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PEER REVIEWER ASSESSMENTS:

OBJECTIVE - Full research articles: is there a clear objective that addresses a testable research question(s) (brief or other article types: is there a clear objective)?

Yes - there is a clear objective

DESIGN - Is the current approach (including controls and analysis protocols) appropriate for the objective?

Yes - the approach is appropriate

EXECUTION - Are the experiments and analyses performed with technical rigor to allow confidence in the results?

Yes - experiments and analyses were performed appropriately

Statistics - Is the use of statistics in the manuscript appropriate?

N/A - there are no statistics in this study

INTERPRETATION - Is the current interpretation/discussion of the results reasonable and not overstated?

No - there are minor issues

OVERALL MANUSCRIPT POTENTIAL - Is the current version of this work technically sound? If not, can revisions be made to make the work technically sound?

Probably - with minor revisions
GENERAL COMMENTS: The article describes an application that the need of it, for me, in the beginning was not so clear. After reading this article, I do understand where it can help elder's daily life but I do not think it was emphasized enough in the article.

REQUESTED REVISIONS:

First of all - the whole article needs a linguistic editing. For example: not "community living people" but "community dwelling people" (line 29) and other language or spelling mistakes.

The application is directed (at the end) for elders with mild cognitive impairment, but the literature review almost does not deals with them but with "normal" elders. I do understand and it is well explained in the limitation section that the study was conducted on "normal" elders in order to widen the use for elders with mild cognitive impairments but to my opinion, the literature review should deal with both populations.

Line 75 - it is mentioned that elders with risk for cognitive impairments can benefit from using this application but it is not stated how they can benefit from it.

during reading the whole article I was concerned regarding ethical and privacy issues. If the application is collecting information about usage and saving it for previous use (e.g. professionals or designers) where is the privacy? Same goes with the possibility for others except for the elder to monitor or actively being engaged with the application. The authors should tackle this issue in the discussion and/or limitation section.

I think the authors should emphasis the different between "RemindMe" and other calendar application in order to help the reader better understand this application's benefits and uniqueness.

Methodology: In line 156 it is mentioned that due to the fact that 3 people were not able to participate in the focus groups, the total number of study participants after exclusion was 20. But, in table 1' the total number of participants before exclusion (N) was 22. Please re-examine the numbers.

Line 180 - The authors mentioning "focus group leader". Is it the moderator? if yes - why to use different name. If not - who is he/she, what is his/her role and how he/she got this role?

Line 185 - Question 2 deals with the 3 main core application uses. did all participants use all 3 core uses? if not - how many used each use?

Findings: The authors gives a lot of self-interpretation or brings verbatim outstations but in each time it is done, there should be a quotation to demonstrate it (e.g. lines 295-296; lines 305-308; lines 323-325 etc.). Also, it is not clear from the quotation in line 302 how the authors concluded
what they did (meaning how from one line that can be interpreted in different ways, those are the conclusions). A longer quotation with the context is needed.

In "Learning to use "remindMe"" theme, the authors brings up some functioning limitations of the elders. maybe it should be moved to other them (new or "RemindMe" challenges) or maybe the authors can give this current theme another better adequate name?

I find "It talks to me" theme as the most important theme for the purpose of this study. Hence, I think there is more place for more quotations that will demonstrate the way the participants see this application and its usage.

Discussion - In line 494 the authors tackle the idea of a support person. I wonder if the elders' feeling of being in continuous need was taken in account given the unique situation of elders trying to use new technologies. I think the authors can refer to Nimrod (2016) 2 articles: "Technophobia among older internet users" and "The hierarchy of mobile phone incorporated among older users" for this topic as well as for the literature review.

ADDITIONAL REQUESTS/SUGGESTIONS:

Please correct spelling and grammar mistakes.

Note: This reviewer report can be downloaded - see attached pdf file.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?  
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Does the work include the necessary controls?  
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?  
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

No

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?  
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

Not relevant to this manuscript
Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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