

1 **Title**

2 Assessing the usability of the new automated medication dispensation device for patients and the
3 adherence dashboard for real-time medication monitoring for healthcare providers: a study
4 protocol
5

6 **Short title**

7 Usability of a new automated medication dispensation device and adherence dashboard: study
8 protocol
9

10

11 **Author names and affiliations:**

12 Tejal Patel^{1,2,3¶}, Christoph Laeer^{1,4,5,6¶*}, Hamed Darabi^{8,#a&}, Maxime Lachance^{6,#b&}, Michelle
13 Anawati^{4,6,8}, Marie-Hélène Chomienne^{6,8¶}
14
15

- 16 1. University of Waterloo, School of Pharmacy
17 10A Victoria St. S, Kitchener, ON N2G 1C5 Canada,
18
19 2. Centre for Family Medicine Family Health Team
20 10B Victoria St S, Kitchener, ON N2G 1C5 Canada
21
22 3. University of Waterloo – Schlegel Research Institute of Aging
23 250 Laurelwood Drive, Waterloo, ON N2J0E2 Canada
24
25 4. Équipe de santé familiale communautaire de l'Est d'Ottawa
26 1811 St Joseph Blvd, ON K1C 7C6 Orléans, Canada
27
28 5. Family First Family Health Team: c/o Family First Health Centre,
29 PO Box 51031, 375 Des Epinettes Ave, ON K1E 3E0 Canada;
30
31 6. Institut du Savoir Montfort,
32 713 chemin Montréal, Ottawa, ON K1K0T2 Canada
33
34 7. Department of Family Medicine, University of Ottawa,
35 600 Peter Morand Cresc. Suite 201. Ottawa, ON K1G 5Z3 Canada
36
37 8. University of Toronto, Leslie Dan Faculty of Pharmacy,
38 144 College Street, Toronto, ON M5S 3M2 Canada
39

40 #a Current address: Loblaw Pharmacy, 1980 Baseline Rd, Nepean, ON K2C 0C6 Canada
41

42 #b Current address: School of Psychologie, Université de Moncton, 18 avenue Antonine-
43 Maillet, Moncton, NB E1A 3E9 Canada
44

45 **Keywords:**

46 Technology assessment, smart oral multi dose medication adherence products, chronic disease,

47 multimorbidity, polypharmacy

48 **Word count:** 4721

49

50 **Funding**

51 The project is funded by the Association of the academic physicians of the Hôpital

52 Montfort (AMUHM) , Family Medecine Department, Ottawa, ON, Canada. 19-20-08-020

53

54

55 **Declarations of interest:**

56 Tejal Patel: None

57 Christoph Laeer: None

58 Hamed Darabi: None

59 Maxime Lachance: None

60 Michelle Anawati: None

61 Marie-Hélène Chomienne: None

62

63

64

65 *** Corresponding Author:**

66 Christoph Laeer, claeer@esfestottawa.ca (CL)

67

68 † These authors also contributed equally to the work

69

70 & These authors also contributed equally

71 **Abstract:**

72 **Background:**

73 Non-adherence to prescribed medication regimens can lead to suboptimal control of
74 chronic health conditions and increased hospitalizations. Older adults may find it particularly
75 challenging to self-manage medications due to physical and cognitive limitations resulting in
76 medication non-adherence. While automated medication dispensing technologies may offer a
77 solution for medication self-management among older adults, these technologies must
78 demonstrate usability before effectiveness can be investigated and products made available for
79 widespread use.

80

81 **Objectives:**

82 This study will aim to measure usability, workload, and unassisted task completion rates
83 of an automated medication dispenser and medication adherence dashboard on the Medipense
84 portal with older adults and their clinicians, respectively.

85

86 **Methods:**

87 This study is designed as convergent parallel mixed methods observational study with
88 older adults and their clinicians. Usability will be examined with the use the System Usability
89 Scale while NASA-TLX will be utilized to assess the workload of both the device and the
90 adherence monitoring platform. Cognitive walkthrough will be utilized prior to usability testing
91 to identify series of steps required to use the automated dispenser and adherence dashboard. The
92 study will assess the unassisted task completion rates to successfully operate the device. Semi-

93 structured interviews with both types of participants will provide qualitative data with which to
94 comprehensively gauge user experience with the automated dispenser.

95

96 **Results:**

97 The results of this study will allow us to examine usability of both the automated
98 medication dispensing system and the adherence monitoring dashboard from older adult and
99 health care provider perspectives. The results of this study will highlight and address the
100 challenges with usability that older adults and healthcare providers may face with this device and
101 dashboard.

102

103 **Conclusions:**

104 The results of this study will be used to optimize the usability of both the automated
105 medication dispenser and the adherence dashboard.

106

107 **Keywords:**

108 Technology assessment, smart oral multi dose medication adherence products, chronic disease,
109 multimorbidity, polypharmacy

