, especially for a single person, a single elderly living alone... it is very easy to forget and mix things up. So, it can remind me—even if it just said one sentence—and I would think: ‘Oh, I forgot to take my medicine. Let me go take my medicine quickly.’ It would be a great help.”*

5.6 Findings: Health Tracking

Participants discussed various considerations for the envisioned VA to support health tracking (see Fig. 4 and Table 2)

5.6.1 Track medical history. Participants identified difficulties in recalling medical histories accurately ($n = 4$), especially changes in medication dosage, when needed by existing and new doctors or emergency personnel. Currently, they track their medical history by reading after-visit summaries when needed ($n = 2$), maintaining paper medication lists ($n = 1$), or relying on their doctors to communicate updated lists with each other ($n = 2$), but not to their satisfaction. They suggested the VA could help track and communicate updated medications with doctors directly or allow users to print ($n = 2$). Tracking health information via VAs was also seen as beneficial for sharing data with family or friends ($n = 5$).

5.6.2 Track vitals. Participants discussed the challenges they face and the utility of VAs in monitoring vitals *e.g.*, blood sugar and blood pressure ($n = 4$). They noted that VAs could remind them to perform these checks per doctor's instructions and prompt them to report readings. W1-P highlighted this benefit, *"For a while, I had to take blood pressure, it's not something of a routine and that was a pain in the neck... But Alexa could help me with the temporary program."* Currently, participants track health metrics using traditional methods, such as writing them down or entering them into a health portal, which can lead to forgetting or inaccurate reporting. VAs can enhance this process, ensuring more accurate and consistent monitoring.

5.6.3 Medication tracking. After interacting with VA prototypes, participants also discussed effective ways to track medication intake ($n = 8$). While open to tracking intake, preferences varied on the "how". Some preferred self-reporting (user-initiated) rather than VA-initiated inquiries. Conversely, some participants wanted more active monitoring methods, such as smart pill boxes and touch sensors. W1-R suggested these devices could communicate with the VA to tailor reminders, role-playing a scenario: *"Hey, did you take the pill? Because the pillbox isn't touched."* Similarly, W3-B wanted reminders if she left the house without touching the medication bottle. Overall, participants favored customizable interaction modes (user-initiated vs. VA-initiated) based on individual preferences and needs.

Participants also expressed their dissatisfaction with reliance on pharmacies for medication refill reminders ($n = 5$), as W2-M explained, *"I get my medications currently from [pharmacy] online, and they send me text reminders, but they are not good at syncing the number of pills I have with when they prompt me to reorder. Sometimes, I almost have a full bottle left, and they ask if I want another. When I decline, they fail to prompt me again, so I have to go online."* Participants suggested that VAs could effectively remind them when refills are needed ($n = 4$), as W1-P indicated, *"At some point, I would like a little preview, maybe 5 days before, if I need to refill my medication."*

5.7 Findings: General Considerations for VA Design

The general considerations for designing effective voice assistance are summarized in Fig. 5.

5.7.1 Privacy. To enable the above mentioned features for consultation, reminder and tracking, *health data sharing* with the VA is crucial. Participants raised concerns about health data being shared with VAs as it can be accessed easily by unwanted personnel (strangers, visitors or friends) through the speech interface. However, they indicated they would be comfortable uploading documents into the system as long as they have control over the information they share, the data is anonymous and the access is secured ($n = 7$). To address these concerns, following solutions were discussed among participants and researchers: 1) using confidential activation phrases and security questions

Table 2. Summary of findings of co-design workshop for the envisioned personal health assistant: consultation, reminder, and tracking. The purple circles represent considerations that were implemented in the refined prototype through prompt engineering (Stage 4).

	Challenges	Solutions
Consultation	1. Lack of personalized health queries in current VAs	Enable personalized health queries through integration of after-visit summaries from doctor's office ①
	2. Information on medications is complex and doctors' may fail to inform important aspects	Enable auxiliary medication-related queries ②
	3. Lack of immediate access to doctors in emergencies	Provide surrogate medical advice in emergencies
	4. Conflict between patients and caregivers	Facilitate communication with neutral advice grounded in medical data
Reminder	1. Medication management is difficult: having to manage multiple medications, uncertain timing for taking medications, and forgetfulness	Provide regular medication reminders as a back up to their current recall strategies ③
	2. Think of pills not as standalone items, but in relation to their intake time. Additionally, may use pill boxes	Cluster medications by intake time for creating reminders. Consider their use of pill boxes ④
	3. Missing out-of-routine medications (e.g., allergy medications) is more common	Proactively remind about unusual and event driven medications
	4. Irregular user routines; fixed reminders may not work	Capture and adapt to irregular user routine ⑤
	5. Forget medications when travelling or away house	Accommodate for temporary routine changes
	<i>User preferences for design alternatives</i> (finding of a direct question asked from participants)	Participants with many medications and varied routines preferred Design 2 (user-driven, tailored), while those with fewer medications preferred Design 3 (VA-driven). Create user profile ⑥
Tracking	1. Difficulties in recalling medical histories when needed	Track and provide medical history over time through after-visit summaries from doctors
	2. Inconsistency and inaccuracy in tracking health vitals	Record, double check and report health vitals
	1. Can miss medications despite reminders 2. Unhappy with reliance on pharmacies for medication refill reminders	Track medication intake to enable proactive actions Track medication unavailability to alert for refills

for authentication, 2) restricting medical information access to authorized users only via voice profiles feature, and 3) allowing users to opt in or out of information sharing.

5.7.2 *VA characteristics.* Participants highlighted various aspects of VA characteristics in the given context:

Adaptable to user. Participants discussed VAs should not be static across people but adaptable to users ($n = 4$). Three aspects were discussed: 1) their preferences, 2) their emotional state, and 3) context of interaction. User preferences, specifically when explicit, should be taken into account as is. Furthermore, W1-B advocated for incorporating users' feedback into the VA's responses ("Alexa, I don't like the way you are talking to me.") allowing users to express their preferences, enabling the VA to adjust its behavior accordingly. The emotional state of the user and the context of interactions are also crucial ($n = 4$). For example, W1-P described a potential scenario: "If I mixed up my medications, see, I probably wouldn't know. And then I'd panic. So if Alexa could sort of bring me down if I did something wrong and say: P, not to worry, if you are experiencing blah blah blah then you should call 911." Similarly, cognitive decline may necessitate adjustments as W1-B pointed out, "When you are failing cognitively, you might want a very sophisticated answer, or you might not be able to deal with a sophisticated answer."

