Give research a *first draft.*

Use AI to draft personas from approved material. Check which users are missing, trace claims to interviews and revise with the teams who will use the result.

How I used it at Medius.

At Medius, product and marketing needed a common description of who used the products and what they were trying to do. I created ADEPT, a persona template built around goals, pain points and workflows, and used AI to help synthesise the material.

The first AI-assisted draft leaned too heavily towards one type of user. I added five interview transcripts and revised the personas in workshops with stakeholders. Product and marketing then worked from one set.

When to use it.

Good fit

Several teams describe the same users differently and need one shared picture. You have source material, such as notes, tickets or transcripts, and not enough time to synthesise it by hand.

Start elsewhere

You have no interview evidence to check the draft against. A draft built on unverified material gives you confident wording and no grounding. Collect evidence first.

The steps.

Give every claim a way back to the evidence

Draft — Use approved sources and a shared template. →

Check coverage — Identify missing users or workflows. →

Add evidence — Look for interviews that fill the gap. →

Revise — Check claims in a workshop and record changes.

1. Pick a template that forces specifics. I used goals, pain points and workflows.
2. Use an approved tool and material you have permission to process. Remove identifying details where possible and ask for source references next to each proposed claim.
3. Read the draft for who is missing. Look for one type of user dominating.
4. Check the original material and add interviews where coverage is thin. At Medius I added five interview transcripts.
5. Revise with stakeholders in a workshop. Ask product and marketing to bring examples and check them against the source material.
6. Publish one set. Say where it came from, including that AI helped with the first draft.

Making the decision.

What to check.

Check the draft against people, not against itself.

Ask which user the draft describes best, and whether anyone you interviewed would recognise themselves in the others. A model can produce fluent personas from thin evidence, so the useful check sits outside the model: transcripts and the people who work with these users.

When the draft sounds right

Fluent text is not evidence. Trace each claim in a persona to a transcript or a note. Cut or flag the claims you can't trace.

Worked example.

Practice scenario

A draft describes three personas, and all three are approvers in large finance teams. You interviewed two small-company users last quarter, and their work doesn't appear.

The decision

Check the two interview records for a concrete difference in who approves and when. Bring the evidence and the proposed revision to a workshop. Leave the role provisional if the two interviews only support a hypothesis.

Keep the earlier draft. Showing what changed after the interviews is the clearest way to explain why the final set is different.

When it gets complicated.

Stakeholders disagree about a persona.

Ask each person for a source the team is allowed to review. Record disagreements by role or workflow before deciding whether the persona needs a change or a narrower scope.

The new transcripts contradict the draft.

Treat the contradiction as the finding. Revise the persona and note which claim the interview changed.

The available sources can't be used with the model.

Build the first draft manually from approved material. Keep the same claim-to-source check and list the gaps before asking anyone to rely on the draft.

See how I revised the ADEPT personas →

Worksheet.

Check a draft before you share it.

Bring the draft, the sources it used and the interviews you have. Decide what to add before the workshop.

Filled-in example	
Draft	Three draft personas from approved support notes. Note the source ID beside each claim.
Who is missing	Small-company users. Every persona works in a large team.
Evidence to add	Interview transcripts from the missing users.
Workshop question	Which of these descriptions matches the customers you speak to?
Decision	Share the revised set once each claim traces to a source.
Keep as a draft when	You can't add interviews yet. Label it as a draft and name when you will.

Use it on your project

The next time you use AI to draft research, record the sources, what the draft missed and what changed after review.

Claim and source reference

Missing user or workflow

Revision and evidence to bring to review