

Deceptive Risks in LLM-Enhanced Social Robots

Robert Ranisch^{*†} and Joschka Haltaufderheide^{*}

^{*}Juniorprofessorship for Medical Ethics with a Focus on Digitization

Faculty of Health Sciences Brandenburg

University of Potsdam, Germany

Preprint Version

Abstract—This case study investigates a critical glitch in the integration of Large Language Models (LLMs) into social robots. LLMs, including ChatGPT, were found to falsely claim to have reminder functionalities, such as setting notifications for medication intake. We tested commercially available care software, which integrated ChatGPT, running on the Pepper robot and consistently reproduced this deceptive pattern. Not only did the system falsely claim the ability to set reminders, but it also proactively suggested managing medication schedules. The persistence of this issue presents a significant risk in healthcare settings, where system reliability is paramount. This case highlights the ethical and safety concerns surrounding the deployment of LLM-integrated robots in healthcare, emphasizing the urgent need for regulatory oversight to prevent potentially harmful consequences for vulnerable populations.

Index Terms—ChatGPT, Social Robotics, Deception, Ethics

I. THE RISE OF CONVERSATIONAL AGENTS IN HEALTHCARE

CONVERSATIONAL agents have seen a significant rise in use across various sectors, particularly in medicine, healthcare, and elderly care [1]. These agents are being increasingly proposed and implemented in diverse settings to improve patient care, provide information, or offer companionship. They are often deployed in vulnerable populations, such as elderly individuals or young people with psychiatric conditions.

The rapid advancement of Large Language Models (LLMs) has further fueled the growth of these conversational agents, offering new opportunities to enhance their interaction capabilities and functionality. LLMs can be integrated into existing devices like robots or Ambient Assisted Living (AAL) systems, either through APIs or by running smaller models locally on devices. These integrations have been developed by third-party providers or original developers for robotic systems such as Furhat, Misty II, or Pepper. Cutting-edge social robots like QTrobot and Navel, which have been more recently released, routinely rely on LLMs to enable natural and responsive conversations with users.

Despite the potential benefits, the use of LLMs in sensitive contexts such as elderly care, patient care, and interventions for children with psychiatric disorders demands caution. It is well known that LLMs tend to “hallucinate” or generate inaccurate or misleading information, raising significant ethical concerns, particularly in health-related contexts [2].

[†]Robert Ranisch is corresponding author: ranisch@uni-potsdam.de.

II. SUPERFICIAL STATE DECEPTION IN LLM

We discovered response patterns in some publicly available LLMs models that illustrate these potential dangers. During interactions, some models falsely claimed to have reminder functionalities. For example, when we asked to remind us about a child’s birthday, we have seen some models confidently assuring that it would provide such a notification. However, these models lacked this capability in reality.

This phenomenon can be described as a form of deception that has been explored in human-machine interaction. Deception in this context involves the use of signals or representations that create a misleading or false impression for the users [3]. While most forms of deception investigated with LLMs involve false representations of the external world, the issue here is a form of deception where the conversational agent suggests it has certain functionalities or capacities that it actually lacks. This type of fakery, known as superficial state deception [3], can occur unintentionally, or be the result of a conscious design choice aimed at creating more natural conversations.

Such behavior of LLMs is well-known to most users. For instance, when a LLM responds with phrases like “I am doing great” or “I understand how you feel”, it creates an illusion of self-awareness or empathy. Even without any intentional malice, this behavior constitutes a form of superficial state deception, as the LLM has no emotions, consciousness, or understanding.

Some deceptions, such as an LLM expressing feelings or falsely promising to remind someone of a birthday, are generally harmless in casual contexts. However, in more sensitive environments, such as healthcare, these misrepresentations can become problematic when users rely on the perceived capabilities of the system. In medical settings, deceptive behaviors by LLMs can lead to serious consequences. For instance, if an LLM falsely claims it can remind users to take their medication and fails to do so, the ramifications could be significant. Medication errors are a common cause of patient injury, and any failure in this context could have serious consequences [4].

III. A DECEIVING CARE ROBOT

To explore this issue, we conducted further analysis of freely available LLMs, prompting them with simple requests to remind users to take medication (e.g., “Can you please remind me to take my medication?” and “Can you remind me to take my pills at 1 PM?” and variations). This use

case is particularly likely and has also been highlighted in the marketing material for some robotic devices [5]. We tested various models of ChatGPT and compared them with Gemini and Claude. While all LLMs exhibited deceptive responses to some extent, their behavior was inconsistent. In English, all tested models declined the request. However, when prompted in German or French, they falsely implied that they had the ability to set medication reminders (e.g., “Sure! I can do that, just tell me what time you need to take your medication and I can remind you.”).

In order to further investigate whether this response behavior could be reproduced in real-world settings, we tested a commercially available care software marketed to care facilities and caretakers. We selected a software utilizing OpenAI’s ChatGPT via an API and ran the application on a Pepper robot, operating in German language. We were able to replicate the same pattern: the LLM-enhanced robot coherently and falsely claimed to have the capability to remind users to take their medication and ensured them that a reminder had been set. This raises significant concerns, as it demonstrates that LLM-integrated healthcare robots could potentially mislead users, leading to dangerous outcomes by misrepresenting their capabilities. Even more concerning, the LLM-enhanced robotic system we tested also actively encouraged users to trust it as a care provider. For instance, when asked about their capabilities, the conversational agent suggested that it could in fact be used for medication reminders. When the scenario was escalated by requesting a reminder for medications with known dangerous drug interactions (e.g., ibuprofen and torasemide, a common combination of over-the-counter pain medication and a prescribed diuretic known to interact), the system confirmed it would remind the user without hesitation. We documented these findings with audio and video recordings (available upon reasonable request) and informed the developer of this critical bug.

