We thank the reviewers for thoughtful reviews. As noted by the AC (R4), the representativeness of the population we studied is the main contention amongst reviewers. R1 and R2 expressed concern, and we respond to this issue first.

We respectfully argue that academics are appropriate and reasonable to study since they form part of the target population served by PTM tools. Except for perhaps being more tech savvy (and therefore more likely to use/try e-PTM tools), we have no reason to believe that academics are unrepresentative of the broader population. Since our goal was to understand individual differences in PTM, we were hoping to find a population with interesting variation among individuals' PTM. We were initially concerned that academics would be very homogeneous in their PTM behaviors. But the focus group, conducted prior to the field study, revealed that academics were quite diverse with respect to PTM. Previous studies have shown group differences in PTM across different job holders [1]. By focusing on academics, we have been able to highlight individual differences rather than group differences (something that would be difficult to tease apart with the same number of subjects spread across diverse jobs). Prior studies have also focused on a narrow population (e.g., Bellotti studied 7 managers).

That said, we fully agree that the generalizability of our findings needs validation. We have a survey (going through our ethics board) which will be distributed widely and across various job holders such as accountants, health care providers, and lawyers.

We will add a paragraph to our final paper to justify our focus on academics (mirroring the points above). R4's suggestion to add "academics" to the title is excellent, and we will do it. We will also make it clear in the introduction that our study focused on academics. To tone down the claims, we will carefully go through the discussion and conclusion to ensure that claims, specifically the implications for design, are not extended beyond the academics.

Classification of people: R4 asked "has prior research also found similar clusters?". We have re-reviewed the time and task management literature and cannot find similar clusters of users based on tool use and the degree of their DIYness. R2 asked "Do adopters, DIYers, make-doers apply to the work of, say, Bellotti et al.?". Based on a preliminary assessment of the Bellotti work, the data on a number of their participants is rich enough to apply our categorization to their participants. For example, it appears that the 3 managers who used Task Vistas for making formal paper to-do lists are adopters (if this is the tool they used most).

R3 suggested we classify users on 2 axes with continuous values instead of binary ones. We had considered this, but for 2 reasons we opted for binary values for this dimension, i.e. using "whether or not" instead of "the degree to which". First, since everyone, including adopters, used general tools, we relied on a participant's primary tool for their classification. This categorized people into 2 groups: those who adopt dedicated PTM tools and those who use general-purpose tools (as their primary tool). Second, the DIYness dimension did not apply to adopters; it only applied to those who used general-purpose tools.

To address R1's second point, we clarify that categories of PTM behaviors and people emerged using grounded theory; we aggregated codes into categories. Going from detailed data (e.g. diverse behaviors) to general themes is a standard method in GT. To clarify, we did not argue that the 3 types of users represent strategic market grouping. As discussed in the conclusions, the GT approach generates theories that describe what's going on with the studied sample.

Classification of factors: R3's question "is accessibility of a tool environmental or tool-related?" revealed a minor ambiguity in our description of the categories of factors. To remove this ambiguity, we will add the following sentence to p5: "In addition to these main basic factors, described above, there are secondary factors that are derived from the main factors. For example, we consider availability of a tool a secondary factor that is derived from both tool-related factors and environmental factors."

Discussion and implication for design: R3 makes some excellent suggestions (3a/c) which we will follow. For example, on fortifying this section by providing solid examples of the evolving needs (3a), we will add a paragraph, which refers back to 2 examples that are reported in the results section. We will also summarize what caused DIYers to avoid use of dedicated PTM tools (3c).

[1] Francis-Smythe, J., & Robertson, I. (1999). Time-related individual differences. Time & Society, 8(2-3), 273