110

111

112 **Introduction**

113 Worldwide, the population is aging and by 2050, there will be 2.1 billion individuals
114 older than 60 years of age, accounting for 1 out of every 5 people.[1] The increased life
115 expectancy is resulting in an increased prevalence of chronic disease comorbidities, functional
116 impairment and concomitant multiple medications use.[2-6] The use of multiple medications
117 introduces new challenges such as adverse effects, drug interactions, drug-induced diseases,
118 complex drug dosing regimens, with resulting negative impact on medication non-adherence and
119 an increase in medication errors.[6-9] Adherence is defined as “the degree to which the person’s
120 behavior corresponds with the agreed recommendations of a healthcare provider.”[9]
121 Medication non-adherence is of particular importance in management of chronic conditions.
122 Non-adherence leads to less than optimal control of chronic health conditions and significant
123 additional costs for the Canadian healthcare system estimated at \$4 billion CAD per year.[10-14]
124 There are numerous reasons why patients do not adhere to a medication regimen. Of the five
125 different types of factors identified,[15,16] patient and therapy related factors are of particular
126 importance among older adults. For example, increasing use of multiple medications to treat an
127 increasing number of multi-morbidities results in complex therapeutic regimens which directly
128 impact medication adherence negatively.[8,16,17] Older adults, especially those who may have
129 mild cognitive impairment, may become more forgetful which decreases medication
130 adherence.[17] Outside of forgetfulness and short-term memory impairment, a decline in
131 executive function may reduce the ability of cognitively impaired individuals to organize and
132 plan medication taking activities. [18,19] In addition, older adults may also accumulate physical
133 limitations which impact medication taking resulting in medication non-adherence. Vision
134 impairment increases the risk of medication errors.[20] Age-related conditions such as arthritis

135 and Parkinson’s disease impacts the ability to open vials and punch blister packs. [21] According
136 to the World Health Organization, the rate of medication non-adherence in developed countries
137 nears 50%.[10]

138

139 The well recognized problem of medication non-adherence has spurred the development
140 of numerous medication adherence technologies. A recent literature review identified 78 devices
141 capable of providing real-time monitoring of medication intake.[22] Among these devices are
142 vials, blister packaging, pill boxes, storage boxes and injectable and inhaler devices embedded
143 with sensors or other technology that permits real-time tracking of medication taking through
144 opening of vials or pill box compartments, puncturing of blisters or actuation or injection.[22]

145 These devices offer a sizeable array of features which may impact the usability of the devices by
146 older adults based on the physical or cognitive limitations they are facing. Usability is defined as
147 the “extent to which a system, product or service can be used by specified users to achieve a
148 specified goal with effectiveness, efficiency and satisfaction in a specified context of use.”[23] In
149 their examination of key usability barriers associated with the use health technolog among older
150 adults, Wildenbos et al. proposed a framework of four key categories: cognitive, physical,
151 perception and motivational barriers as relevant for effective and safe use of technology.[24]

152 Within this framework, cognitive barriers such as declining working memory, spatial cognition,
153 attention, verbal fluency and reasoning may impact errors in the use of the technology, decrease
154 efficiency, learnability, memorability and satisfaction.[24] Physical ability barriers such as
155 declining speed of performance, grip strength, hand-eye coordination and flexibility of joints
156 impact errors and efficiency of use.[24] Similarly, vision acuity, contrast detection, color vision,
157 computer literacy, self confidence also affects learnability, efficiency, errors and satisfaction

158 with use of technology.[24] Therefore, it is imperative that usability of medication adherence
159 technology is assessed with older adults prior to utilizing these devices to address medication
160 non-adherence.

161
162 Unfortunately, very few studies have examined the usability of medication adherence
163 technology in older adults. In one study, where the usability of 21 electronic medication
164 adherence products was investigated in older adults, caregivers and healthcare professionals,
165 usability varied widely, with mean usability scores, as measured with System Usability Scale
166 (SUS) per product ranging from 0 to 100.[25] However, the products tested in this study
167 included electronic blister cards, pillboxes, and prescription vials with electronic caps with a
168 variety of features. None of these electronic medication adherence devices automatically
169 dispensed medications.

170
171 In one of the earliest studies examining the perceived usefulness and satisfaction of an
172 automated medication dispensing device, 96 frail older adults receiving home care used one such
173 device, the MD.2 dispenser, for one year after which they reported on the ease of use, reliability,
174 acceptability, routine task performance and medication management assistance.[27] The MD.2
175 medication dispenser was 13” by 12” by 14” machine which held 42 medication cups and could
176 dispense 1 to 6 cups per day. The front of the machine had a delivery ramp, an alert light, an
177 LCD message screen and a dispensing button. The dispenser dispensed the allocated medications
178 in a cup when dispensing button was pressed. In this study, 94% of participants found the device
179 very easy to use and 84% indicated they would use it in the future. However, the results are not
180 reflective of initial usability, i.e. immediately after the implementation of the device The study

181 did not address the usability concerns that frail older adults may have faced in the first days or
182 weeks of use. Furthermore, pre-filled cups with unit doses of patient's medications were refilled
183 in the MD.2 every two weeks by nurses and not the participants. This further limited a true test
184 of usability of the device by participants by limiting the interaction with the machine to one of
185 just dispensing. Finally, participants were receiving home care and had frequent interactions with
186 healthcare providers who assisted with the automated dispensing device.

187

188 In their study examining the impact of cognitive impairment on the usability of an
189 electronic medication delivery device, Ligons et al., demonstrated a significant relationship
190 between cognitive impairment, measured with Mini Mental Status Examination (MMSE) scores
191 and percentage of task success. For example, individuals with MMSE scores of 24 and above (no
192 cognitive impairment) were able to successfully complete 69% of the tasks compared to only
193 34% of those with MMSE scores of <24 ($p = 0.04$).^[28] The automated medication dispenser
194 used in this study was designed to deliver medications from single dose blister cards based on a
195 schedule programmed by pharmacies. Up to 10 different blister cards could be loaded into this
196 device and users interacted with the device through a touch screen interface. At the time of
197 scheduled dose, the automated dispenser would beep and display a flashing message on the touch
198 screen to alert the user to take their medication doses. Participants were then expected to confirm
199 their readiness to take their medication as well as retrieve the blister card from the dispensing
200 drawer, and extract the dose from the blister. The participants were tested on several usability
201 tasks such as loading and unloading blister cards, removing pills from the blister cards, manual
202 drop, and viewing inventory. Usability was measured with SUS and observed by researchers as

203 they interacted with the dispenser. Only three of the 19 participants scored SUS at 80 or higher.
204 Task success rates ranged from 10.5% for manual drop to 57.9% for viewing inventory.

