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Reviewer's report:

I can figure out that the authors have taken caution in designing a useful research. The intervention design, data collection methods, parameter measurement and data analysis will work. However, the paper is not publishable in its current shape. It suffers from severe incoherence in writing, i.e., in one paragraph, the sentences are structured from different perspectives, making it difficult for readers to follow. The paper suffers unclear presentation, inaccurate use of words, rough structure of paragraphs, etc. It needs several iteration in reshaping the entire article before reaching the quality standard for publication in BMC.

I will give some indicative examples below, however, this list is not exhaustive. The authors need to make substantial modifications, taking effort to think through how to craft a coherent message, from the start to the end of the article.

1. Abstract section. The last sentence in the background section is not clear. The aim of the paper is not well defined.

Page 2. Highlights section. The first sentence is not clear. The message of the highlights is difficult to understand as the context of the statements is not set up.

Page 4. Example of shifting the subject of conversation: The first sentence starts with 'The use of mobile technology', presumably by human, then 'and its presence' shifts the subject to mobile technology. This is confusing for audience to anticipate what the story is about.

Line 18-19. 'all the strata', bad choice of word.

Page 4. Line 55. The first sentence is over-stated.

Page 5. Line 14-15. SMS's is colloquial presentation, not suitable for scientific writing.

Line 29 to 54. The difference between mobile and SMS message is not substantiated. The evidence provided is not convincing.
Page 6. Lines 1 to 13. The words used are colloquial, not suitable for scientific writing, such as Line 2. 'improves the results obtained'. It is not clear what the results are. 'on the health status' has changed the topic from digital tool to human.

The terms used are random, lacking consistency. This makes it difficult to follow. Page 6. Line 24 'health parameters' is not appropriate here. Lines 29 to 53. Difficult to follow.

The rough writings:


Page 8 LInes 12 to 22.

Unclear presentation due to lack of definition. Page 8 LIne 30 'being sedentary'.

Page 8. Push notification. The final decision of pushing out the message is not in accordance with the reasons given.

The diagrams are not clear.

---

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

No

**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.

Unable to assess

**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.

I am able to assess the statistics
Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited
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