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Dear Editor-in-Chief,

Please find attached a revised version of our article entitled “Antilock Breaking System Effectiveness in Prevention of Road Traffic Crashes in Iran”; MS: 6942368567439124.

Thank you for giving us the opportunity to revise our manuscript; the revised version addresses all comments made by reviewer.

We feel the manuscript has improved a lot and we hope that, in its revised form, you will find it acceptable for publication.

Yours sincerely,

Soheil Saadat
Corresponding Author
Outline of modifications

Reviewer's report:

*Manuscript submitted by Saadat et al reports the effectiveness of anti-lock braking system (ABS) in personal cars in Iran, which is an interesting study from the public health perspective in general and the road safety perspective in particular. My specific comments are given below*

**General comments:**

The manuscript has a number of limitations as follows:

1. *Poor English, grammar and word selection (e.g. spelling mistakes in the title such as 'Breaking', which should be 'Braking') and wrong use of terms (e.g. 'utilize' should be 'used')*

Sorry for poor English. The manuscript was reviewed by an English Editor once more and if it is find to be acceptable, it will be sent to a Native English Editor before publication.

2. *Inconsistency of reporting aims and objectives of the study*

Thanks you. Now there is a consistency in the aim and objective in both abstract and introduction of the revising manuscript (Please see page 2, paragraph 2, under aim section in the abstract as well as page 4, paragraph 2, as the aim of study in the main text).

3. *Lack of sampling technique used in selecting participants*

We clarified this point. Participants were selected using simple random sampling method among the registry of the Central Insurance Organization. This is now included in the methods (Please see page 5, paragraph 2 under case selection section).

4. *Lack of criteria for choosing cars of only one make (manufacturer)*

We clarified this point. The reason for restricting the study to cars of only one manufacturer was to limit the sources of variation such as socioeconomic status of drivers and the technical differences. This is included in the methods of revised manuscript (Please see page 4, paragraph 3, line 2-4).
5. **Absence of literature review on the magnitude of road traffic crashes (RTCs) and associated burden (health, social and financial) in Iran**

Now additional information is included regarding the magnitude of road traffic crashes as well as road traffic injuries with focus on health, financial and social burden of RTIs worldwide and with more focus on Iran (Please see the first and the second paragraph of background section on page 3).

6. **Overview of road safety regulations and drivers’ driving and safety training and licensing issues in the country**

Information about safety regulation, drivers’ driving and safety training and licensing issues is now presented in the revised version of the manuscript (Please see the second paragraph of the introduction on page 3 and the first paragraph in page 4).

7. **Lack of description of study tools (e.g. survey questionnaire)**

Data was collected during a telephone interview using a questionnaire (Please see page 4, last paragraph, line 8).

8. **Lack of the method of data collection (e.g. a self-administered questionnaire, telephone interview or face to face interview etc.)**

Data was collected during a telephone interview using a structured questionnaire (Please see page 5, paragraph 1, line 5).

9. **Lack of description / presentation of a comprehensive list of studied variables and/or questions asked.**

The variables included drivers age (years), sex, the frequency of intercity trips, the number of people who drove the vehicle and the vehicle’s age, the mean daily driving time (DDT) in hours, the number of traffic collisions during the past Persian calendar period and the information on the reported collisions including the cause, financial toll, injuries (Please see last paragraph on page 5).

10. **Data reporting – lack of complete data reporting in table format on demographics (e.g. gender, age, daily driving time, years since driving, number of intercity trips) and associated variables vis-à-vis study participants, absence of disaggregated data for ABS cars and non-ABS cars with respect total RTCs, injurious RTCs and fatal RTCs, a need for separate reporting for financial losses for both types of cars, distinction of incidence and incidence rates, separation of ranges from ranges for confidence intervals etc**

This information now is included in the revised version of the manuscript in more details (Please see page 6, paragraph 1). Moreover, Table 1 is added to present demographics of study subjects. Moreover, the gender of drivers was added into Result section (Please see page 6,
11. Discussion should focus on Iran with reference to the findings of this study and evidence from other countries.

We tried to address this point (See page 7-9 under discussion section).

12. Authors should not generalize their findings to other countries in the Middle East.

We acknowledge this point. In the new version of manuscript, there is no generalization of the findings in other countries (See page 2, last paragraph, page 10 under conclusion section).