Personalization over time. VA style should adapt over time as user preferences evolve ($n = 6$). Personalization over time was discussed in two aspects. First, updating the VA's interaction style based on prior interactions, as W1-R noted: *"Right now, every person is getting the same response from Alexa, but in theory, Alexa should begin to know who you are... So she should adjust its own presentation so that it minimizes counter-questions from you."* Second, detecting confusion and frustration in repeated interactions to generate proactive VA behaviors, specifically in context of cognitive decline, as W1-B suggested: *"I can see how that can build in terms of when you ask for medication reminders and then you ask: 'Alexa, did I take so-and-so?' If there were a lot of 'Did I take so-and-so,' there should be a way to take account of that or notice that."* Adjustments in style and tone were also suggested. W2-L proposed changes in voice tone after repeated failed reminders: *"Like the third time it tells me to take my medicine and I have not answered, it might be nice to change the voice... A more aware voice. [Role playing] L! HAVE you taken your medicine?"*

Support user autonomy and control. Participants wanted to maintain autonomy over VAs, as observed during the *medication reminders creation* interactions. They negotiated the frequency and timing of medication intake, revealing potential conflicts between user preferences and VAs' suggestions based on doctor's orders ($n = 2$). While the VA initially encouraged adherence to medical recommendations, it eventually complied with participants' preferences, providing necessary warnings. This "respect" for user decisions was appreciated, W1-R: *"It is always asking is it okay to have this appointment at 8 o'clock, do you want to change it. That's really good, it always asks you to make the final decision."* Participants also reported positive perceptions of the VA after interacting with it ($n = 2$), feeling it enabled them to manage their healthcare independently and reduced the need to consult doctors for minor inquiries. W1-P highlighted: *"One of the nice things is that it puts you in control, you are not calling the doctor asking questions, you are managing your life. That's nice."* Participants also expressed a desire for the VA to be easily modifiable and adaptable to individual needs and expectations ($n = 5$). W1-R emphasized: *"Everything that she does should be modifiable except for critical health things..."* Thus, to ensure desired autonomy and control of user over interactions, two actionable items emerged: 1) users should have the final say, and 2) VAs should be modifiable by the user.

5.7.3 Presentation of VA content. We outline participants' preferences for presentation of VA content:

Hierarchical content structure. Participants appreciated the hierarchical information presentation by the prototype VA, where a summary was followed by detailed information upon request as W2-L described, *"It was like, the initial part was like a summary but then because I did not tell it to stop, it kept going and I kept listening, you know, at a point I had an answer okay so I said Alexa stop."*

Verbosity. Participants acknowledged the VA's verbosity was necessary due to the sensitive nature of medication discussions ($n = 2$). W2-L noted: *"I guess because it was talking about medication, it had to say more... You have to give more information so it's gotta solicit more information."*

Clear and simple Q/A format. Multiple questions in a single prompt increased cognitive load. During the user profile creation, W2-M, who has a variable routine, was overwhelmed by the VA asking about meal times on both early and late wake-up days in the same question. W2-L suggested a solution: breaking down complex questions into simpler, sequential ones, such as, *"I almost wanted it to say [Alexa:] Okay, what's your schedule for Monday? What's your schedule for Tuesday?... Kind of like how I'd actually put it on my calendar."* This would reduce cognitive load by tailoring further questions based on each response. Additionally, participants were sometimes confused during questions. After asking a question, the VA would sometimes immediately begin an explanation, such as, *"Let's start with your first Amoxicillin. Could you tell me your usual meal times? This will help me schedule your Amoxicillin reminders accurately..."* Participants often began answering right after the question, but the VA continued speaking, causing confusion. They also found it




Fig. 5. Co-design workshop findings: general considerations for VA design. The pink circles represent considerations that were implemented in the refined prototype's phase 2 and 3 through prompt engineering.

unclear at times why the VA asked personal questions and expected it to communicate its intentions first.

Simple, understandable language. Language barriers were evident in immigrant participants' (W3-N and W3-Y) interactions with the VA, as they sometimes did not understand the VA's questions and statements and needed more time to mentally translate their responses from Mandarin to English. This indicates that, when designing for special populations within aging adults (e.g., immigrants less fluent in English) considerations such as simpler phrases, shorter sentences, and less complex language should be employed.

The workshops resulted in considerations for both the application-specific VA (Table 2) and voice assistance in general (Fig. 5). The next stage of our design process focuses on refining the prototype based on key considerations identified during the co-design workshops to better meet older adults' needs for a personal health assistant.

6 Stage 4: Refining the Prototype VA

The co-design workshop revealed several key design considerations (summarized in Fig. 4 and Table 2) that are actionable within the envisioned personal health assistant to support awareness and adherence for older adults. To refine the initial prototype, we focused on consultation and medication reminders, excluding tracking, as it cannot be validated in a single interaction. General design recommendations (Fig. 5) were applied to the VA where feasible, given the brief nature of the interaction for validation study. For example, long-term personalization cannot be assessed in one session. In this section, we detail out the implementation of the refined personal health assistant. The interaction with the VA involved three same phases (see Fig. 6) as initial prototype (stage 2). Purple circles represent considerations for the envisioned assistance and pink circles represent general considerations. The three modified phases are as follows:

6.1 Phase 1 Health Data Sharing

Phase 1 targets capturing patient's health data. We simulate health data sharing with the prototype by having the users fill out their chronic conditions, medications and specialists they see. The medical data is then input into an LLM prompt by the experimenter to convert it into an after-visit summary following a real summary template (see Fig. 6).

6.2 Phase 2 After-Visit Debrief

The after-visit debrief interaction is the same as the initial prototype (section 4.2). Fig. 6 shows the system prompt to support hierarchical presentation 4 of dense information 5. The VA allows personal health 1 and auxiliary medication queries 2 grounded in the users' health data 2. Once the user is done with this phase, the VA guides the user to phase 3 6 by saying: "Great, let's move on to the next task. I need to know a bit about your daily routine and how you manage your medications to suggest appropriate reminders. Let me know when you are ready."

6.3 Phase 3 Medication Reminder Creation

We implement the VA to support adherence by enabling users to create regular medication reminders ③. The VA should accommodate for variations in the user’s routine to ensure that the reminders are timely and relevant ⑤. Designing such an adaptable VA can be achieved by capturing user routine—relevant to their medication management—to create a user profile ⑥. The medication reminder creation consists of two sub-phases:

6.3.1 Creating user profile. In this sub-phase, the VA focuses on gathering requisite information about the user’s medication routine and preferences to create a profile ⑥. The after-visit summary is input into the LLM to extract medication requirements as prescribed by doctors. In co-design workshops, most participants ($n = 5$) preferred Design 2 (user profile creation before reminders) for its comprehensive approach, which is helpful for those with multiple medications or varying routines. However, participants with fewer medications ($n = 3$) preferred Design 3 (asking only relevant questions). To accommodate the majority, we implemented a hybrid of Designs 2 and 3, creating the user profile first but only asking essential questions. To create user profile, we prompt (Fig. 6) the LLM to ask the following:

- (1) **Assess routine consistency:** To account for irregular schedules for users, the VA first asks about the consistency of the user’s routine, including variations on weekends ⑥.
- (2) **Current medication management:** The VA asks the user how they manage their medications, whether the user organizes the medications into pill boxes by time of day (e.g., morning and night pills) or use original containers ②.
- (3) **Need-based queries:** The VA asks necessary questions about their routine based on the medication list in the after-visit summary. For instance, the VA only inquires about meal times if a medication needs to be taken around meals. These questions are meant to capture their daily routine, meal times, availability for medication intake, and any other specific preferences for reminders.

