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Abstract

Delete first sentence in background “The high?” and remove the acronym (RTI). As you do not really use this acronym, also remove in the main body Background first paragraph, and make the start of the second paragraph “Road traffic injuries?”

Done.

In the Method, do not cite larger study here and refer to age, such as “This was a grounded theory qualitative study of male motorcyclists who were aged ?18?.”

Done.

Background

First sentence: delete reference [1] as this is not WHO. Done.

Second and fourth sentence appear to have an incorrect reference (about substance use)[3], please correct.

Authors’ Response: Done.


Authors’ Response: Done.

Second sentence reports on countrywide but the reference [13] is only for Tehran (as noted at the start of the next sentence).

Authors’ Response: Done.

It also states the data is for 2003 but the reference is “1999 to 2000”?

Authors’ Response: We understand, but the data for the study that we cited were obtained from trauma patients admitted to six major trauma hospitals in Tehran from August 1999 to September 2000. However, the information about number of registered car is from 2003. So we think information should be accurate.

Also as this was a decade or more ago, is there any newer research to cite? ? please correct.

Authors’ Response: We added more recent citation to show that in 2010, there were more than 10 million monocycles in Iran {Automotive industry in Iran, #7269}

Then in the next sentence of [14-15], there is insufficient detail of [14] in the citation ? who was the report for/who published it?

Authors’ Response: Done.

Please carefully check all your reference formats in the Reference section against those required for the Journal to be sure all fields are included and in correct format (there are several uses of ..,.. which is incorrect, for example).
Authors’ Response: Done. We apologize for all the mixed up in the citations and reference. We noticed many instances of double references and errors in our EndNote file. We corrected the file and we assure you that the references are error free now.

Then the sentence ‘The majority of the public?? is misleading as it reads as if this about Iran.
Authors’ Response: We moved this sentence to a new paragraph.

Also [20] is incorrect as a reference ? the authors and report do not match as this is a report led by Stradling and about car drivers only. I cannot locate a report with this team of authors in this order and there are spelling mistakes (i.e., this should be Hannigan). Please correct.
Authors’ Response: We corrected this citation, using the correct version in the out EndNote file.

Then this comment should be qualified, such as ?Research in other countries suggests that public awareness of motorcycles as one of the least safe modes of transportation is high [19, 20].? The last part of this sentence re verification is not needed as already covered in introductory paragraph. Please carefully check all your use of references in the text (Background and Discussion) and be sure each is correctly assigned and the text is clear about when the work is from Iran vs other countries or about motorcyclists versus drivers, etc.
Authors’ Response: Done

The categories by Christmas were first based on their motivations for riding in terms of passion, performance and practicality (as per the title) then differences were explored in terms of risk. Please correct this, for example, ?seven categories to reflect their different motivations for riding, related to passion, performance and practicality, which also differed in attitudes and perceptions..?
Authors’ Response: As suggested we restructure this sentence to: Christmas et.al, have categorized motorcyclists into seven categories to reflect their different motivations for riding, related to passion, performance and practicality, which also differed in attitudes and perceptions.

Third paragraph, second sentence: you have not established what the awareness of motorcycling risk is among Iranian riders in what you have written so far ? rather only the above sentence based on research in the UK. Do you have this in your other references? You either need to cite this first or otherwise it is incorrect to describe the objective of your research as ?to learn how Iranian motorcyclists deal with the mental tension of this awareness?. You have not established that this awareness or mental tension exists. You could revise this paragraph to follow the first sentence with something like ?Assuming this awareness is also high in Iran, yet Iranian motorcyclists have a high acceptance of road risks [15], this raises the question as to whether there is a disconnect between their awareness of risk and risk behavior.
Authors’ Response: We followed the reviewer’s suggestion and revised this statement to: Assuming this awareness is also high in Iran, yet Iranian motorcyclists have a high acceptance of road risk (Zamani-Alavijeh, Niknami et al. 2009), this raises the question as to whether there is a disconnect between their awareness of risk and risk behavior.
Cognitive dissonance theory. In the sixth sentence starting “More specifically,” the example should not just be about riding but (e.g. risky motorcycle riding). Then end this paragraph here. The remainder (“The results”) is more a point for the Discussion.

Authors’ Response: We added the term “risky” and moved the rest of the paragraph to the end of the “Discussion section”.

Method

First sentence, please revise to “We chose grounded theory method to”?
Authors’ Response: Done, we changed “approach” to “method”.

Then the second sentence should explain/describe how this method works? the rest of this paragraph should be deleted (it is also more of a point for the Discussion).

