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**Reviewer’s report:**

**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.

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.

**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.

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.
**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

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

**Statistical review:** No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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