After completing the questions, the LLM component generates a user profile (see Fig. 6). The VA then prompts the user to proceed, saying, “Let’s create medication reminders now. Let me know when you’re ready.”

6.3.2 Grouping medications for suggesting reminders. The next step involves organizing medications and suggesting reminders tailored to the user profile as a backup to current management practices ③. The LLM uses the after-visit summary and the user profile as input to suggest reminders in chronological order, following the rules below:

- **Cluster medications:** The VA groups medications by time of day (morning, afternoon, night) or event (meals, wake-up, sleep), while also considering pill box use ④. For example, bedtime medications are grouped as one reminder: “*X and Y should be taken at bedtime. I’ll set the reminder for 9:45 p.m., just before bed. Does that sound good?*”
- **Adapt to the user:** The VA uses the user profile to suggest reminders tailored to the user’s routine and practices ②. It integrates medications into the daily schedule and suggests reminders in chronological order. For example: “*Let’s start with your morning medication. . . Next, the afternoon medications. . .*” The VA also reads out the name of each medication in a grouped reminder to ensure consistency with the user’s pill management. For instance, it checks if the medications in the evening reminder match those in the evening pillbox: “*We’ll group your evening medications—A, B, and the second dose of C together. . .*”
- **Medication intake compliance vs. user control:** The VA prioritizes medication intake requirements from the after-visit summary when suggesting reminders, while allowing the user to make the final decision ③. However, the VA emphasizes following the doctor’s instructions and alerts the user if their request conflicts with these requirements, as allowing the user to proceed with their preference may not always be beneficial. A balance between user autonomy and medical compliance is necessary. For example, the VA might say: “*Setting a reminder for X at 11 AM conflicts*

with the doctor's instructions to take it in the morning before food or other medications. Would you like to keep the 8:15 AM reminder, or proceed with 11 AM?"

- **Modifiable reminders:** The VA can update, add, or delete reminders upon user request at any time ③ to match their preferences ① and even adjust the frequency of reminders for any medication ⑤.

The VA lets the user know once all reminders are set and user can end the interaction by saying "Goodbye".

6.3.3 Implementation of General Considerations. Based on workshop findings, the following general considerations were implemented to improve user experience:

- **Single question approach:** The VA asks only one question at a time to avoid confusion and reduce cognitive load, even if multiple follow-up questions are needed ⑧. Complicated follow-up questions are split into simple, single questions. For instance, "What time do you wake up and go to bed on weekdays?" followed by "Now, how about weekends?" if the user has a different routine on the weekend.
- **Explain reasons behind questions:** Before each question requesting personal data, the VA explains its purpose to ensure clarity and transparency ⑦. For example, before asking about the user's routine, it says: "I need to know a bit about your routine and how you manage your medications to suggest appropriate reminders." Additionally, no statements should follow a VA question to avoid confusion ⑧.
- **Guided user navigation:** Navigation cues are added to ensure that users can navigate the various components of the interaction independently ⑥. For instance, after completing the profile creation, the VA says, "Let's create medication reminders. Let me know when you are ready."

7 Stage 5: In-Home Validation Study

To validate the second iteration of the personal health assistant, we conducted a small-scale in-home study with older adults, assessing the VA's usability and effectiveness in debriefing after-visit notes and guiding users to create reminders.

7.1 Study Plan and Procedure

At the beginning of the study, each participant received a brief description explaining that they would be interacting with a VA designed to assist with their health self-management. Participation was voluntary, with consent obtained via signed forms. Participants then completed a medical information form, detailing their medical conditions, medications, and the specialists they usually see. The experimenter informed them that this data (anonymous) would be used to simulate the after-visit summary for interaction with the VA. While the experimenter set up the task, participants filled out a demographics survey. The experimenter then explained the interaction and demonstrated a few exchanges with the VA. Participants could ask questions they had before they began interacting with the VA independently. After the interaction, participants were asked to fill out a usability survey. Finally, the study ended with a brief interview to gather feedback. The entire study took approximately 60 minutes.

7.2 Participants

We recruited five older adults for the validation study (4 female, 1 male), aged 65 and above ($M = 78.80$, $SD = 4.76$). Participants included a mix of those familiar with VAs and those who were not, as well as individuals who had previously participated in various stages of the process (interviews and co-design workshops) and those who had not (Table 3).




Fig. 6. Refined VA and example participant interactions. “...” represents truncated speech for brevity. C1–C4 are conversation labels used in the text to reference examples in this figure. All prompts are in the supplementary materials¹.

7.3 Data Analysis and Metrics

For our analysis, we derive the following metrics from audio interaction data and a post-study questionnaire:

7.3.1 *User interaction evaluation.* We coded interactions with the VA during different stages to evaluate its effectiveness:

- **After-visit debrief.** We coded participants' *success in navigating the VA's debrief* and their engagement through the number of questions asked. The VA's effectiveness was measured by *percentage of questions it successfully answered*.
- **User profile creation.** We coded the *accuracy of the persona* generated based on the conversation participants had with the VA. A user profile was considered accurate if it correctly reflected the user's routine in line with the medication intake requirements from the simulated after-visit summary.
- **Reminder creation.** We coded the *percentage of reminders successfully created* during the interaction and the *accuracy of the created reminders* by matching it to the user profile and their conversation with the VA.

7.3.2 *Usability evaluation.* We calculated the System Usability Scale (SUS) score for each participant using a 10-item, five-point Likert scale questionnaire [9]. A score above 70 (0 – 100) indicates good system usability [1]. We also gathered participants' perceptions through post-study interviews to complement the usability score.

7.4 Results

The results of validation study are summarized in Table 3.

7.4.1 *User interaction evaluation.* Our results on the VA's effectiveness, as reflected in user interactions, are as follows: **After-visit debrief.** All participants ($N = 5$) successfully navigated the after-visit summary and engaged with the VA, each asking at least one question, with an average of three per participant. They asked a variety of questions about their health *e.g.*, medical conditions (C1 in Fig. 6) and lifestyle changes (C2). All questions were answered by the VA, except one that was not heard, demonstrating the ability of the VA in handling personal health queries. The VA also personalized responses based on the user's health context from the after-visit summary. For example, it tailored advice to the participant's arthritis (C2).

User profile creation. Profiles created for all the participants ($N = 5$) were accurate according to their conversation with the VA. Fig. 6 shows an example of created user profile.

Reminder creation. The VA successfully created reminders for all medications listed in the after-visit summary, except for one medication. Details of the created reminders are shown in Table 3. Medications were grouped into 1 – 3 reminders based on the time of day or events. All reminders were accurate as per the user profile, medication requirements, and preferences recorded during the conversation. These results show the VA effectively adapted to user routines when suggesting reminders. Additionally, users easily modified reminder timing and frequency (C4 in Fig. 6).

