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Lima, December 08, 2011

Editorial Board,
BMC Public Health

Dear sirs,

I am submitting a revised version of our manuscript entitled “Evaluation of interventions on road traffic injuries in Peru: a qualitative approach”, addressing point-by-point the editorial comments and each of the points raised by reviewers.’

**Editorial comments**

Please make the following formatting changes during revision of your manuscript. Ensuring that the manuscript meets the journal’s manuscript structure will help to speed the production process if your manuscript is accepted for publication.

1. Copyediting: Please note that BioMed Central journals are not copyedited prior to publication. We advise you to pay close attention to language during revision of this manuscript. If necessary, please seek the assistance of a fluent English speaking colleague, or have a professional editing service correct your language. For authors who wish to have the language in their manuscript edited by a native-English speaker with scientific expertise, BioMed Central recommends Edanz (www.edanzediting.com/bmc1). BioMed Central has negotiated a 10% discount to the fee charged to BioMed Central authors by Edanz. Use of an editing service is neither a requirement nor a guarantee of acceptance for publication. For more information, see our FAQ on language editing services at http://www.biomedcentral.com/info/authors/authorfaqs#12.
   **Answer:** Language was thoroughly revised in this new version.

2. RATS - Please revise your manuscript so that it conforms to RATS guidelines for reporting qualitative studies (http://www.biomedcentral.com/info/ifora/rats,) and please indicate in your cover letter how you have done this.
   **Answer:** We have expanded in Methods section details (and also in Results and Discussion) on rationale of our qualitative study and on the different aspects related to the quality standards required by RATS guidelines.

3. Title page: This should contain; Title, Author list, Affiliations (department names, institution name, street name, city, zip code, country), email addresses. The author list and email addresses must be identical in the manuscript file and on the submission system, and it must be clear which affiliation pertains to each author.
   **Answer:** Title page was revised according to the instructions.

   *The LIST OF AUTHORS in the manuscript should be written exactly as they are in the submission system, both in style and order. The preferred style is ‘First name Initial Last name’ (e.g. Joe F Bloggs).
   **Answer:** This was done.

4. Box: Unfortunately we cannot incorporate boxes. Please either change the box to a
We changed the boxes to tables.

5. Figure cropping: It is important for the final layout of the manuscript that the figures are cropped as closely as possible to minimise white space around the image. For more information, see the instructions for authors: http://www.biomedcentral.com/info/ifora/figures.

Answer: Figures are cropped.

**Reviewer: Blanca Pelcastre**

**Major Compulsory Revisions**

1. In methodology, fourth paragraph, the authors refer their theoretical framework let them identify some assumptions, described in document, but they do not specify which their theoretical framework is really. Must be necessary to explain briefly which the theoretical perspective of the study is (i.e. Phenomenology, Grounded Theory, etc.), because it is important in order to evaluate methodological coherence in relation with the objective. In description of analysis, it is possible identify steps from Grounded Theory but it is necessary recognize if this perspective they applied to all the study or analysis only, which is totally possible.

Answer: We have included now explicit paragraphs describing in detail the rationale of our theoretical framework, which was inferred from a desk review performed for exploring documents related to implemented interventions, and after contrasting their characteristics with the recommendations of the World Health Organization on how to design and implement RTI interventions (page 9, last paragraph). We have also included a paragraph explaining that we used the grounded theory approach for several sections of our study, including sampling and analysis process (page 8, second paragraph; page 10, third paragraph).

2. The section results and discussion are not balanced, authors present results in a descriptive way but after that, they do not establish a dialogue with them, for instance they could discuss if those they assumed (described in methodology) were right or not, and why. However boxes where results are synthetized are very well.

Answer: Thanks to reviewer for this comment. We have included now in the Results and Discussion section whether our assumptions are in line with the results or not, and why.

3. Last paragraph of background section is related to methodology, so it is necessary to place correctly this information.

Answer: We have moved that paragraph to Method section.