205

206 In a more recent study, usability, usefulness, satisfaction and impact on caregiver burden
207 of an automated medication dispenser was tested with 58 older adults and 11 caregivers.[28]
208 Usability was measured with SUS and Usefulness, Satisfaction and Ease of Use questionnaire. In
209 this study, the mean SUS scores was 85.74 (SD 12.7, range 47.5 – 100). More than 75% of
210 participants agreed with the statement that the product was easy to use. The automated
211 medication dispensing system, spencer, is a rectangular shaped device with a touch screen, a
212 narrow opening in the front that allows the dispensation of single multidose medication pouch
213 and opening at the top for loading of refill boxes. It dispenses multidose pouches of the
214 participants' medications at scheduled times. The multidose pouches are packaged in strips by
215 pharmacies and supplied in boxes that are loaded into the dispenser. Pouches can be dispensed
216 with the use of a touch screen interface. Although most participants found the automated
217 dispenser easy to use, usability was only measured at the end of the 6 months intervention.
218 Similar to the study conducted with the MD.2 automated dispenser, this study did not capture the
219 usability of the device at the beginning of the intervention. Furthermore, the study did not
220 observe the participants who successfully carried out the tasks and which required more
221 assistance.

222

223 While all the automated medication dispensers appear to have a touch screen or LCD
224 interface and all appear to dispense medications that are prepackaged into a multidose container,
225 the usability of the different automated dispensers varies. Some digital interfaces may be

226 challenging for some older adults, while others may not be able to complete the loading of refills.
227 Therefore, it is necessary to observe how older adults interact with the automated dispenser at
228 their initial interaction as well as after a period of time of regular use. Assessment of usability
229 and task success at the initial interaction is necessary to identify whether the usability challenges
230 encountered can be addressed before long-term use is implemented. Assessment of long-term
231 usability is necessary to measure learnability of using the device appropriately to ensure safe
232 medication dispensing.

233

234 Therefore, we aim to study the overall and task specific usability of a new automated
235 medication dispenser with older adults at the start of the study intervention and after 6 weeks of
236 use. We will also examine the usability of a connected real-time medication intake monitoring
237 dashboard with the participants' health care providers. The dashboard enables clinicians to view
238 adherence metrics of medications their patients are prescribed while they use the automated
239 medication dispenser. As with measuring the usability of automated dispensers, usability of
240 accessing and viewing adherence data is also just as important to measure. If there are usability
241 concerns with accessibility of the dashboard, or with interpretability of adherence metrics by
242 clinicians, useful information may not be utilized in clinic to adherence medication non-
243 adherence.

244

245 **Ethical Approval**

246 This research project has undergone ethical review and approval by the Hôpital Montfort
247 Research ethics board (HM-REB) ID 19-20-08-020, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada. Prior to enrolling

248 in the study, participants will be informed of the study details in writing, and will provide
249 written, informed consent for limited data abstraction from their medical records.

250

251 **Methods**

252 **Study Design**

253 This study is designed as a prospective, parallel mixed-methods convergent study. We
254 will utilize both quantitative measures, such as the System Usability Scale [29] and NASA Load
255 Index (NASA-TLX) [30] as well as semi-structured interviews with participants to realize the
256 potential barriers to appropriate use of the automated medication dispenser as well as the
257 medication adherence tracking platform. Prior to testing the usability of the automated
258 medication dispenser and the adherence tracking platform, we will collaboratively establish steps
259 for an appropriate use through the use of cognitive walkthroughs with the developers of the
260 automated medication dispenser as well as the adherence dashboard, clinicians and
261 researchers.[31] An overview of the study process can be found in Fig 1.

262

263 **Study Participants**

264 **Inclusion criteria**

265 Older adult participants: Older adults, aged 65 years and older, will be recruited from
266 patients presenting to one family health team in Ontario, Canada. Additional inclusion criteria
267 include the use of three or more prescriptions and/or over-the-counter medications as well as
268 having at least two chronic conditions.

269

270 **Healthcare provider participants:**

271 Clinicians, including family physicians, pharmacists and nurse practitioners who are
272 interested in accessing real-time medication adherence data on the adherence dashboard of their
273 patients who have enrolled in the study will also be invited to participate.

274

275 **Exclusion criteria**

276 Older adults participants who are non-French-speaking will be excluded as the Family
277 Health Team serves primarily a French population. Additionally, individuals with a diagnosis of
278 dementia (any type) or cognitive impairment as noted in their electronic medical record will be
279 excluded as this could impact participants' ability to learn and accurately use the dispensing
280 device.

281

282 **Healthcare provider participants:**

283 Healthcare providers whose patients have not enrolled in this study will be excluded.

284

285 **Sampling technique**

286 We will use purposive sampling techniques to recruit both types of participants in this
287 study.

288

289 **Sample Size**

290 A sample size of 5 is adequate to identify up to 80% of the usability problems with a
291 device; ^[32] therefore, we will aim to recruit at least 5 and up to 10 older adults and their

292 healthcare providers, including their family physician, nurse practitioner and pharmacist, to test
293 the usability of the automated medication dispenser and adherence dashboard.

294

295 **Location**

296 This study will be conducted at the Équipe de santé familiale communautaire de l'Est
297 d'Ottawa which has two sites in Ottawa. Currently, 12 doctors, 4 nurse practitioners, 4 registered
298 nurses, 1 psychologist, 1 social worker, 1 pharmacist, and 1 dietitian serve approximately 9000
299 patients (June 3rd, 2023).