7.4.2 *Usability evaluation.* The average SUS score was 85 ($SD = 12.90$), which is above the 70 threshold for good usability [1], with only one participant scoring below. Participants found the system learnable, as 4M noted, "*Just a matter of doing it and practicing and getting used to it.*" Even novice participants found the system intuitive. For instance, participant 1C found the system easy to use and navigate despite her preconceived notion of a low learning curve with technology prior to this interaction: "*The experience was very pleasant, understandable, to grasp ... I caught on very quick and I think the more I used it, the better I would get. I just, I don't have one here and it was suggested that I don't get too used to something like this. So, I, we have avoided it.*" However, participants with low tech familiarity (*e.g.*,

Table 3. Findings of Validation Study: **Prior VA experience** indicates participants' familiarity with the VA and their participation in various stages of the design process. **Debrief** shows whether participants successfully navigated the after-visit debrief with the VA. **Reminders Created** shows the number and percentage of medication reminders successfully created, e.g., 4/4 (100%), and $r = 3$ indicates that 3 reminders were created for morning, evening, and bedtime. *All reminders created were accurate.

P	Medication Management and VA use			Results of Validation Study				
	Pill boxes	Medications (doses)	Prior VA experience	SUS	Debrief	Q/A during debrief	User profile creation	Reminders created*
1C	evening	4 (5 doses)	novice to VAs	95.0	✓	100% 2/2 answered	✓	4/4; 100%; $r = 3$ morning, evening & bedtime
2C	morning & bedtime	7 (5 doses, 2 as needed)	novice to VAs	87.5	✓	75% 3/4 answered	✓	5/5; 100%; $r = 3$ morning, bedtime & standalone
3L	morning & bedtime	15 (18 doses, 1 as needed)	workshop only, novice to VAs	62.5	✓	100% 3/3 answered	✓	13/14; 92.86%; 3 morning (2) & bedtime
4M	×	5 (6 doses)	whole pipeline	90.0	✓	100% 4/4 answered	✓	5/5; 100%; $r = 3$ morning, evening & night
5R	×	2 (2 doses)	whole pipeline	90.0	✓	100% 1/1 answered	✓	2/2; 100%; $r = 1$ bedtime

non-smartphone users) may need assistance inputting the after-visit summary, as 1C added, "I'd need a crash course on taking the picture of the medication."

Our validation study showed that participants found the VA intuitive and easy to use; they successfully navigated the after-visit debrief and medication reminder creation. Overall, participants perceived the VA as learnable and pleasant, indicating that the design considerations (Figs. 4 and 5) were effective in creating a fluid, positive interaction.

8 General Discussion and Conclusion

In this work, we tackle the lack of relevant user context (*i.e.*, user routine and health data) and usability challenges in VA technology to support older adults' health self-management. We co-designed a VA—personalized to their health information and aligned with their self-management practices—that effectively debriefs doctor visits, facilitates personal health queries, and assists in creating medication reminders through guided conversation, addressing identified health *awareness* and *adherence* challenges. Below, we describe our implications for future work.

8.1 Preemptive Integration of Assistive Technologies into Older Adults' Lives

Throughout the design process, participants frequently grappled with the idea that they may not currently need all aspects of the system, given their ability to manage their healthcare independently. However, they also acknowledged the inevitability of cognitive decline [53] and the uncertainty of when they might require more assistance. Participants recognized the challenges of learning new technology at their age [19, 38, 47], especially without support. For instance, W2-E mentioned that her daughter said she would not have time to teach her, so she never tried any new technology and now feels it is too late. Similarly, 1C mentioned that her husband discouraged the use of technology by saying she would

never get used to it. These adoption challenges are exacerbated when cognitive abilities start declining further, as 2C pointed out: *“Because you know when you lose your mind, it gets harder and harder to learn these things, the things that are in there already tend to stay.”* Therefore, integrating assistive technology to support health and well-being for aging in place should be introduced before the absolute need develops. Early familiarizing older adults with technology, whether it be VAs, smartphones, or blood pressure recording devices as early adoption is a key for effective interventions [8, 43]. This proactive approach increases the likelihood of sustaining their way of life as cognitive impairment progresses. For instance, using medication reminders as a backup when they are cognitively aware may seem less critical, but having the system in place before cognitive impairment begins can ensure continuous support and enable aging in place effectively. Such foresight in technology adoption can help bridge the gap between current independence and future needs, providing a smoother transition into reliance on assistive technologies.

However, getting started with VA technology can be challenging for older adults due to usability issues while navigating the system [6, 40, 60]. Our VA aimed to address the navigation challenge by introducing cues to support independent interaction. While the LLM-powered VA could assist participants within an interaction, it struggled to guide them between interactions. For instance, when participant 1C asked how to access the assistant later, the VA gave a generic response, *“Feel free to reach out at any time. I am here,”* instead of providing clearer instructions, *“To contact me later, just say: Alexa, personal health assistant”* Context-aware responses, and real-time guidance are key to helping older adults engage effectively with conversational VAs to achieve their goal [33, 40].

8.2 Awareness to Promotion and Adherence to Tracking: Going Beyond Reactive Assistance

“Health is more than your medication though. I mean are you exercising, what’s your weight? I mean those kind of things,” as P15 highlighted that health is not all about knowing and managing chronic disease through medications. Prior work has also shown that older adults envision voice assistants to go beyond basic awareness and event management to include preventive care and play a proactive role in monitoring health [70], enabling them to access a “holistic health” picture [25, 44, 55]. Currently, the proposed system focuses on awareness and adherence, as identified in problem-finding interviews. However, the awareness is limited to knowing about doctor’s visits and soliciting personal healthcare questions and the adherence is restricted to medication reminders, with the VA being reactive to users’ input. Transitioning from awareness to promotion of healthy behaviors and adherence to active tracking can open up added benefits for self-management of their holistic health. Participants frequently brought up their expectations from such a system. For instance, W1-R suggested incorporating cognitive assessments into the VA to enable monitoring cognitive decline to dynamically adapt VA interactions: *“To address that, why can’t Alexa test you to see when you are becoming senile?”* W1-R also discussed the potential for situation-aware companionship: *“Since Alexa knows where you are at. And I say I am going out’ and it knows where you are. And it can say: Well last time you went out in this weather you only wore a hat but you know take gloves. I can tell it if I were cold after coming back etc.”* Thus, a holistic health management system would target proactive preventive care, improved sleep health, consistent physical activity, situation-aware companionship and well-being. Additionally, overall health monitoring such as tracking medication intake, monitoring sleep health, accountability for achieving lifestyle goals such as nutrition and physical activity, and assessing cognitive decline would be part of the system.