**Discretionary Revisions:**

1. If extension permits it, authors must strengthen results with some quotations from informants; this is the evidence in qualitative studies.

Answer: We have included now actual quotations in the Results and Discussion section.
**Minor Essential Revisions:**
1. In table 1 clarify the meaning of “M&E system in place”
   **Answer:** We have clarified this statement in Table 1 and explained that M&E is referred to Monitoring and Evaluation as an explanatory footnote.

2. In the second paragraph of methodology, authors mention a semi-structured questionnaire which was applied to interviewees and the specific thematic issues which are considered for assembling the questionnaire, when the correct term should be an interview guide in both cases; questionnaire is a technique from another methodological perspective.
   **Answer:** We have replaced “semi-structured questionnaire” by “interview guide” in both cases.

**Reviewer: Reece Hinchcliff**

**Major compulsory revisions:**

1. While there is a considerable amount of interesting information in this paper, the authors do not explicitly identify the practical implications of the research for non-Peruvian jurisdictional settings, which decreases the relevance of the paper for an international audience.
   **Answer:** We have included in Background section a paragraph putting into context the Peruvian case, and explaining how and why the lessons learned from the Peruvian experience would be relevant to an international audience. Specifically, we have detailed how migration, urbanization, urban planning limitations and an inadequate road infrastructure configure a context where RTIs happen in Peru (page 3, second paragraph), making also easier to understand the need of complex interventions that are described afterwards in Discussion.

2. The descriptions of complex RTI interventions in Curitiba and Bogota are strangely placed in the discussion, with limited explanation offered as to the reason for their inclusion, and relationship to the study results/implications.
   **Answer:** The explanatory contextual paragraph just summarized above justifies now why these experiences are important and how are related to the results of the study. We have additionally introduced a brief statement on the relevance of these experiences (page 24, first paragraph).

3. There are numerous grammatical and stylistic errors throughout the paper that require correction. The first sentence/paragraph of the paper is a prime example of the additional work required to develop the paper to a publishable standard.
   **Answer:** We have reviewed thoroughly the English grammar and style through the paper.

4. The third paragraph provides a hypothesis that a disproportionate amount of crashes occur in "poorer inner cities", but no socio-economic data that could justify the assertion is provided. Indeed, there is a lack of evidence provided throughout the paper, both in terms of references (e.g. the final sentence of the third paragraph - 'motorcars are fragile and hazardous etc’), and the study
participant perceptions upon which the conclusions are based (i.e. no actual quotes are provided).

**Answer:** We have provided data on poverty indicators (page 5, second paragraph, lines 9 and 10), we have included a reference supporting the statement that ‘motocars are fragile and hazardous’ (page 5, second paragraph, line 17). We have additionally included references supporting statements along the paper. Finally, actual quotes are included now throughout the Results section.

5. The number of interviews etc should be identified in the methods, rather than results section. Recruitment processes should also be provided.

**Answer:** We moved this to Methods. We also describe now the recruitment process (page 8, last paragraph).

6. In addition, there is no explanation of how the authors were in fact qualified to undertake this task. Qualitative research relies on the researcher as the main data collection tool, so a comprehensive description of the expertise of the authors is required.

**Answer:** We provide now detail of characteristics and qualifications of the research team (Page 7, last paragraph, and page 8, first paragraph).

7. No explanations or references are provided to explain why the key elements of the theoretical framework were chosen.

**Answer:** We included a paragraph explaining our theoretical framework, as the references (page 9, last paragraph).

8. No references are provided to justify the employed methods of analysis.

**Answer:** We included an explanatory paragraph on the grounded theory approach (page 8, second paragraph; page 10, third paragraph), and the supporting references (Refs. 23 and 24), and also a brief clarification on this approach and on reflexivity and triangulation principles considered during the analysis (Ref. 25).

9. The key factors identified in the results could be more simply presented in a table.

**Answer:** These are included in Tables 3 and 4.