Major Compulsory Revisions

ABSTRACT:

1. Study aims should be consistence in the abstract and the introduction. In aims, please clarify whether you are referring the incidences or the incidence rates, which are two different terms

In new version of the manuscript, this point was considered and there is a consistency in the aim and objective in both abstract and introduction of the revised manuscript (Please see page 2, paragraph 2; page 4, paragraph 2). Moreover, all “incidence”’s were corrected to “incidence rate”’s and now there is a consistency in whole main text and abstract regarding using incidence rate (Please see page 2, paragraph 2, under aim section in the abstract as well as page 4, paragraph 2, as the aim of study in the main text).

2. There is a lot of repetition in the text reporting methods in the abstract. This should be concise without any duplication. For example, ‘Using a historical cohort design, a telephone survey of drivers of personal cars with ABS (n=1232) and cars with other braking systems (n=3123) was used for data collection on RTCs, and associated financial losses and other variables’.

Thanks. Now all repeated sentence or phrases were removed from the abstract.

3. Findings should be reported in the abstract in a logical order such as demographics followed by statistics on RTCs, financial losses and so on. Conclusion in the abstract should focus only on the area of study i.e. Iran and avoid generalization to other countries in the Middle East

Thanks for reviewer comments. In the revised version, the abstract and main text is arranged according to reviewer’s comments. (See page 2 under result section; and result section of the main text on page 6-7).

BACKGROUND:
4. The background could be improved by describing literature review on the extent of road traffic crashes, and associated impacts in terms of health, psychological and financial losses at the global level, and then at the national level i.e. Iran. This should follow with a report on effective measures that could help in reducing the burden of RTCs. The measures should include the use of anti-lock braking system (ABS) and electronic stability control (ESC) systems etc. in this context, the authors should define/describe the ABS and their effectiveness around the world. This could follows with the description of public policy vis-à-vis mandatory outfitting of cars with ABS in Iran. In this background, the aims and objectives of this study should be reported. The aims/objectives should be consistent throughout the manuscript whether it is the abstract or the main text.

Thank you. In the background we included information about the magnitude of the RTIs and RTCs and information about the RTIs impact on health and psychological and financial losses due to RTIs worldwide and at the national level. Moreover, effective measures in RTCs prevention were presented. There is now consistency in the objective in both abstract section and background in the main text (Please see page 3, paragraph 2).

METHODS:

The methods section should clearly report the following:

5. # The study design,

Study design is already specified as Historical Cohort and now this point is clarified with more details (Please see page 4, paragraph 4).

6. # participants’ selection including the sampling technique used

Participants were selected using simple random sampling method among the registry of the Central Insurance Organization. This is now included in the methods (Please see page 5, paragraph 2, line 3).

7. # the criteria and justification for choosing cars of only one make (manufacturer),

The reason for restricting the study to cars of only one manufacturer was to limit the sources of variation such as socioeconomic status of drivers and the technical differences. This was included in the methods (please see page 4, paragraph 3, line 2-4).

8. # a detailed description of study tools e.g. survey questionnaire, if any,

Now the questionnaire is included as appendix 1 (Please see page 5, paragraph 1, line 5).

9. # description / presentation of a comprehensive list of studied variables and/or
Study subjects were asked to report their age (years), sex, the frequency of intercity trips, the number of people who drove the vehicle and the vehicle’s age. They were also asked to report the mean daily driving time (DDT) in hours and their answers were verified according to the frequency of gas fillings. The number of traffic collisions during the past Persian calendar period and the information on the reported collisions including the cause, financial toll, injuries and the role of brake failure (according to their perception) was sought during a structured telephone interview. This information now is included in the revised version of the manuscript in more details (Please see page 6, paragraph 1).

10. # Description of questions asked including what questions were common for the both groups i.e. drivers of cars with ABS and without ABS. In addition, what questions were unique for the two groups of drivers

The common quesions for both groups were age (years), sex, the frequency of intercity trips, the number of people who drove the vehicle and the vehicle’s age, the mean daily driving time (DDT) in hours, the number of traffic collisions during the past Persian calendar period and the information on the reported collisions including the cause, financial toll, injuries. Moreover, the drivers of unexposed group were asked to report if there have been situations that ABS had prevented a traffic crash. They were also asked to report how they usually used the (ABS) brake, to explore their knowledge of the right way to use ABS. This was included in the Methods (Please see page 6, paragraph 1).

11. # Description of the method of data collection e.g. a self-administered questionnaire, telephone interview or face-to-face interview etc.

