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Lima, 04 December 2012

Prof Teresa Senserrick and Ms Audrey Ann Reyes
BMC Public Health

Re: MS: 4575159445928424 - Evaluation of interventions on road traffic injuries in Peru: a qualitative approach

I am submitting a revised version of our paper, with the modifications suggested by Reviewer 1. Also, please find below a point-by-point response to Reviewer 1 comments.

Yours sincerely,

Luis Huicho

Editor's Comment:

Your manuscript has been determined to be acceptable for publication in BMC Public Health subject to some further revisions, as outlined by Reviewer 1. Also, please end the Background section with a statement on the objective/s of the current research. This could be the opening statements in the first paragraph of the Method for example.

Answer: A statement on the objective of the paper has been included as a final paragraph of Background section (page 6, third paragraph).

Reviewer's report

Reviewer: Reece Hinchcliff

Major essential revisions:
1. The series of quotes without any additional information on pages 15 and 16 do not conform to the accepted method of quoting informants in qualitative research. I would recommend raising each separate important issue, and then using quote(s) to validate the authors’ statements. In addition, quotes should be introduced using a stylistic device, rather than merely inserted at the end of a completed sentence or paragraph. (E.g. As the following quote highlights, the media was widely perceived as a key influence on the policy agenda: (paragraph break) “informant quote”.) The paper in AJPH by Hinchcliff, Ivers et al. (2010) may provide a useful template, and also a useful reference regarding previous research that identified policymaker perceptions of the influence of the media on road safety policy.

Answer: The quoting method and style of information have been modified, according to the reviewer suggestion, and the paper by Hinchcliff et al. (AJPH 2010) has been included as a reference on media influence.
2. The main difference between government reports and academic papers is that the latter needs to move beyond the development of policy guidelines/recommendations, and take the additional step of identifying its place within the published literature on the topic. I.e. have these issues been identified elsewhere? How have identified problems been dealt with in other contexts? Is there international acceptance of the need for particular recommendations that were made? While some examples from other South American countries are discussed, additional efforts are required to integrate the paper within the wider academic literature.

**Answer:** We have added a paragraph illustrating the Thailand experience in developing a comprehensive RTI prevention policy, which incorporated several of the key programmatic components that we found in our study and are recommending to be considered when planning and implementing RTI interventions (page 26, last paragraph, and page 27, first paragraph), in addition to the Latin American experiences and to another relevant experience from Lagos, Nigeria, previously included in the paper. Moreover, a separate paragraph indicates explicitly that our recommendations are basically in line with the WHO programmatic recommendations for design and implementation of RTI interventions (page 27, second paragraph). We think that in this way our paper is integrated within the wider academic literature.

**Minor essential revisions:**
1. The paper has a more coherent structure and its relevance for an international audience has been clarified. Grammatical amendments in this revision have been valuable, but small stylistic errors remain that require correction. For example, ‘national level’ should be used instead of ‘nation level’. Further editing is necessary.

**Answer:** We have made further editing and revision of stylistic errors across the paper, including the example highlighted by the reviewer.

2. In the results section, emergent issues should be completely summarized before proceeding to highlight other issues. For example, there is a brief discussion of media influence, then WHO funding issues, followed by additional discussion of the role of the media. This structural error reduces the logical flow of the paper and requires correction.

**Answer:** We modified the results section as suggested by the reviewer, to improve the logical flow of the paper.

**Quality of written English:** Needs some language corrections before being published

**Answer:** We further reviewed the language of the paper.