8.3 Placement in the Patient-Provider Ecosystem

Patient and provider interactions are episodic, occurring only during scheduled appointments or follow-ups, while interactions between patients and a VA can occur daily or even multiple times a day. This frequent interaction provides an

opportunity for more active tracking of health status, which can then be shared with healthcare providers for timely and accurate monitoring and communication. Prior work has explored some aspects of the integration of LLM-powered VAs into patient-provider ecosystem [71], but a comprehensive system that includes medication intake tracking, recording of vitals, and monitoring of sleep and physical activity needs further exploration. Integrating a patient-centric VA system into the patient-provider ecosystem can enhance the quality of care and is desired by participants as indicated in our co-design workshops. The integration is two-folds. First, direct channel of communication between care providers and the VA approved by the patient. Participants suggested functionalities such as sending doctor's visit notes directly to the VA from the doctor's office, the VA setting appointments directly with the doctor's office on behalf of the patient, and the VA confirming and checking these appointments. Moreover, the VA can act as a tool to share holistic health information with doctors and even first responders, ensuring comprehensive and coordinated care. Second, the VA serves as surrogate or middleman between care providers and patients depending on the situation. Participants discussed the VA serving as a surrogate for medical advice when the doctor's office is not readily available. VAs can also offer assistance with self-diagnosis in non-emergent situations. The VA can keep record of these conversations and then share with care providers [71]. Beyond functional aspects, VAs can provide emotional support instantly, keeping patients calm in emergency scenarios. Overall, integrating VAs into the patient-provider ecosystem can bridge the gap between episodic and continuous care, enhancing the health self-management for older adults.

8.4 Catering for Diverse Needs of Aging Population

Consideration should be given to the diverse subgroups within the older adult population. Different living situations present unique challenges. For instance, those in assisted living have to compromise their autonomy due to their reliance on nursing staff for medication intake, as P2 mentioned his grievance during stage 1 interviews: *"They don't realize that patients aren't computers even though I've told them as much... For instance, right now they come in... they give it [medicine] to me in the morning around 10:30. It's supposed to be twice a day and they want to give it to me in the afternoon at 6 p.m. How is that? You know, you want to space them out as, as close to 12 hours as you can."* Therefore, they may desire VA that helps them advocate for themselves, rather than just reminding them to take medications.

Immigrant participants (W2-N and W2-Y) struggled with language barriers, often needing more time to understand the VA's questions and mentally translate responses from Mandarin to English. Thus, VAs should use simpler phrases, shorter sentences, and less complex questions for better communication. Additionally, older adults face unique challenges such as forgetfulness, cognitive decline, visual and hearing impairments, and mobility issues, all of which impact the design of personal health assistant. Therefore, these factors must be considered when designing voice assistants for older adults to address their specific needs effectively.

8.5 Limitations and Future work

While our five-stage design process offered valuable insights into older adults' needs and preferences for personal health assistants and validated the prototype's usability, a longitudinal field study is needed to assess the effectiveness of our VA to increase awareness of their health and enhance their compliance with medication reminders. Additionally, our small, sample-focused on one community center and local residents, with no participants reporting memory issues—highlights the need for future studies with a larger, more diverse population.

Acknowledgements

This work was supported by the National Science Foundation award #1840088 and Malone Center for Engineering in Healthcare.

CRediT author Statement

Amama Mahmood: Conceptualization, Methodology, Software, Validation, Formal analysis, Investigation, Data curation, Writing - Original draft, Writing - Review & editing, Visualization, Project Administration.

Shiye Cao: Conceptualization, Methodology, Validation, Formal analysis, Investigation, Data curation, Writing - Review & editing

Maia Stiber: Conceptualization, Methodology, Validation, Formal analysis, Investigation, Data curation, Writing - Review & editing

Victor Nikhil Antony: Conceptualization, Methodology, Validation, Formal analysis, Investigation, Writing - Review & editing

Chien-Ming Huang: Conceptualization, Methodology, Resources, Writing - Original draft, Writing - Review & editing, Visualization, Supervision, Funding acquisition.

References

- [1] Aaron Bangor, Philip Kortum, and James Miller. 2009. Determining what individual SUS scores mean: Adding an adjective rating scale. *Journal of usability studies* 4, 3 (2009), 114–123.
- [2] Shoshana H Bardach, Yelena N Tarasenko, and Nancy E Schoenberg. 2011. The role of social support in multiple morbidity: self-management among rural residents. *Journal of health care for the poor and underserved* 22, 3 (2011), 756–771.
- [3] Elizabeth A Bayliss, Jennifer L Ellis, and John F Steiner. 2007. Barriers to self-management and quality-of-life outcomes in seniors with multimorbidities. *The Annals of Family Medicine* 5, 5 (2007), 395–402.
- [4] D Beirl, Y Rogers, and Nicola Yuill. 2019. Using voice assistant skills in family life.
- [5] Johnna Blair and Saeed Abdullah. 2019. Understanding the needs and challenges of using conversational agents for deaf older adults. In *Conference Companion Publication of the 2019 On computer supported cooperative work and social computing*. 161–165.
- [6] Manuel Bolaños, César A Collazos, and Francisco L Gutiérrez. 2020. Adapting a Virtual Assistant Device to Support the Interaction with Elderly People.. In *ICT4AWE*. 291–298.
- [7] Robin Brewer, Casey Pierce, Pooja Upadhyay, and Leeseul Park. 2022. An empirical study of older adult’s voice assistant use for health information seeking. *ACM Transactions on Interactive Intelligent Systems (TiIS)* 12, 2 (2022), 1–32.
- [8] Aimée K Bright and Lynne Coventry. 2013. Assistive technology for older adults: psychological and socio-emotional design requirements. In *Proceedings of the 6th international conference on pervasive technologies related to assistive environments*. 1–4.
- [9] John Brooke et al. 1996. SUS-A quick and dirty usability scale. *Usability evaluation in industry* 189, 194 (1996), 4–7.
- [10] Szevi Chan, Jiachen Li, Bingsheng Yao, Amama Mahmood, Chien-Ming Huang, Holly Jimison, Elizabeth D Mynatt, and Dakuo Wang. 2023. "Mango Mango, How to Let The Lettuce Dry Without A Spinner?": Exploring User Perceptions of Using An LLM-Based Conversational Assistant Toward Cooking Partner. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.05853* (2023).
- [11] Chen Chen, Janet G Johnson, Kemeberly Charles, Alice Lee, Ella T Lifset, Michael Hogarth, Alison A Moore, Emilia Farcas, and Nadir Weibel. 2021. Understanding barriers and design opportunities to improve healthcare and QOL for older adults through voice assistants. In *Proceedings of the 23rd International ACM SIGACCESS Conference on Computers and Accessibility*. 1–16.
- [12] Young Ik Cho, Shoo-Yih D Lee, Ahsan M Arozullah, and Kathleen S Crittenden. 2008. Effects of health literacy on health status and health service utilization amongst the elderly. *Social science & medicine* 66, 8 (2008), 1809–1816.
- [13] Benjamin R Cowan, Nadia Pantidi, David Coyle, Kellie Morrissey, Peter Clarke, Sara Al-Shehri, David Earley, and Natasha Bandeira. 2017. "What can i help you with?" infrequent users’ experiences of intelligent personal assistants. In *Proceedings of the 19th international conference on human-computer interaction with mobile devices and services*. 1–12.
- [14] JM Cramm, JM Hartgerink, EW Steyerberg, TJ Bakker, JP Mackenbach, and AP Nieboer. 2013. Understanding older patients’ self-management abilities: functional loss, self-management, and well-being. *Quality of Life Research* 22 (2013), 85–92.
- [15] Nicola Davies. 2011. Promoting healthy ageing: the importance of lifestyle. *Nursing Standard (through 2013)* 25, 19 (2011), 43.
- [16] Julie Doyle, Emma Murphy, Janneke Kuiper, Suzanne Smith, Caoimhe Hannigan, An Jacobs, and John Dinsmore. 2019. Managing multimorbidity: identifying design requirements for a digital self-management tool to support older adults with multiple chronic conditions. In *Proceedings of the 2019 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*. 1–14.
- [17] Philip R Doyle, Justin Edwards, Odile Dumbleton, Leigh Clark, and Benjamin R Cowan. 2019. Mapping perceptions of humanness in intelligent personal assistant interaction. In *Proceedings of the 21st international conference on human-computer interaction with mobile devices and services*. 1–12.
- [18] David A Ellis, Ross McQueenie, Alex McConnachie, Philip Wilson, and Andrea E Williamson. 2017. Demographic and practice factors predicting repeated non-attendance in primary care: a national retrospective cohort analysis. *The Lancet Public Health* 2, 12 (2017), e551–e559.
- [19] James L Fozard and Hans-Werner Wahl. 2012. Age and cohort effects in gerontechnology: A reconsideration. *Gerontechnology* (2012).
- [20] Anna Garnett, Jenny Ploeg, Maureen Markle-Reid, and Patricia H Strachan. 2018. Self-management of multiple chronic conditions by community-dwelling older adults: A concept analysis. *SAGE Open Nursing* 4 (2018), 2377960817752471.
- [21] Emer Gilmartin, Marine Collery, Ketong Su, Yuyun Huang, Christy Elias, Benjamin R Cowan, and Nick Campbell. 2017. Social talk: making conversation with people and machine. In *Proceedings of the 1st ACM SIGCHI International Workshop on Investigating Social Interactions with Artificial Agents*. 31–32.
- [22] Erin R Giovannetti, Jennifer L Wolff, Qian-Li Xue, Carlos O Weiss, Bruce Leff, Chad Boulton, Travonia Hughes, and Cynthia M Boyd. 2012. Difficulty assisting with health care tasks among caregivers of multimorbid older adults. *Journal of general internal medicine* 27 (2012), 37–44.
- [23] Gabriel Haas, Michael Rietzler, Matt Jones, and Enrico Rukzio. 2022. Keep it Short: A Comparison of Voice Assistants’ Response Behavior. In *Proceedings of the 2022 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*. 1–12.
- [24] Christina N Harrington, Radhika Garg, Amanda Woodward, and Dimitri Williams. 2022. "It’s Kind of Like Code-Switching": Black Older Adults’ Experiences with a Voice Assistant for Health Information Seeking. In *Proceedings of the 2022 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*. 1–15.
- [25] Christina N Harrington, Lauren Wilcox, Kay Connelly, Wendy Rogers, and Jon Sanford. 2018. Designing health and fitness apps with older adults: Examining the value of experience-based co-design. In *Proceedings of the 12th EAI international conference on pervasive computing technologies for healthcare*. 15–24.