300

301 **Recruitment period**

302 The recruitment period is planned from January 1st 2024 to February 28th 2024

303

304 **Automated Medication Dispenser**

305 In this study, we will use Medipense RxPense® device (9.84” by 14.06” by 18.09”). [33]
306 It is a dispensing device with a remote monitoring solution that ensures that the user will take
307 the correct medications on time. Medications in this packaging will hold up to two weeks’ worth
308 of medication supply with 56 individual containers delivering up to 8 doses a day. The device
309 notifies users about the next dose by voice prompts, visual alarms, remote notifications to a
310 wearable alert device, email or SMS alerts. If a user misses a dose the designated caregivers will
311 be notified through SMS or email. It records and documents the use of all prescriptions including
312 “as needed” prescriptions and over-the-counter medications. Medications are securely locked
313 into the device and can only be dispensed when the user is authenticated at the right time through
314 the use biometric, radio frequency identification or a password. Any missed doses will be kept in

315 the RxPense ® device. The dispensing mechanism is arthritis friendly and the display supports
316 visually impaired persons. Verification and audit trail is also provided with images during pill
317 dispensing and after the patient is taking the pills. An audit trail is securely stored (HIPAA and
318 PIPEDA compliant) in the RxPense® Cloud.

319

320 The RxPense device is connected to the RxPense® Portal and provides real time
321 information and access to the user relevant information, monitoring and adherence by all defined
322 members of the circle of care. [34] The RxPense® Portal allows tracking and reporting of
323 medication adherence on an organizational and patient level. Before or after dispensing the
324 medications, patients can be asked questions about their well-being, health or consumption
325 habits. Data collected may be stored anonymized for further analysis. Reports are displayed to
326 the patient on the RxPense Hub screen. It can also capture monitor and store vitals (through
327 external sensors), in the electronic patient record.

328

329 **Outcomes**

330 We aim to examine the overall usability with the System Usability Scale (SUS). The
331 SUS has been used to examine the usability of medication adherence products in previous
332 studies.[29] It is a quick and easily administered end-of-test subjective assessment of the
333 usability of a product. It consists of 10 statements (5 positive and 5 negative) which are scored
334 immediately after testing a product on a 5-point Likert scale. Scores range from 0 to 100, higher
335 scores indicating more user-friendliness of the product. We will also examine the workload
336 involved in using the automated medication dispenser and the adherence tracking platform.
337 Human mental workload is an important concept associated with usability. It refers to cost

338 associated with performing a cognitive task and can be used to predict operator and/or system
339 performance.[35] Interaction between workload and usability drive objective performance of
340 technology. Indeed, a previous study demonstrated that higher workload with setting up and
341 using a medication adherence product was associated with declining SUS scores.[25] In this
342 study, NASA-TLX will be used to measure workload.[30] The NASA-TLX consists of six
343 subscales: mental, physical and temporal demands, frustration, effort and performance.
344 Participants will be asked to rate each of the above-mentioned variables on a 20-point scale that
345 measures from high to low (scored from 0-100). Finally, before we initiate the usability studies,
346 we will conduct cognitive walkthrough with the automated medication dispenser and the
347 adherence tracking platform collaboratively with the developers of the dispenser and the research
348 team. Cognitive walkthrough methodology examines the level of difficulty in completing
349 particular tasks within a system and will enable the researchers to identify the pain points of
350 using both the automated dispenser and adherence dashboard by older adults and clinicians,
351 respectively. [31] Key tasks for using both the automated dispenser and the adherence dashboard
352 will be determined a priori by investigators. These include key tasks that are completed
353 frequently or critical to complete and those that exhibit core capabilities of the system.
354 Participants are then invited to “use” the automated medication dispenser or the adherence
355 dashboard while thinking aloud and under observation by investigators; points at which the
356 completion of key tasks fail will be noted for further development and iteration on a cognitive
357 walkthrough checklist. Think aloud refers to participants verbalizing their thoughts as they
358 complete the tasks required to use the automated medication dispenser or the adherence
359 dashboard.[36] Think aloud enables researchers to gain insight into what the participant is
360 thinking and reflect on why errors occur. Unassisted completion rates of all tasks (number of

361 steps completed accurately without assistance/total number of steps) and key errors (and reasons
362 for these errors) will be reported.[37]

363

364 **Intervention**

365 Patients who agree to participate will test the device at home. All participants will be
366 trained by the developers of the automated dispensing system. A nurse will provide home
367 support to participants. The duration of the usability study will be 6 weeks per older adult
368 participant. We plan 2 visits for all participants. During the first visit at the beginning of the
369 study period, all participants will provide informed consent and will be trained to use the
370 automated medication dispenser. Following the training, participants will be asked to use the
371 automated dispenser to access one dose of their medication regimen while thinking aloud and
372 being under observation by a research team member. As a part of the cognitive walkthrough,
373 participants will be observed by a member of the research team during the use of the dispenser.
374 A research member will note whether each step in accessing the medication dose is completed
375 successfully without assistance. These sessions will be audio recorded. If the participant
376 encounters any problems with successfully completing the steps, these will be noted in detail by
377 the research assistant on the Cognitive Walkthrough data collection sheet. Once this medication
378 has been dispensed, they will be asked to complete SUS and NASA-TLX. Following the
379 completion of both tools, participants will participate in a one-on-one semi-structured interview
380 designed to investigate their impression of the device, the particular problems they encountered
381 with the dispenser, and discuss any assistance they required to successfully complete the task of
382 dispensing the medication. Once the interview is completed, researchers will complete a second
383 round of training with the participant to ensure they are able to use the automated dispenser

384 effectively for the remainder of the study duration. At the end of the 6-week duration of the
385 study, we will complete a second visit (Visit 2) with the older adult participants. During this
386 visit, participants will complete the SUS and NASA-TLX again. Another semistructured
387 interview will be conducted to investigate the participants' experience with using the device over
388 the 6 week period.