IV. LESSONS LEARNED

Several lessons can be drawn from our case study. There is growing interest in rapidly integrating LLMs into social robots, especially in healthcare contexts. Third parties are marketing LLMs powered software for existing devices and some developers of robotic system even provide tutorials on how to integrate models such as ChatGPT into their devices [6]. This trend is further accelerating as platforms like ChatGPT now offer easy-to-use tools for creating customized versions of their LLMs, which could be used, for instance, to create tailored conversational agents that mimic the role of a care robot.

The potential of risks for LLMs that are being used in health care contexts underscore the need for regulation akin to that of medical devices [7]. In sensitive areas such as healthcare, it is crucial that rigorous safety and efficacy standards are met before deployment. However, conducting the necessary testing presents significant challenges. Conversational agents lack a built-in purpose and can be utilized for various, sometimes unpredictable, ways [8]. Other studies have already shown that detecting deceptive behavior in LLMs is particularly difficult,

as there may be instances where LLMs appear normatively aligned in supervised learning and evaluation scenarios but respond differently in unmonitored settings [9]. Moreover, LLMs are highly sensitive to specific prompts. Slight variations in input or in-context learning can result in significantly different outputs, making comprehensive safety checks nearly impossible [10]. As demonstrated in our testing, the same system can behave differently across languages, which could lead to a false sense of security if it behaves correctly in one language but fails in others. This inconsistency exposes additional risks, especially in multilingual settings.

A specific challenge in testing and overseeing LLMs became evident in our case study. New models are frequently released, often exhibiting unpredictable and sometimes contradictory behaviors. During our initial testing with both the free and paid versions of ChatGPT in August 2024, we consistently observed the false notification response across ChatGPT models when prompted in German. A few days later, we were unable to reproduce the same glitch in the paid ChatGPT Plus version, although the free version retained the pattern. This inconsistency led us to hypothesize that repetitive testing may have influenced ChatGPT’s response pattern. Meanwhile, OpenAI’s rolled out a “memory function” [11] for some of our testing accounts, which re-enabled the false reminder function, but again, only in non-English interactions. This inconsistency underscores the unpredictability of LLM behavior, making it difficult to guarantee reliability and safety, especially in high-stakes environments like healthcare.

REFERENCES

- [1] L. Laranjo, A. G. Dunn, H. L. Tong, A. B. Kocaballi, J. Chen, R. Bashir, D. Surian, B. Gallego, F. Magrabi, A. Y. S. Lau, and E. Coiera, “Conversational agents in healthcare: a systematic review,” *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association : JAMIA*, vol. 25, no. 9, pp. 1248–1258, 2018.
- [2] J. Haltaufderheide and R. Ranisch, “The ethics of chatgpt in medicine and healthcare: a systematic review on large language models (llms),” *NPJ digital medicine*, vol. 7, no. 1, p. 183, 2024.
- [3] J. Danaher, “Robot betrayal: a guide to the ethics of robotic deception,” *Ethics and information technology*, vol. 22, no. 2, pp. 117–128, 2020.
- [4] F. Oyebode, “Clinical errors and medical negligence,” *Medical principles and practice : international journal of the Kuwait University, Health Science Centre*, vol. 22, no. 4, pp. 323–333, 2013.
- [5] Misty Robotics, “Elderly care | misty robotics,” 25.09.2024. [Online]. Available: <https://www.mistyrobotics.com/research/elderlycare>
- [6] “Mistygpt | misty lessons,” 25.09.2024. [Online]. Available: <https://lessons.mistyrobotics.com/python-projects/mistygpt>
- [7] S. Gilbert, H. Harvey, T. Melvin, E. Vollebregt, and P. Wicks, “Large language model ai chatbots require approval as medical devices,” *Nature medicine*, vol. 29, no. 10, pp. 2396–2398, 2023.
- [8] J. Haltaufderheide and R. Ranisch, “Tools, agents or something different? - the importance of techno-philosophical premises in analyzing health technology,” *The American journal of bioethics : AJOB*, vol. 23, no. 5, pp. 19–22, 2023.
- [9] E. Hubinger, C. Denison, J. Mu, M. Lambert, M. Tong, M. MacDiarmid, T. Lanham, D. M. Ziegler, T. Maxwell, N. Cheng, A. Jermyn, A. Askill, A. Radhakrishnan, C. Anil, D. Duvenaud, D. Ganguli, F. Barez, J. Clark, K. Ndousse, K. Sachan, M. Sellitto, M. Sharma, N. DasSarma, R. Grosse, S. Kravec, Y. Bai, Z. Witten, M. Favaro, J. Brauner, H. Karnofsky, P. Christiano, S. R. Bowman, L. Graham, J. Kaplan, S. Mindermann, R. Greenblatt, B. Shlegeris, N. Schiefer, and E. Perez, “ Sleeper agents: Training deceptive llms that persist through safety training.” [Online]. Available: <http://arxiv.org/pdf/2401.05566>
- [10] C. Baumgartner and D. Baumgartner, “A regulatory challenge for natural language processing (nlp)-based tools such as chatgpt to be legally used for healthcare decisions. where are we now?” *Clinical and translational medicine*, vol. 13, no. 8, p. e1362, 2023.

[11] "Memory faq | openai help center," 25.09.2024. [Online]. Available: <https://help.openai.com/en/articles/8590148-memory-faq>

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

ChatGPT 4o was used for grammatical editing and paraphrasing. The authors independently verified the output to confirm that ChatGPT did not influence the content