- [26] Randy Allen Harris. 2004. *Voice interaction design: crafting the new conversational speech systems*. Elsevier.
- [27] Jorunn L Helbostad, Beatrix Vereijken, Clemens Becker, Chris Todd, Kristin Taraldsen, Mirjam Pijnappels, Kamiar Aminian, and Sabato Mellone. 2017. Mobile health applications to promote active and healthy ageing. *Sensors* 17, 3 (2017), 622.
- [28] Jeff Hummel, P Evans, CM Roger, T Bearden, S McBride, P Deering, et al. 2012. Providing clinical summaries to patients after each office visit: a technical guide. *Qualis Health* (2012).
- [29] Alyssa Hwang, Natasha Oza, Chris Callison-Burch, and Andrew Head. 2023. Rewriting the Script: Adapting Text Instructions for Voice Interaction. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.09992* (2023).
- [30] Manuel Jesús-Azabal, Javier Rojo, Enrique Moguel, Daniel Flores-Martin, Javier Berrocal, José Garcia-Alonso, and Juan M Murillo. 2020. Voice assistant to remind pharmacologic treatment in elders. In *Gerontechnology: Second International Workshop, IWOG 2019, Cáceres, Spain, September 4–5, 2019, Revised Selected Papers 2*. Springer, 123–133.
- [31] Eunkyung Jo, Daniel A. Epstein, Hyunhoon Jung, and Young-Ho Kim. 2023. Understanding the Benefits and Challenges of Deploying Conversational AI Leveraging Large Language Models for Public Health Intervention. In *Proceedings of the 2023 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems* (Hamburg, Germany) (CHI '23). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, Article 18, 16 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3544548.3581503>
- [32] Sunyoung Kim and Abhishek Choudhury. 2021. Exploring older adults' perception and use of smart speaker-based voice assistants: A longitudinal study. *Computers in Human Behavior* 124 (2021), 106914.
- [33] Lyndsie M Koon, Sean A McGlynn, Kenneth A Blocker, and Wendy A Rogers. 2020. Perceptions of digital assistants from early adopters aged 55+. *Ergonomics in Design* 28, 1 (2020), 16–23.
- [34] Jarosław Kowalski, Anna Jaskulska, Kinga Skorupska, Katarzyna Abramczuk, Cezary Biele, Wiesław Kopeć, and Krzysztof Marasek. 2019. Older adults and voice interaction: A pilot study with google home. In *Extended Abstracts of the 2019 CHI Conference on human factors in computing systems*. 1–6.
- [35] Yaa A Kumah-Crystal, Claude J Pirtle, Harrison M Whyte, Edward S Goode, Shilo H Anders, and Christoph U Lehmann. 2018. Electronic health record interactions through voice: a review. *Applied clinical informatics* 9, 03 (2018), 541–552.
- [36] Lucian Leahu, Marisa Cohn, and Wendy March. 2013. How categories come to matter. In *Proceedings of the SIGCHI conference on human factors in computing systems*. 3331–3334.
- [37] Q. Vera Liao, Muhammed Mas-ud Hussain, Praveen Chandar, Matthew Davis, Yasaman Khazaeni, Marco Patricio Crasso, Dakuo Wang, Michael Muller, N. Sadat Shami, and Werner Geyer. 2018. All Work and No Play?. In *Proceedings of the 2018 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems* (Montreal QC, Canada) (CHI '18). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3173574.3173577>
- [38] Christopher Sze Chong Lim. 2010. Designing inclusive ICT products for older users: taking into account the technology generation effect. *Journal of Engineering Design* 21, 2-3 (2010), 189–206.
- [39] Ewa Luger and Abigail Sellen. 2016. "Like Having a Really Bad PA" The Gulf between User Expectation and Experience of Conversational Agents. In *Proceedings of the 2016 CHI conference on human factors in computing systems*. 5286–5297.
- [40] Amama Mahmood, Junxiang Wang, and Chien-Ming Huang. 2024. Situated Understanding of Older Adults' Interactions with Voice Assistants: A Month-long In-home Study. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.02421* (2024).
- [41] Amama Mahmood, Junxiang Wang, Bingsheng Yao, Dakuo Wang, and Chien-Ming Huang. 2023. LLM-Powered Conversational Voice Assistants: Interaction Patterns, Opportunities, Challenges, and Design Guidelines. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.13879* (2023).
- [42] R Manfredi. 2017. SMS Reminders Reduce Missed Medical Appointments for Providers.
- [43] Hannah Ramsden Marston and Julie Samuels. 2019. A review of age friendly virtual assistive technologies and their effect on daily living for carers and dependent adults. In *Healthcare*, Vol. 7. MDPI, 49.
- [44] Aqueasha Martin-Hammond, Sravani Vemireddy, Kartik Rao, et al. 2019. Exploring older adults' beliefs about the use of intelligent assistants for consumer health information management: A participatory design study. *JMIR aging* 2, 2 (2019), e15381.
- [45] Kenneth R McLeroy, Daniel Bibeau, Allan Steckler, and Karen Glanz. 1988. An ecological perspective on health promotion programs. *Health education quarterly* 15, 4 (1988), 351–377.
- [46] Emma Mitchell and Richard Walker. 2020. Global ageing: successes, challenges and opportunities. *British journal of hospital medicine* 81, 2 (2020), 1–9.
- [47] Tracy L Mitzner, Julie B Boron, Cara Bailey Fausset, Anne E Adams, Neil Charness, Sara J Czaja, Katinka Dijkstra, Arthur D Fisk, Wendy A Rogers, and Joseph Sharit. 2010. Older adults talk technology: Technology usage and attitudes. *Computers in human behavior* 26, 6 (2010), 1710–1721.
- [48] Roger K Moore, Hui Li, and Shih-Hao Liao. 2016. Progress and Prospects for Spoken Language Technology: What Ordinary People Think.. In *Interspeech*. San Francisco, CA, 3007–3011.
- [49] National Council on Aging. 2022. Chronic Inequities: Measuring Disease Cost Burden Among Older Adults in the U.S. A Health and Retirement Study Analysis. <https://ncoa.org/article/the-inequities-in-the-cost-of-chronic-disease-why-it-matters-for-older-adults> Page 5, Figure 2.
- [50] Thi Ngoc Minh Nguyen, Lisa Whitehead, Rosemary Saunders, and Gordana Dermody. 2022. Systematic review of perception of barriers and facilitators to chronic disease self-management among older adults: Implications for evidence-based practice. *Worldviews on Evidence-Based Nursing* 19, 3 (2022), 191–200.
- [51] David Oliver. 2019. David Oliver: Missed GP appointments are no scandal. *bmj* 364 (2019).