389

390 Healthcare providers whose patients have agreed to participate in the study and who are
391 interested in accessing the medication adherence dashboard will be invited to participate in a
392 one-day training module where they will be trained on the steps required to access the adherence
393 data for their patient as well as to interpret the information available. During this training session,
394 they will also be asked to provide informed consent. Once they are trained, they will be
395 provided with access to their patient's medication adherence information. One week after their
396 patients have been using the automated medication dispensing device, they will be asked to
397 access the medication adherence tracking platform while under the observation of a research
398 team member, who will note the challenges the healthcare provider encounters while accessing
399 and using the platform. Similar to the older adult participants, healthcare provider participants
400 will be invited to think aloud as they use the adherence dashboard. At the end of this session, the
401 healthcare provider will complete a SUS and NASA-TLX and participate in a semi-structured
402 interview designed to further examine the usability of the dashboard, identify points where
403 clinicians encounter difficulties with accessing or interpreting the medication adherence data.
404 At the end of the six week study period a semi structured group interview with all health care
405 providers will be conducted to gather further information about the device experience.

406

407 **Data collection**

408 In addition to SUS and NASA-TLX, we will also collect socio-demographics (age, self-
409 identified gender, sex at birth, medical conditions, name and dosing regimen of prescribed and
410 “as needed” prescription and over-the-counter medications, number of doctors and other
411 healthcare providers involved in the patient’s care, any physical or sensory barriers (for example,
412 physical strength of upper extremities, pain, numbness, tremor in upper extremities, vision or
413 hearing impairment) to medication management. We will ask participants to identify if they use
414 any medication taking aids as well as how long they have used these aids. We will capture the
415 type and intensity of caregiver support that older adult participant have access to at home.
416 Demographic data (age, self-identified gender, sex at birth, years of practice, discipline, patient
417 roster size) for healthcare providers participating in this study will also be collected.

418

419 **Analysis**

420 Descriptive statistics (mean, range, standard deviations and/or frequencies) will be
421 reported for quantitative measures (demographic data, SUS and NASA-TLX). Change in SUS
422 and NASA-TLX scores between the first and second visits among participants using the
423 automated medication dispenser for 6 weeks will be examined for significance with a paired t-
424 test. Statistical analysis will be conducted with the use of R. ^[30]

425

426 Error rates will be calculated by dividing the number of tasks errors made by each
427 participant while using the automated medication dispenser or the adherence dashboard divided
428 by the total number of steps required to use the dispenser or dashboard. Unassisted task

429 completion rates will be measured by dividing the total number of tasks completed by each
430 participant without assistance while using the dispenser or dashboard. Error rates, unassisted
431 completion rates between the two visits will be compared with a paired t-test. The errors
432 identified during the think aloud sessions will be coded qualitatively and classified into themes
433 for each task.

434

435 Think aloud sessions and semi-structured interviews for both groups of participants will be
436 audio-recorded, transcribed verbatim and examined for completeness and accuracy by two
437 independent research team members prior to the initiation of data analysis The framework by
438 Braun et al ^[38] will be used to perform thematic analysis for the semi-structured interviews. Two
439 transcripts for each of the participant types will be coded independently by two research team
440 members to identify preliminary codes. These codes will be compared between the two
441 transcribers to resolve any discrepancies, develop a consensus on codes and their
442 definitions/meaning and finalize a coding manual. This coding manual will be used as a
443 reference for coding the remaining transcripts by one research team member for each type of
444 participant independently. Codes that are generated will be classified into themes.

445

446 **Impact**

447 Completing the pilot usability study for automated medication dispensing device will
448 permit a determination of whether older adults are able to use the device for its intended purpose
449 at home while examining the usability of the real-time medication monitoring and adherence
450 portal is importance to identify whether healthcare clinicians are able to easily access the
451 adherence data for the management of their patients. This study will guide the implementation of

452 the automated medication dispensing device in primary care by ensuring that older adults are
453 able to use the device appropriately at home as well as ensure that clinicians use the adherence
454 data available to manage medication non-adherence. The study results will also allow the
455 developers to optimize the functionality of the automated medication dispensing device and the
456 adherence monitoring platform to meet the needs of both older adult and clinician end-users.
457

458 **Discussion**

459 Our patient population will be using three or more chronic medications and we will test
460 the device for a 6-week period at home. We expect that the results will reflect the feasibility of
461 the usability, acceptance, and workload of the device from the patient's perspective. In addition,
462 it will assess three things: the usability of the RxPense platform for health care providers,
463 patients and, potentially, care givers; real time adherence monitoring from a health care provider
464 perspective; and integration of this system into the primary care sector. Real time monitoring of
465 adherence will allow caregivers a better understanding of the factors related to non adherence as
466 well as the opportunity for early interventions. Objective, in time adherence information on the
467 patient or aggregate level will help clinicians to unmask and understand the dimensions of non-
468 adherence. It will create a shame- and blame-free environment to ask questions as objective
469 information are discussed. The relationship between clinician communication and adherence has
470 been studied since the 1960s [39]. A Meta-analysis by Zolnieriek and colleagues in 2009 point
471 out that physician communication is significantly positively correlated with patient adherence
472 and that there is a 19% higher risk of nonadherence among patients whose physician
473 communicates poorly than among patients whose physician communicates well. [40] Enhanced
474 communication and interaction between the prescriber and the patient will allow to unmask

