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Reviewer’s report:

This manuscript provides a detailed and clear report of a small study into the experiences of older people with a newly developed digital calendar with in-built reminders. Although well written there are a few major concerns as well as some minor details that would require attention to make this manuscript more relevant for publication. The major concerns are:

1. It is unclear how the participants in the focus groups were exactly selected. Table 2 provides some information but that is very limited. The selection of participants has great influence on the results and will also influence to what extend these results can be transferred to other settings. That should at least by more extensively discussed in the manuscript.

2. At many places in the manuscript the authors write "an interactive digital calendar with SMS reminders". At other places they write "RemindMe". I think it is important to consistently use the latter formulation. The other ("an interactive….") suggest that the results can be applied to other digital interactive calendars, but that is not true. There is insufficient information about the precise characteristics of RemindMe in comparison to other digital calendars to be able to conclude anything about to what extend the results can be applied for other calendars as well. So I strongly advice to say "RemindMe" everywhere and to add a section in the discussion about what the results mean for other calendars.

3. I was surprised that the authors have developed their 'own' digital calendar. I think this needs some more justification. I was also surprised that end users appear not to have been involved in the development process. Please expand on these aspects (at least in the discussion section).

4. It is not very clear whether the findings can be attributed to specific characteristics of the RemindMe application or to more general aspects of using smartphones. My feeling that there is a least a large 'grey area'. I think this needs to be discussed in the discussion section of the manuscript. What is specific for RemindMe and what is general for smartphones?

5. Why have the authors not chosen to do a more 'standard' usability study, looking into the specific features of RemindMe? I think there should be some discussion about this.
The minor details are:

6. Lines 24 and 36: There seems to be a contradiction between the statement in line 24 that senior people might find it difficult .... and the choice for people for whom use of the smart phone is an essential part of everyday life in line 36. See also my remark 1 above.

7. Line 42: reflecting instead of reflected?

8. Line 46 is an unclear sentence.

9. Line 87: unclear what is meant with "sensitivity to the user's environment".

10. Line 90: unclear remark about personal data. What do you mean?

11. Lines 100-102: strange sentence: "the development of RM has been initiated by investigating the effectiveness, efficiency and satisfaction.... with TM...."???

12. Lines 119 and 130 seems contradictory; limiting choice of colour versus using different colours...

13. Lines 218-220: see earlier comment about lack of detail about population; details are not clear at all.

14. Lines 266 and 270: I think you should avoid terms like 'most' and 'some' in a qualitative study; they are irrelevant and suggest that one is more important than the other.

15. Line 442: although it is well...

16. Line 473 and around: here you present use of smart phone calendars as a healthcare issue. Is that really the case? I have never asked my doctor about how to use my phone.... Please discuss!
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