Authors’ Response: Done so and moved the rest of this section to the first part of the “limitations”.

The second paragraph should also be deleted here. Rather you could include these details on expertise as being the ?reviewers? of the data as referred to under Data Analysis fourth sentence. [Note though that you change from general comment about this method ? in present tense ? about what this approach is in general, to changing to past tense about the current study ?Identified themes were then?? . Best to keep this all in past tense about this study.]

Authors’ Response: Done so and moved the details on the expertise of the research team to the “Data Analysis” under Trustworthiness /Validity and Reliability section, and kept all this section in past tense.

Settings and Participants:

When you say “Once potential participants were identified? do you mean motorcyclists? Also include here why only were male. Could you also explain “in the street” - for example did you go to motorcycle parking areas? I assume then they were invited to the focus groups at a certain location? and also for the interviews, or could these be done by phone? Did the participants get selected for focus groups versus interviews or was it their choice or did you have quotas? When was consent obtained? at this time or when appeared for the focus group/interview? Please clarify. For example, you would revise this paragraph to something like this depending on what you did:

This study was conducted in ?. Potential participants were identified by approaching motorcyclists at motorcycle parking areas in the cities. Only males were approached as motorcycling is almost entirely a male activity in Iran. At the time of recruitment, they were asked: 1) if they were 18 years of age or older; 2) if they were living in one of the
If meeting eligibility criteria including self-identifying as a risky rider, they were invited to choose to attend either a focus group or interview at the researchers’ offices at a later date, when written informed consent was obtained before participating in the study.

Then move the sentence at the end of this page ?Twenty-six male?? to follow as this is still about the participants. Include here the total sample number and introduce the table. For example, revise to: ?Twenty-six male? interviews, therefore a total N=34. The breakdown of participant numbers by cities is included in Table 1.? In addition, you seem to have age so please include the mean age and age range of participants here.

Authors’ Response: Done. We incorporated suggested revisions and restructuring of the sentences as the following. Twenty-Six male motorcyclists participated in five focus group discussions, and eight motorcyclists participated in one-on-one in-depth interviews, therefore a total of N = 34. The breakdown of participant numbers by cities is included in Table 1. The mean age, standard deviation, and age range of participants were 32±13 and 45, respectively.

(Then Data Collection would be the same first paragraph and the second paragraph would start ?The study principle?? and ?To align??.)

Authors’ Response: Done.

Data analysis: first sentence, delete?in Farsi?.

Authors’ Response: Done.

Last sentence, who are ?the experts? here? Is this not the study team? Do you mean as recommended in the literature?

Authors’ Response: Yes. To make it clear we added the following phrase: as recommended in the literature, ...

Trustworthiness: I appreciate this term was used by the Reviewer, but in the context of this research, please change this to Validity and Reliability and keep all of this paragraph in past tense (?were reflected?).

With all due respect to this reviewer’s comment, we are not sure about this recommended revision since the term “trustworthiness” is the suggested term to indicate reliability and validity in ‘qualitative’ studies (see Shenton 2004). We thought of an alternative such as: Trustworthiness /Validity and Reliability. However, we yield to the final edit of the reviewer.

Results

Please make all of the Results section past tense.

Authors’ Response: Done.

Risk Managers: please reduce the number of behavior examples.

Authors’ Response: We deleted the following behavior examples from this section: And most of the time these riders also don’t follow traffic rules. Therefore, they are the one who are more likely to get into accidents and put their own lives or the lives of others in danger.
I am experienced now. If I have to cross a red light [without stopping], I make sure I have everything under control. For example,

“I can ride my motorcycle on one wheel and do this for a long time, and at the same time turn in any direction that I want. I can control my motorcycle even under the most difficult situations (19 years old).”

Risk Takers: change ?cycling? to ?motorcycling?.
Authors’ Response: Done.

Change ?passion for motorcycling? to ?passion for risky riding?.
Authors’ Response: Done.

Change ?stuns? to ?stunts?.
Authors’ Response: Done.

Discussion

This should start with a summary of your findings relative to the aims then discuss in light of relevant previous literature. Revise the first paragraph to delete the first four sentences

Authors’ Response: We deleted the following four sentences from the first paragraph.