475 various patient behaviors that can be addressed directly and help to better understand real life at
476 home barriers to adherence. Studies show that patients make changes to their prescription
477 regimen (e.g., adjusting doses, or times) whilst withholding the information from their health
478 provider [41,42,43] Improved knowledge of the changes may allow more conversations with the
479 health provider towards improved shared decision-making, or increase needed patient education
480 and information on their medications or prescription regimen towards better self-management.
481 The information collected will also have the potential to inform the health provider on side
482 effects the patient may be encountering. Thus improving medication adherence. On the
483 aggregated data level, a tailored approach for adherence specific communication processes and
484 routinely asking questions can be developed and can involve patients. [43]
485

486 **Strengths of the Study**

487 The study answers a need to assist patients living with comorbidities who take multiple
488 medications. Adults rarely report the problems they have with medication management. Our
489 study assesses the usability of an innovative device and digital platform from a patient and
490 provider perspective. The patients are recruited from a team-based primary care interdisciplinary
491 environment serving a middle income active population (the majority of the population is
492 between 15 and 65 years of age) in suburban Ottawa, Ontario. The study uses standardized,
493 established usability assessment tools as well as targeted questions and semi-structured
494 interviews to understand the system challenges. It assesses adherence in real time directly in the
495 home of the patient. An advantage of a study of this system is that it provides guidance to future
496 patients who must navigate complex multidrug regimens by eliminating the need for patient
497 decision-making concerning what medication to take, how much, and at what time thereby
498 improving adherence. Further on, the dispenser mechanism will prevent patient medication
499 overadherence and administration of medication at incorrect time intervals.

500

501 The system possesses the ability to wirelessly transmit patient medication adherence data,
502 providing opportunities to assess and monitor patient medication adherence in real time. The
503 information can be interpreted by the patient, care giver and health care provider. In addition,
504 health care providers can interpret information of adherence challenges and attempt to identify
505 specific population characteristics to include the learning in adherence improvement measures.

506

507 **Limitations of the Study**

508 Given the novel aspect of the study, the project might heighten the participant's anxiety.
509 Participants are asked to test a product they have not been exposed to before for essential health
510 matters, and this could negatively impact the results. In addition, because the opening of the
511 device dispensing drawer is used as a proxy measure for adherence, patient actions such as
512 failing to ingest removed medications can lead to inaccurate estimates of patient medication
513 adherence and raise concerns toward their medication adherence monitoring accuracy because of
514 potential patient behaviors.

515

516 **Credit Authorship Contribution Statement**

517 Tejal Patel: Conceptualization, methodology, writing – original draft, writing – review & editing

518 Christoph Laeer: Conceptualization, methodology, writing – original draft, writing – review &
519 editing, project administration, supervision

520 Marie-Hélène Chomienne: Conceptualization, methodology, writing – original draft, writing –
521 review & editing

522 Hamed Darabi: Project administration

523 Maxime Lachance: Project administration

524 Michelle Anawati: Funding acquisition, conceptualization, writing – review and editing

525

526 **Acknowledgements**

527 We are grateful to the ESFCEO administration, the providers and board of directors for
528 their support. We would like to thank Dr. Sadaf Faisal and Ms. Jessica Ivo for assisting with

529 study methodology. We would like to thank Terry Fagon and the whole Medipense team for their
530 support, granting access to the RxPense Portal and the device in planning this study.

532 **References**

- 533 1. United Nations. World Population Ageing 2017 Highlights. New York City, USA:
534 United Nations: 2017
535 [https://www.un.org/en/development/desa/population/publications/pdf/ageing/WPA2017_](https://www.un.org/en/development/desa/population/publications/pdf/ageing/WPA2017_Report.pdf)
536 [Report.pdf](https://www.un.org/en/development/desa/population/publications/pdf/ageing/WPA2017_Report.pdf) Accessed 24.09.2023
- 537 2. Salive ME. Multimorbidity in older adults. *Epidemiol Rev.* 2013;35:75-83. [https://doi:](https://doi.org/10.1093/epirev/mxs009)
538 [10.1093/epirev/mxs009](https://doi.org/10.1093/epirev/mxs009).
- 539 3. Barnett K, Mercer SW, Norbury M, Watt G, Wyke S, Guthrie B. Epidemiology of
540 multimorbidity and implications for health care, research, and medical education: a cross-
541 sectional study. *Lancet.* 2012 Jul 7;380(9836):37-43. [https://doi: 10.1016/S0140-](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(12)60240-2)
542 [6736\(12\)60240-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(12)60240-2).
- 543 4. Suzman R, Beard J.. Global Health and Aging. National Institute of Aging.
544 https://www.nia.nih.gov/sites/default/files/2017-06/global_health_aging.pdf
545 Accessed 24.09.2023
- 546 5. Ferrucci L, Giallauria F, Guralnik JM. Epidemiology of aging. *Radiol Clin North Am.*
547 2008 Jul;46(4):643-52, v. [https://doi: 10.1016/j.rcl.2008.07.005](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rcl.2008.07.005).
- 548 6. Aggarwal P, Woolford SJ, Patel HP. Multi-Morbidity and Polypharmacy in Older People:
549 Challenges and Opportunities for Clinical Practice. *Geriatrics (Basel).* 2020 Oct
550 28;5(4):85. [https://doi: 10.3390/geriatrics5040085](https://doi.org/10.3390/geriatrics5040085).
- 551 7. Patel CH, Zimmerman KM, Fonda JR, Linsky A. Medication Complexity, Medication
552 Number, and Their Relationships to Medication Discrepancies. *Ann Pharmacother.* 2016
553 Jul;50(7):534-40. doi: [10.1177/1060028016647067](https://doi.org/10.1177/1060028016647067).