Data was collected during a telephone interview using a structured questionnaire (Please see page 5, paragraph 1, line 5)

12. More importantly, the authors need to review the distinction between ‘exposed (cases) and unexposed (control) groups reported in this study. The authors have stated that the “exposed group” comprised ‘drivers of cars with traditional braking systems’ and the “unexposed group” comprised ‘drivers of cars with anti-lock braking system (ABS). However, the aim of the study was to study the effectiveness of the ABS in prevention of RTCs’. This means that the intervention was ‘introduction of ABS in car’; therefore, the ‘cases/exposed group’ should be ‘drivers of cars with the ABS’ and the controls/unexposed group’ should comprisethe drivers of cars with non-ABS/traditional braking systems. The authors need to reconsider this fact and reassess their methodology/analyses/findings.

While designing the study, we assumed that ABS should reduce the incidence of RTC; therefore, we considered “lack of Anti-lock Braking system” as a risk factor for RTC. By “exposed group” we mean “the group exposed to the risk factor”. After all, considering either of the groups as “exposed’, does not affect
the interpretation of the results. This point is now clarified in the revised version of the manuscript (Please see page 3, paragraph 1).

13. Please be clear whether you are reporting the ‘incidences’ or ‘incidence rates’.

Thanks for the comment. We meant “incidence rate”; and this point was clarified in whole manuscript.

14. Furthermore, I assume that the data would deviate from the normal distribution, which would require use of non-parametric analytical techniques. Therefore, the authors need to provide justification for using the T-test and Poisson regression, with especial attention should be paid as to how authors dealt with the assumptions necessary for the above analytical techniques.

The student’s t-test was used to compare the age of cars in exposed versus unexposed group. This variable deviated from normal distribution (as seen in the figure 1); however, the student’s t-test is robust to the normal distribution assumption in large (>30) sample sizes; this point is clarified in the revised version of the manuscript (Please see figure 1; and data treatment in page 5, line 1) Poisson regression is widely used to analyze RTC data, considering the nature of this data that is best explained by Poisson distribution (see data treatment in page 5, line 4).

15. Regarding the Poisson regression analysis, the authors need to report what was the outcome variable and what were the predictors / explanatory variables.

This point is now clarified in the revised version of the manuscript in the methods section (Please see page 5, last paragraph).

16. In addition, In the case of data deviation from normal distribution, reporting of the mean statistics become less important; therefore, median values should be reported (See page 6, paragraph 2, line 2; page 6, paragraph 2, line 3; and page 13, table 1).

Median values were included in addition to means (Please see page, paragraph).

17. The power of study should be reported in the methods section.

It was moved to the methods section.

18. The response rate is missing and it should be reported in this section.

The response rate was 88.0% (1232 out of 1400) and 89.2% (3123 out of 3500) for ABS and non-ABS group, respectively. This was included in the methods section (Please see page 5, paragraph 2, line 3)

RESULTS:
In the current format, results are not logically reported. The presentation of the results could be improved in the following order:

19. Table 1 should report data on demographics e.g. gender, age, daily driving time, number of years since driving, and number of intercity trips (Please see page 13).

Table 1 is added to present demographics of study subjects. Moreover, the gender of drivers was added into Result section (Please see page 6, paragraph 2, line 1-2; and page 13, Table 1; and page 2, abstract section under result part).

20. Table 2 should report disaggregated data on total RTCs, injurious RTCs and fatal RTCs, locality of RTCs (urban vs. rural, major highways vs. country roads), RTCs due to the brake failure and financial losses due to RTCs should be reported separately for ABS cars and non-ABS cars.

Table 2 is added including the suggested items (Please see page 13)

21. The current table 1 and table 2 could be renumbered.

Table 2 was renumbered and table 1 was deleted (Please see page 13).

22. In addition, the data reported in parenthesis should clearly state it is the ranges or confidence intervals and so on.

This was clarified accordingly (Please see page 6, paragraph 4, line 1-3; page 6, paragraph 4, line 2; page 7, paragraph 1, line 1; page 7, paragraph 2, line 1-2; page 7, paragraph 3, line 1; page 7, paragraph 4, line 1, 2, 4, 5; and Table 3 on page 14).

23. Moreover, the authors should state whether they are reporting the incidences or the incidence rates.

All “incidences” were changed to “incidence rates” in whole manuscript.

24. Poisson regression results: authors need to report statistics showing model fit with the given data. Additional comments on the Poisson regression analysis are given below with reference to Table 2.

Statistics showing model fit were added into the bottom of table 3 (Please see Table 3 on page 13).