In Iran, like many other countries in the region, use of motorcycle as a mean of transportation is quite common and is expected to increase (Moghisi 2005, Zargar, Khaji et al. 2006). According to the available estimates from WHO, motorcycle related injuries will continue adding to the burden of injury in Iran, unless appropriate actions are taken (Moghisi 2005). Zamani et al, in an earlier study reported that regardless of the motivation for use, and regardless of the rider’s socio-economic class, the prevalence of traffic-law violations among Iranian motorcyclists is high (Zamani-Alavijeh, Niknami et al. 2009). Given that the perception of risk and traffic behaviors (including risky riding) vary in different socio-cultural contexts (Perel, McGuire et al. 2004, Harré, Foster et al. 2005, Nja and Nesvag 2007, Zamani-Alavijeh, Niknami et al. 2009), this study aimed to explore how Iranian motorcyclists, regardless of being aware that risky riding can result in injuries or deaths, justify their biases towards risky riding.

Although these categories are not mutually exclusive, we discuss them separately to improve our understanding of the motorcyclists risk biases; how they perceive, appraise, and justify risks related to their own riding.

[Also here I notice, is reference [14] in fact the same as [41]?]
Authors’ Response: Ref 41 was deleted.

Move the sentence ?Although these categories are not?? to after the following explanatory paragraph.
Authors’ Response: Now this sentence is part of the last paragraph in the “Discussion”, before “Limitation” section. Such as the following: Although the aforementioned categories are not mutually exclusive, we discuss them separately to improve our understanding of the motorcyclists risk biases; how they perceive, appraise, and justify risks related to their own riding

Explain when cite Watson et al that this is Australian research. Please review and be clear on the countries of the research cited in the Discussion.
Authors’ Response: Done as following: Similarly, in an Australian study, Watson et al, (Watson and Freeman 2007) report
Reducing the anticipation?: break this into more than one paragraph.
**Author’s Response:** We broke this section to three paragraphs.

At the end the quote from Jderu “out-group” does not translate well? did you mean “outsider group” or “out there group”. Not clear what angle this is.
**Author’s Response:** Yes, this term was used by Jderu and meant “outsider group”. We provided the following description in the parenthesis …riders as “out-group” (i.e., outsider group)

Also you focus on road safety campaigns here as the main form of intervention. Are there any references to cite that campaigns are effective in changing motorcyclist behavior? Or other road user behavior? That is, what is the evidence that campaigns might address the problem?
**Author’s Response:** Indeed there were not any relevant studies to cite, or at least we did not find any. Our intention was to suggest intervention(s). So to make it clearer, we made the following revisions: Therefore, they may be more attentive and attracted to road-related safety campaigns that enhance their inner needs for achieving riding competency and control. Future studies are needed to inform us if such campaigns are effective in changing motorcyclists’ behaviors.

In this respect road safety interventions may benefit from active engagement of more competent riders in delivering road safety education and training to novice riders. The unintended consequence of this could be that this group may keep their own riding habits in check. Further empirical investigation could provide evidence as to whether these types of interventions address the issue.

Replace worries?: you include more information here than in the Results. Swap around so that the Results has the more detail and here is the summary.
**Author’s Response:**
We moved the following sentence to the results for “Risk Utilizer” to add more details in this section. Of the motorcyclists in the study, those who belonged to the Risk Utilizers category had a defined notion that risk-free riding is not practical due to existing driving and road traffic circumstances.

Include the Christas reference [25].
**Author’s Response:** Done

Again you refer to safety tips for these riders being a solution but without a reference to support this as an effective strategy in improving safety. Or perhaps there are other references to cite that theorise such a strategy.
**Author’s Response:**
There were not such intervention to cite, or at least we did not find any. Our purpose here was to suggest/propose intervention(s). Therefore we included the following phrase to this section:
Future interventional studies can assess if...

Changed the meaning?: What does the last sentence mean ?to regulate these?? Are you referring to enforcement? There seems to be a lack of attention to the role of enforcement despite it likely being a more powerful influencer of behavior then education alone. Please clarify this statement and include supporting references.
**Author’s Response:** Well taken. We made the following revisions to the this section.
The challenge for the road safety promoter is to influence risky riding behaviors of these types of riders by identifying effective enforcement incentives that would prevent them from making irrevocable riding decisions with regretful outcomes through both positive and negative reinforcement strategies (i.e., rewarding safe riding behaviors and implementing significant, consistent penalties for risky riding behaviors) [Zamani-Alavijeh, 2009 #6190] [Khan, 2008 #3975]. In this respect, a synergistic-based approach can encourage cooperation among motorcycle safety advocates, insurance industry, and judicial and law enforcement organizations in developing, implementing, and monitoring of such incentives [Sreedharan, 2010 #5657] [Khorasani-Zavareh, 2011 #7275] [Khorasani Zavareh, 2008 #7309] [The United States., 2000 #7704].