- 554 8. Yap AF, Thirumoorthy T, Kwan YH. Systematic review of the barriers affecting
555 medication adherence in older adults. *Geriatr Gerontol Int*. 2016 Oct;16(10):1093-1101.
556 [https://doi: 10.1111/ggi.12616](https://doi.org/10.1111/ggi.12616).
- 557 9. Field TS, Mazor KM, Briesacher B, Debellis KR, Gurwitz JH. Adverse drug events
558 resulting from patient errors in older adults. *J Am Geriatr Soc*. 2007 Feb;55(2):271-6.
559 [https://doi: 10.1111/j.1532-5415.2007.01047.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1532-5415.2007.01047.x).
- 560 10. World Health Organization. Adherence to Long-Term Therapies: Evidence for Action.
561 Geneva, Switzerland: World Health Organization, 2003
562 <https://iris.who.int/bitstream/handle/10665/42682/9241545992.pdf> Accessed 24.9.2023
- 563 11. Will JC, Zhang Z, Ritchey MD, Loustalot F. Medication Adherence and Incident
564 Preventable Hospitalizations for Hypertension. *Am J Prev Med*. 2016 Apr;50(4):489-499.
565 [https://doi: 10.1016/j.amepre.2015.08.021](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.amepre.2015.08.021).
- 566 12. Gentil L, Vasiliadis HM, Prévaille M, Berbiche D. Adherence to Oral Antihyperglycemic
567 Agents Among Older Adults With Mental Disorders and Its Effect on Health Care Costs,
568 Quebec, Canada, 2005-2008. *Prev Chronic Dis*. 2015 Dec 31;12:E230. [https://doi:](https://doi.org/10.5888/pcd12.150412)
569 [10.5888/pcd12.150412](https://doi.org/10.5888/pcd12.150412).
- 570 13. Roebuck MC, Liberman JN, Gemmill-Toyama M, Brennan TA. Medication adherence
571 leads to lower health care use and costs despite increased drug spending. *Health Aff*
572 (Millwood). 2011 Jan;30(1):91-9. [https://doi: 10.1377/hlthaff.2009.1087](https://doi.org/10.1377/hlthaff.2009.1087)..
- 573 14. Cutler RL, Fernandez-Llimos F, Frommer M, Benrimoj C, Garcia-Cardenas V. Economic
574 impact of medication non-adherence by disease groups: a systematic review. *BMJ Open*.
575 2018 Jan 21;8(1):e016982. [https://doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2017-016982](https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2017-016982).

- 576 15. Mickelson RS, Holden RJ. Medication adherence: staying within the boundaries of
577 safety. *Ergonomics*. 2018 Jan;61(1):82-103. [https:// doi:](https://doi.org/10.1080/00140139.2017.1301574)
578 [10.1080/00140139.2017.1301574](https://doi.org/10.1080/00140139.2017.1301574).
- 579 16. Smaje A, Weston-Clark M, Raj R, Orlu M, Davis D, Rawle M. Factors associated with
580 medication adherence in older patients: A systematic review. *Aging Med (Milton)*. 2018
581 Dec;1(3):254-266. doi: [10.1002/agm2.12045](https://doi.org/10.1002/agm2.12045).
- 582 17. Maher RL, Hanlon J, Hajjar ER. Clinical consequences of polypharmacy in elderly:
583 *Expert Opin Drug Saf* 2014; 13: 57 – 65
- 584 18. Smith D, Lovell J, Weller C et al. A systematic review of medication adherence in
585 persons with dementia or cognitive impairment. *PLOS One* 2017; 12(2): e0170651
- 586 19. Arlt S, Lindner R, Rosler A et al. Adherence to medications in patients with dementia:
587 Predictors and strategies for improvement. *Drugs Aging* 2008; 15: 1033 – 1047
- 588 20. Mullen RJ, Curtis LM, O'Connor R, Serper M, McCarthy D, Bailey SC, Parker RM, et al.
589 . Visual acuity, literacy and unintentional misuse of nonprescription medications. *Am J*
590 *Health Syst Pharm* 2018; 75: 1221
- 591 21. Notenboom K, Beers E, van Riet-Nales DA et al. Practical problems with medication use
592 that older people experience: A qualitative study. *J Am Geriatr Soc* 2014; 62: 2339 -
593 2344
- 594 22. Faisal S, Ivo J, Patel T. A review of features and characteristics of smart medication
595 adherence products. *Can J Pharm* 2021; 154: 312 – 323
- 596 23. Ergonomics of human-system interactions - Part 11: Usability: definitions and concepts.
597 ISO: ISO; 2018. URL: <https://www.iso.org/obp/ui#iso:std:iso:9241:-11:ed-2:v1:en>