**DISCUSSION:**

25. The opening paragraph mentions other Middle Eastern countries, which should be avoided and the focus of the discussion should be on the findings in the context of Iran. The discussion should provide critique of the study in relation to the evidence from other countries and finally some policy suggestions for the road safety in Iran should be proposed.
We acknowledge this point and we removed the Middle Eastern countries from the both first paragraph of the discussion and conclusion section. Moreover, some policy suggestions were included at the end of the discussion section (Please see page 9, paragraph 2, line 8-13).

**CONCLUSION:**

26. *As stated earlier, the conclusion in the abstract should focus only on Iran and present a bottom line of the study findings.*

In light of this comment, we avoided from generalization of the findings to the Eastern Mediterranean countries (See the conclusion section in abstract on page 2, and conclusion section of the main text in page 10).

27. *Table 2, Colum 3 ‘SD’. Is this the ‘standard deviation’ or the ‘standard error(SE)’? I believe it is the SE.*

Thank you; this reflects SE and it is corrected now (Please see Table 2 on page 13).

28. *Could you please provide 95% confidence intervals for the Poisson regression coefficients for each of the variables included in the Poisson regression model?*

In the revised version of the manuscript, 95% confidence intervals for the Poisson regression coefficients are included.

29. *In the results section, the authors have stated that they included six variables i.e. cars with ABS, age of drivers, age of vehicles, number of drivers, daily driving time (DDT), and frequency of inter-city trips I the Poisson regression model. However, Table 2 provides statistics for only 4 variables i.e. cars with ABS, age of drivers, daily driving time (DDT), and age of cars. Authors therefore need to provide statistics for all variables included in the model.*

We excluded the variables that did not appear significant in the model (i.e. number of drivers and frequency of inter-city trips). This is clarified in the results and methods.

**Minor Essential Revisions**

**TITLE:**

30. *Spelling mistake: change ‘Breaking’ to ‘Braking’*

Point taken. Breaking changed to Braking (See page 1 in the title).

**AUTHOR INSTITUTION:**

31. *Authors have written ‘Sina Trauma Research Centre’ and ‘Sina Trauma and Surgery Research Centre’. This should be consistent*
Authors reported ‘Social Determinant of Health’. In my opinion, the term ‘Determinant’ should be ‘Determinants’

Thanks for close attention. Sina Trauma and Surgery Research Centre and Social Determinants of Health are correct that were presented in the new version of the manuscript (See page 1, author affiliation in line 4).

32. Authors reported ‘Student Scientific Research Centre’. In my opinion, the term ‘Student’ should be ‘Students’

Yes. This was corrected as “Students Scientific Research Centre”. (See page 1, author affiliation in line 5).

ABSTRACT:

33. Background is generally written in the present tense; hence, the use of ‘was’ should be avoided.

This was corrected accordingly (Page 2, first paragraph under background section, line 2 and 3)

34. Background: change ‘was’ to ‘is’ in line 2 and 3. Aim: Change ‘loss’ to ‘losses’

These were corrected accordingly (See page 2, first paragraph under background section line; page 2, paragraph 2 under aim section, line 2)

35. Methods: ‘similar models’ in what sense?

This sentence was changed to: “The study population was the drivers of two similar vehicles of the same manufacturer and similar engine, design and price” (Please see page 4, paragraph 4, line 1-2)

36. Results: see suggested major revisions

Done.

37. Conclusion: delete ‘similar Middle Eastern Countries’. What do you mean by ‘preparation of a list of priorities’?

Done. (Please see page 2, last paragraph under conclusion section,1-2)

BACKGROUND:

38. Delete ‘and development’

Done.

39. Change ‘are increasing’ to ‘are projected to increase’
‘are increasing’ was changed to ‘are projected to increase’ (Page 3, paragraph 1, line 1)

40. **Delete ‘a’ before psychological**

Done (Page 3, paragraph 1, line 2).

41. **Change ‘jurisdictions’ to authorities’ or ‘road traffic safety regulatory authorities’**

‘Jurisdictions’ was changed to ‘road traffic safety regulatory authorities’ (See page 1, paragraph 1, line 1)

42. **Change ‘exceed’ to ‘exceeds’**

Exceed was changed to exceeds (See page 4, paragraph 1, line 6)

43. **Change ‘story’ to ‘evidence’**

Story was changed to evidence (See page 4, paragraph 1, line 13)

44. **What do you mean by ‘a small fraction’? Could report some figures instead?**

Unfortunately there is not a reliable statistics available. However, ABS has been installed only on vehicles that cost more than 12000 US$ and majority of population do not afford to own those vehicles.