- [52] Federal Interagency Forum on Aging-Related Statistics. 2020. *Older Americans 2020: Key indicators of well-being*. U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, DC. <http://www.agingstats.gov/docs/LatestReport/OA2020.pdf> Accessed: July 1, 2024.
- [53] Ricardo Pais, Luis Ruano, Ofélia P. Carvalho, and Henrique Barros. 2020. Global cognitive impairment prevalence and incidence in community dwelling older adults—a systematic review. *Geriatrics* 5, 4 (2020), 84.
- [54] Sarita Pathak, Gregory Summerville, Celia P Kaplan, Sarah S Nouri, and Leah S Karliner. 2020. Patient-reported use of the after visit summary in a primary care internal medicine practice. *Journal of Patient Experience* 7, 5 (2020), 703–707.
- [55] Alisha Pradhan, Amanda Lazar, and Leah Findlater. 2020. Use of intelligent voice assistants by older adults with low technology use. *ACM Transactions on Computer-Human Interaction (TOCHI)* 27, 4 (2020), 1–27.
- [56] Alisha Pradhan, Kanika Mehta, and Leah Findlater. 2018. "Accessibility Came by Accident" Use of Voice-Controlled Intelligent Personal Assistants by People with Disabilities. In *Proceedings of the 2018 CHI Conference on human factors in computing systems*. 1–13.
- [57] Sherry Ruan, Jacob O Wobbrock, Kenny Liou, Andrew Ng, and James Landay. 2016. Speech is 3x faster than typing for english and mandarin text entry on mobile devices. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1608.07323* (2016).
- [58] Jamie Sanders and Aqueasha Martin-Hammond. 2019. Exploring autonomy in the design of an intelligent health assistant for older adults. In *Proceedings of the 24th International conference on intelligent user interfaces: companion*. 95–96.
- [59] Nancy E Schoenberg, Corinne Leach, and William Edwards. 2009. "It's a toss up between my hearing, my heart, and my hip": Prioritizing and Accommodating Multiple Morbidities by Vulnerable Older Adults. *Journal of health care for the poor and underserved* 20, 1 (2009), 134–151.
- [60] Marcia Y Shade, Kyle Rector, Rasila Soumana, and Kevin Kupzyk. 2020. Voice assistant reminders for pain self-management tasks in aging adults. *Journal of gerontological nursing* 46, 10 (2020), 27–33.
- [61] Victoria Shahly, S Chatterji, MJ Gruber, A Al-Hamzawi, J Alonso, LH Andrade, MC Angermeyer, Ronny Bruffaerts, Brendan Bunting, JM Caldas-de Almeida, et al. 2013. Cross-national differences in the prevalence and correlates of burden among older family caregivers in the World Health Organization World Mental Health (WMH) Surveys. *Psychological medicine* 43, 4 (2013), 865–879.
- [62] Elizabeth Smith, Petroc Sumner, Craig Hedge, and Georgina Powell. 2023. Smart-speaker technology and intellectual disabilities: agency and wellbeing. *Disability and Rehabilitation: Assistive Technology* 18, 4 (2023), 432–442.
- [63] Brodrick Stigall, Jenny Waycott, Steven Baker, and Kelly Caine. 2019. Older adults' perception and use of voice user interfaces: a preliminary review of the computing literature. In *Proceedings of the 31st Australian Conference on Human-Computer-Interaction*. 423–427.
- [64] Hironobu Takagi, Masaki Ohno, Masatomo Kobayashi, and Takeo Nakada. 2018. Evaluating speech-based question–answer interactions for elder-care services. *IBM Journal of Research and Development* 62, 1 (2018), 6–1.
- [65] Ross EG Upshur and Shawn Tracy. 2008. Chronicity and complexity: is what's good for the diseases always good for the patients? *Canadian Family Physician* 54, 12 (2008), 1655–1658.
- [66] Gaby Anne Wildenbos, Monique WM Jaspers, Marlies P Schijven, and LW Dusseljee-Peute. 2019. Mobile health for older adult patients: Using an aging barriers framework to classify usability problems. *International journal of medical informatics* 124 (2019), 68–77.
- [67] World Health Organization. 2018. *Be Healthy, Be Mobile: A handbook on how to implement mAgeing*. World Health Organization. <https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/9789241514125> Accessed: July 8, 2024.
- [68] World Health Organization. 2022. Ageing and health. <https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/ageing-and-health>
- [69] Linda Wulf, Markus Garschall, Julia Himmelsbach, and Manfred Tscheligi. 2014. Hands free-care free: elderly people taking advantage of speech-only interaction. In *Proceedings of the 8th Nordic Conference on Human-Computer Interaction: Fun, Fast, Foundational*. 203–206.
- [70] Satoshi Yamada, Daisuke Kitakoshi, Akihiro Yamashita, Kentarou Suzuki, and Masato Suzuki. 2018. Development of an intelligent dialogue agent with smart devices for older adults: a preliminary study. In *2018 Conference on Technologies and Applications of Artificial Intelligence (TAAI)*. IEEE, 50–53.
- [71] Ziqi Yang, Xuhai Xu, Bingsheng Yao, Ethan Rogers, Shao Zhang, Stephen Intille, Nawar Shara, Guodong Gordon Gao, and Dakuo Wang. 2024. Talk2Care: An LLM-based Voice Assistant for Communication between Healthcare Providers and Older Adults. *Proceedings of the ACM on Interactive, Mobile, Wearable and Ubiquitous Technologies* 8, 2 (2024), 1–35.