- 598 24. Wildenbos GA, Peute L, Jaspers M. Aging barriers influencing mobile health usability
599 for older adults: A literature based framework (MOLD-US). *Int J Med Inform.* 2018
600 Jun;114:66-75. [https:// doi: 10.1016/j.ijmedinf.2018.03.012](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijmedinf.2018.03.012).
- 601 25. Patel T, Ivo J, Faisal S, McDougall A, Carducci J, Pritchard S, Chang F. A Prospective
602 Study of Usability and Workload of Electronic Medication Adherence Products by Older
603 Adults, Caregivers, and Health Care Providers. *J Med Internet Res.* 2020 Jun 2;22(6):
604 e18073. [https:// doi: 10.2196/18073](https://doi.org/10.2196/18073).
- 605 26. Reeder B, Demiris G, Marek KD. Older adults' satisfaction with a medication dispensing
606 device in home care. *Inform Health Soc Care.* 2013 Sep;38(3):211-22. [https:// doi:](https://doi.org/10.3109/17538157.2012.741084)
607 [10.3109/17538157.2012.741084](https://doi.org/10.3109/17538157.2012.741084).
- 608 27. Ligons FM, Mello-Thoms C, Handler SM, Romagnoli KM, Hochheiser H. Assessing the
609 impact of cognitive impairment on the usability of an electronic medication delivery unit
610 in an assisted living population. *Int J Med Inform.* 2014 Nov;83(11):841-8. [https:// doi:](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijmedinf.2014.07.004)
611 [10.1016/j.ijmedinf.2014.07.004](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijmedinf.2014.07.004).
- 612 28. Patel T, Ivo J, Pitre T, Faisal S, Antunes K, Oda K. An In-Home Medication Dispensing
613 System to Support Medication Adherence for Patients With Chronic Conditions in the
614 Community Setting: Prospective Observational Pilot Study *JMIR Form Res* 2022;6(5):
615 e34906 [https:// doi: 10.2196/34906](https://doi.org/10.2196/34906)
- 616 29. Brook J. SUS- a quick and dirty usability scale. In: Jordan PW, Thomas B, McClelland
617 IL, Weerdmeester B, editors. *Usability Evaluation in Industry*. London, K: CRC Press;
618 1996

- 619 30. Hart SG, Staveland LE. Development of NASA-TLX (task load index): Results of
620 empirical and theoretical approach. *Adv Psychol* 1988; 52: 139 – 183 [https://](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0166-4115(08)62386-9)
621 [doi.org/10.1016/S0166-4115\(08\)62386-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0166-4115(08)62386-9)
- 622 31. Kushniruk AW, Patel VL. Cognitive and usability engineering methods for the evaluation
623 of clinical information systems. *J Biomed Inform.* 2004 Feb;37(1):56-76. [https:// doi:](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbi.2004.01.003)
624 [10.1016/j.jbi.2004.01.003](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbi.2004.01.003).
- 625 32. Zapata BC, Fernández-Alemán JL, Idri A, Toval A. Empirical studies on usability of
626 mHealth apps: a systematic literature review. *J Med Syst.* 2015 Feb;39(2):1. [https:// doi:](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10916-014-0182-2)
627 [10.1007/s10916-014-0182-2](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10916-014-0182-2).
- 628 33. RxPense Product brief: [https://medipense.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/12/RxPense-](https://medipense.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/12/RxPense-Product-Brief-2022-EN.pdf)
629 [Product-Brief-2022-EN.pdf](https://medipense.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/12/RxPense-Product-Brief-2022-EN.pdf), <https://medipense.com/rxpense/> Accessed June 4th, 2023.
- 630 34. Medipense Portal: <https://medipense.com/rxpense-portal/>, Accessed June 4th, 2023.
- 631 35. Longo L. Experienced mental workload, perception of usability, their interaction and
632 impact on task performance. *PLoS One.* 2018 Aug 1;13(8):e0199661. [https:// doi:](https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0199661)
633 [10.1371/journal.pone.0199661](https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0199661).
- 634 36. Jaspers MW. A comparison of usability methods for testing interactive health
635 technologies: methodological aspects and empirical evidence. *Int J Med Inform.* 2009
636 May;78(5):340-53. [https://doi: 10.1016/j.ijmedinf.2008.10.002](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijmedinf.2008.10.002).
- 637 37. Sauro J, Lewis J. *Quantifying the User Experience: Practical Statistics for User Research.*
638 Second Edition. San Francisco, CA: Morgan Kaufman; 2016
- 639 38. Braun V, Clarke V. Qualitative analysis. *Qual Res Psychol* 2006; 3: 77 – 101
640 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa>

- 641 39. Davis MS. Variations in patients' compliance with doctors' advice: an empirical analysis
642 of patterns o communication. Am J Public Health Nations Health. 1968 Feb;58(2):274-
643 88. [https:// doi: 10.2105/ajph.58.2.274](https://doi.org/10.2105/ajph.58.2.274).
- 644 40. Zolnierek KB, Dimatteo MR. Physician communication and patient adherence to
645 treatment: a meta-analysis. Med Care. 2009 Aug;47(8):826-34. [https://doi:](https://doi.org/10.1097/MLR.0b013e31819a5acc)
646 [10.1097/MLR.0b013e31819a5acc](https://doi.org/10.1097/MLR.0b013e31819a5acc).
- 647 41. Pound P, Britten N, Morgan M, Yardley L, Pope C, Daker-White G, et al.. Resisting
648 medicines: a synthesis of qualitative studies of medicine taking. Soc Sci Med. 2005
649 Jul;61(1):133-55. doi: [10.1016/j.socscimed.2004.11.063](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2004.11.063).
- 650 42. Dowell J, Hudson H. A qualitative study of medication-taking behaviour in primary care.
651 Fam Pract. 1997 Oct;14(5):369-75. [https: // doi: 10.1093/fampra/14.5.369](https://doi.org/10.1093/fampra/14.5.369). PMID:
652 [9472370](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/9472370/).
- 653 43. MarieBrown,MD, MACPa; Christine A.Sinsky, MD, FACP. Medication Adherence
654 Improve Patient Outcomes and Reduce Costs. [https://edhub.ama-assn.org/steps-](https://edhub.ama-assn.org/steps-forward/module/2702595)
655 [forward/module/2702595](https://edhub.ama-assn.org/steps-forward/module/2702595) Accessed 24.09.2023

656

657 **Supporting information**

658 **S1 Fig Study process**

Figure 1: Study process