*Delete ‘in the world’. Could you please report ‘where’ is the debate taking place vis-à-vis mandatory ABS. Perhaps you are talking about Iran!*

Yes, we meant Iran, which is now clarified in the background section

45. **Report aims in a new paragraph.**

The aims are now presented in a new paragraph (Please see the second paragraph of the background section on page 4).

46. **In aims, delete ‘to provide a preliminary evidence for this debate’.**

Done.

**METHODS**

47. **Delete ‘with a land mass……45 inhabitants/km2. This information does not fit here but could be moved to the introduction/background section.**

The above part is deleted (Please see page 4, paragraph 3, line 1).

48. **Again, what do you mean by ‘similar vehicles’. It would be useful if you could report as ‘two different models of cars i.e. one with ABS and**
second with traditional brake system, produced by the same manufacture”.

This was corrected as follows: The study population was the drivers of two similar vehicles of the same manufacturer and similar engine, design and price (Please see page 4, paragraph 4, line 1-2).

49. Change ‘called’ to ‘contacted’
Done (Please see page 4, last paragraph, line 2).

50. Change ‘traffic collisions’ to ‘RTCs’
Done (Please see page 5, paragraph 1, line 2).

51. Change ‘was sought’ to ‘were sought’ and Delete ‘accordingly’
Done (Please see page 5, paragraph 1, line 4)

Case selection:

52. change ‘drivers that were’ to ‘drivers who were’
This sentence totally revised as “They were selected using simple random sampling method among the registry of the Central Insurance Organization” (Please see page 5, under case selection, line 2-3)

53. change ‘according’ to ‘through’
Done.

Data treatment:

54. Change ‘was’ to ‘were’ ( …were calculated)
Done. (Please see page 5, under data treatment section, line 1)

55. If data was not normally distributed then it is better to report ‘median values’ What variables were categorical? such as….change ‘utilized’ to ‘used’

Please see the answer to comment 14.

RESULTS:

56. It would be better if you could provide sub-headings for reporting data. Such as:
57. Demographic characteristics, RTCs, RTIs, Financial losses, and Drivers perceptions about ABS.
We appreciate if the reviewer let us to follow our previous format. Otherwise it will be several small sentences in this manner.

58. Please revise an incomplete sentence i.e. ‘To non-ABS vehicles was 0.20, 0.65, and 0.96 respectively’ given at the bottom of the results section.

This sentence totally revised as ‘The power of study to detect a 10%, 20% and 30% difference in the incidence rate of RTCs in the ABS compared to non-ABS vehicles was 0.20, 0.65, and 0.96 respectively’ (Please see page 5, under data treatment section, line 6-8).

59. Please refer Table 2 when you describe the Poisson regression analysis in the results section.

Done.

DISCUSSION:

60. Change ‘and in the Middle Eastern Climate’ to ‘in Iran’.

The “and in the Middle Eastern Climate” was changed to ”Iran” (Please see the first paragraph of the discussion section on page 7).

61. Is it ‘annual incidence’ or ‘annual incidence rate’?

We meant ”annual incidence rate”, which is now corrected in the revised version of the manuscript (Please see the first paragraph of the discussion section on page 7, line 6).

62. Please delete an extra comma in paragraph 3 i.e. … and RTIs, , as’ (this should be …RTIs, as was observed.)

The extra comma in the third paragraph of the discussion section is deleted (See the third paragraph of the discussion section on page 8, line 1).

63. Change ‘the story has been controversial in the real world’ to ‘the findings have been inconsistent in the real field’.

This sentence also is revised in new version of the manuscript (See the third paragraph of the discussion section on page 8, line 2).

64. You might need to add the country (i.e. USA) where the ‘Highway Loss Data Institute’ is located.

Thanks. We meant in the USA, which now is clarified. (See the third paragraph of the discussion section on page 8, line 3).
65. Change ‘adding this technology’ to ‘adding the ABS technology’

This sentence is revised in new version of the manuscript (See the third paragraph of the discussion section on page 8, line 4).

66. Please use abbreviation of RTCs and RTIs throughout the text after their initial full spelling

Done.

67. Change ‘by ABS installation’ to ‘involving vehicles with ABS’

Done (See paragraph 4 of the discussion section on page 8, line 1-2).