Appendix

Table 4. Demographics of participants: All participants were fluent in English. All were retired except P10a and W3-B (employed full-time), P11a (employed part-time), and 1C and 2C, who are volunteering or seeking opportunities. Note: “eq” means equivalent diploma. P1–P17 participated in the initial interview. *WX-I* represents the co-design workshop participants, where *X* is the number of the co-design workshop and *I* is the initial of their preferred name *e.g.*, *W1 – B*. *XI* represents evaluation study participants, where *X* is the participant number and *I* is the initial of their preferred name *e.g.*, *2C*.

P	Gender	Age	Ethnicity	Highest degree	Profession	Disabilities
Community Center - Assisted Living (By Self)						
1	F	94	Caucasian	High school or eq	Homemaker	Memory issues
2	M	66	Prefer not to say	Bachelor’s degree	Physician assistant	Wheelchair
3	F	82	Caucasian	High school or eq	Accountant clerk	Hearing aid
4	M	79	Caucasian	Master’s degree	Actuary	Wheelchair
Community Center - Independent Living (By Self)						
5	F	77	Caucasian	Bachelor’s degree	Social work	
6; W2-M; 4M	F	81	Caucasian	Master’s degree	CIA	Cane/Rollator
7	F	74	African American	Bachelor’s degree	Administrator	
14	F	73	African American	Bachelor’s degree	Senior Claims	
15; W2-L	F	73	African American	Master’s degree	Educator/Pastor	
W2-E	F	79	Caucasian	Bachelor’s degree	Admin Assistant	Walker
Community Center - Independent Living (With Spouse)						
W3-N	F	81	Asian	Trade school	Teacher	
W3-Y	M	88	Asian	Master’s degree	Teacher	
1C	F	84	Caucasian	Trade school	Tailor	
Homeowner (By Self)						
8	F	84	Caucasian	Bachelor’s degree	Writer/editor	Walker
9; W1-B	M	75	Caucasian	Bachelor’s degree	Case management	
13	M	81	Caucasian			Vision issues
17	F	68	Caucasian	Trade school	EEG technologist	
W1-P	F	81	Caucasian	Master’s degree	Teacher/social worker	
W1-L; 4L	F	81	Caucasian	Bachelor’s degree	Dietitian	Mild arthritis
2C	F	76	Caucasian	PhD	Neuroscientologist	Vision issues
Homeowner (Couple, With Spouse)						
10a	M	68	Caucasian	Bachelor’s degree	Staff engineer	
10b	F	94	Caucasian	Master’s degree	Education	Walker/scooter
11a; W1-R; 5R	M	72	Caucasian	Master’s degree	Urban planning	
11b	F	71	Asian	Master’s degree	Social work/teacher	
12a	M	75	Caucasian	Bachelor’s degree		
12b	F	72	Caucasian	Nursing diploma	Registered nurse	
16a	M	76	Caucasian	Bachelor’s degree	Business owner	
16b	F	75	Caucasian	Nursing diploma	Nurse	
W3-B	F	65	Asian	Ph.D.	Lecturer	

Table 5. Participants for Co-design workshops: Voice assistant technology use and current health management practices. For medication intake they rely on memory unless states otherwise.

P	VA technology use	Appointments	Medications
Workshop 1: Community dwelling adults			
W1-B	Uses smart speaker based VA (Alexa)	Phone calendar	Relies on memory
W1-P	Uses smart speaker based VA (Alexa)	Paper calendar	Pill boxes, one for morning and one for night
W1-R	Used smart speaker based VA (Alexa)	Phone calendar	Relies on memory
W1-L	Uses phone based VA (Siri)	Paper calendar	Pill boxes, one for morning and one for night
Workshop 2: Independent living community center			
W2-L	Uses multiple smart speaker based VA (Alexa)	Phone calendar, VA reminders	Pill boxes, sometimes use Alexa for reminders
W2-M	Used smart speaker based VA (Alexa)	Paper calendar	Pill boxes
W2-E	Never used VA	Phone calendar, no reminders	Pill boxes
Workshop 3: Immigrants			
W2-B	Uses smart speaker (Apple's HomePod)	Phone calendar, reminders	Relies on memory
W2-N	Never used VA	Paper calendar	Pill boxes, one for morning and one for night
W2-Y	Never used VA	Paper calendar	Pill boxes, one for morning and one for night

Table 6. Example of profile creation for participant 1C from the conversation.

VA	Participant
Now, is your daily routine like wake-up time, meals, and sleep time consistent, or does it change? Also, do you have the same routine over the weekend? ⁷	Yes, that's my routine you mentioned and I do keep the same routine over the weekend.
Got it. How do you store and manage your medications? Do you use pill boxes or keep them in their original containers? ³ ⁷	I keep a week supply in a pill box dated and I take them at one time in the evening just before I go to bed and the rest the bottles are in my nightstand my night table and I fill up the pill box weekly and that's about all I can say and that subject.
Thanks for sharing that. To set the reminders correctly, could you tell me what time you usually wake up and go to bed? ⁸ ⁹	I go to bed between nine and ten and I wake up between six and seven.
Thanks for that. When do you usually have your meals, like breakfast, lunch, and dinner? ⁹	Breakfast when I'm hungry lunch around one.
Thanks for sharing. Could you also let me know when you usually have dinner? ⁹	Between five and six p.m.
I missed your response. Could you please repeat when you usually have dinner?	Dinner is usually between five and six p. m.
Got it. Is there any other specific preference you have regarding medication reminders?	I need the pill box that's all thank you
VA generated user profile: user has consistent routine, wakes up between 6 and 7 AM, and goes to bed between 9 and 10 PM. Breakfast is variable, lunch is around 1 PM, and dinner is between 5 and 6 PM. Manages medications using a weekly pill box, taken all at one time in the evening just before going to bed. Keeps the rest of the bottles in a nightstand.	