68. Change ‘attributed to ABS installation’ to ‘attributed to the ABS’

‘attributed to ABS installation’ was changed to ‘attributed to the ABS’ (See paragraph 4 of the discussion section on page 8, line 1-2).

69. Change ‘failure of this technique’ to ‘failure of the ABS’

This sentence is revised in new version of the manuscript (See last paragraph of the discussion section on page 8, line 5).

70. Change ‘all forms of RTC’ to ‘all forms of RTCs’

This sentence is revised in new version of the manuscript (See last paragraph of the discussion section, page 8, line 5-6).

71. Change ‘got its support by’ to ‘was supported by’

This sentence is revised in new version of the manuscript (See last paragraph of the discussion section, page 8, line 6).

72. How much is a ‘noticeable fraction’? Please be precise!

This is clarified now and the exact percent is 44.1%. (Please see page 8, paragraph 4, line 8).

73. Could you please rephrase this sentence i.e. ‘This is more attentive…………….verbal knowledge [3]’

This sentence is now revised in the new version (See first paragraph of the discussion section, page 9, line 1-3).

74. Change ‘information about’ to ‘information and training about’

Done (See the first paragraph of the discussion section, page 9, line 5).

75. Change ‘ought’ to ‘sought’
Done (Please see page 9, paragraph 2, line 1)

76. Change ‘their products’ to ‘their cars’

‘their products’ was change to ‘their cars’ (Please see page 9, paragraph 2, line 1).

77. You might need to delete the following text i.e. ‘This ratio has been reported………….for safety seat belts of drivers’.

This is very important argument for us in order to show that there are some other safety measure like car seat rather than ABS and car manufactures need to have more focus on them.

78. Please describe what do you mean by a ‘list of priorities’.

We clarify this point. We mean list of safety measures priorities needs to be considered for authorities for car safety (Please see page 9, paragraph 2, line 8).

79. Delete ‘and similar Middle Eastern countries’.

‘and similar middle income countries” was removed from the text (Please see page 9, paragraph 2, line 8).

80. Change ‘any specific policy in this regard’ to ‘any specific policy regarding mandatory fitting of ABS in vehicles’

Done (Please see page 9, paragraph 2, line 9-10).

81. Change ‘Limitation and strength’ to ‘Limitations and strengths’

‘Limitation and strength’ was change to ‘Limitations and strengths’(Please see Limitations and strengths on page 9).

82. Change ‘might believe’ to ‘might have believed’

‘might believe’ was changed to ‘might have believed’(Please see page 9, paragraph 3, line 2).

83. Change ‘overestimate’ to ‘probably overestimated’

‘overestimate’ was changed to ‘probably overestimated’(Please see page 9, paragraph 3, line 3).

84. Change ‘may expect’ to ‘might have expected’

‘may expect’ was changed to ‘might have expected’ (Please see page 9, paragraph 3, line 4).

CONCLUSION:
85. Change ‘While ABS have believed to have prevent RTCs that were due to brake failure up to 40 %’ to ‘While ABS is believed to prevent RTCs due to brake failure (up to 40 %)’

Done (Please see page 10, paragraph 1, line 1 under conclusion section).

86. Change ‘safety authorities’ to ‘Road safety authorities’

‘safety authorities’ was changed to ‘Road safety authorities’ (Please see page 10, paragraph 1, line 2 under conclusion section).

87. Delete ‘and similar Middle Eastern Countries’

‘and similar Middle Eastern Countries’ was removed from the conclusion section (Please see page 10, paragraph 1, under conclusion section).

88. Change ‘should first invest to prepare a list of priorities, considering’ to ‘should first consider’

‘should first invest to prepare a list of priorities was changed to ‘should first consider’ (Please see page 10, last paragraph 1, line 3 under conclusion section).

89. Change ‘specific policy in this regard’ to ‘specific policy vis-à-vis mandatory ABS in vehicles’

‘specific policy in this regard’ was changed to ‘specific policy vis-à-vis mandatory ABS in vehicles’ (Please see page 10, paragraph 1, line 4 under conclusion section).

90. Add ‘In addition,’ before the drivers need ..........effectiveness.

Done (Please see page 10, line 4 under conclusion section).

91. Authors might consider adding the following as the last sentence in the conclusion. ‘This could be facilitated by the organizations responsible for the road traffic safety in the country.’

Thanks for close attention. The above sentence with a slight modification is added in the conclusion section (Please see page 10, line 5-6 under conclusion section).