Focusing on the??: The change of thrill and social marketing suggestions are good?are they from reference [19]? Please be clear or else add other references here.

**Author's Response:** These statements are the authors, suggestions for future intervention studies. We made the following revisions for more clarification. Further qualitative studies can inform the development of interventions that include an alternative ‘thrill’ to replace the one young riders experience from risky riding. In addition, social marketing experts may be able to assist road safety advocates to identify and promote alternative ‘thrills’, and effectively communicate possible consequences of risky riding that could facilitate changing current cultural norms that discourage safe riding among this group. Further studies are needed to implement and test the effectiveness of such interventions.

Limitations: change to ?other than their age and Iranian ethnicity?. Change ?invisible social forces, i.e.,? to ?unmeasured social and other factors, e.g.,?.

**Author's Response:** We incorporated the suggested revision. Finally, the risk biases and risky behaviors of the motorcyclists in our study are influenced by unmeasured social and other factors, which may be unique to Iranian culture.

Change ?trustworthiness and credibility? just to ?credibility?.

**Author's Response:** Done

Change last sentence around ??..support the findings from other countries?. in understanding their road safety behavior.?

**Author’s Response:** Done as the following: In this respect, our findings add to and support the findings from other countries in understanding their road safety behavior.

**Conclusion**

change ?our results benefits? to ?our results add support for?.

**Author’s Response:** Done as the following: Nevertheless, our results add support for road safety

Future directions: change to ?biases?.

**Author's Response:** Done: different risk biases
"As stakeholders, they can play an important role in offering motivational tips for safe riding that are relevant to their risk biases; tips that if not adapted may escalate to dissonant cognitions.

Change "may have fewer worries about" to "may be less motivated by the threat of".

Our findings suggest that Risk Takers may be less motivated by the threat of having their


" Done. studies are needed to report level of readiness to change risky riding of riders

I think you should then finish this paragraph at "Such studies? in Iran [10],. The remainder does not appear related to the current work in any way, unless you can make such a link clearer."

Results of such studies may identify common approaches that would promote collective traffic discipline and new norms of non-risky riding among motorcycle riders, as well as enforcement of legislative policies and police enforcement behaviors (Cawich S.O, Harding H.E et al. 2010, Kashani, Mohaymany et al. 2010). This has been practiced in U.S. through “Don’t drink and drive” (DADD), and “Mothers Against Drunk Driving” policies (MADD). A step forward in this direction could be to operationally define ‘traffic discipline’ and how it can be realized and achieved by motorcyclists in Iran.

Referee 3

http://www.biomedcentral.com/imedia/4994177781028966_comment.pdf

Reviewer's report
Thanks for authors attempt to revise the manuscript. It still needs to made the following revisions before it acceptance.

In the first sentence of the abstract please use road traffic injuries instead of road injuries following by RTIs and then use RTIs in the second line of the abstract.

However, according to the comment of 1st Referee we combined the 1st and 2nd sentences, as following: Road traffic injuries, especially those involving motorcycles, are a particular concern in Iran.

Kindly revise all road injuries in the whole manuscript and try to have consistency of using the same terminology.

Author's Response: Done
Please use “This qualitative approach using Grounded Theory method is part of a larger study that recruited male motorcyclists who…” instead of “This qualitative study is part of a larger study that recruited male motorcyclists who” in the method section of the abstract.

Author’s Response: Replying to the comments of the both respective reviewers, we revised the method statement as the following: This was a grounded theory qualitative study of male motorcyclists who were ≥18 and were living in one of the three cities of Tehran, Isfahan and Ahwaz

Do you have updated information for this reference in the introduction section instead of 2003” In the capital city of Tehran alone there were more than 2 million registered motorcycles in 2003”

Author’s Response: Yes. We added a reference from 2010, as the following: In the capital city of Tehran alone there were more than 2 million registered motorcycles in 2003 (Zargar, Khaji et al. 2006). In 2005, motorcycles made up about 40% of the country's registered vehicles, commonly used by men (Moghisi, 2005 #6768), and in 2010, there were more than 10 million monocycles in Iran (Automotive industry in Iran, #7269)

In the method section revise “We chose grounded theory approach…….” to “We chose grounded theory method…..”

Author’s Response: Done: We chose grounded theory method to”

Thanks authors for their revision in whole manuscript. But some part of this explanation “Although a qualitative approach may limit the reproducibility of our results, we are not aiming to identify a list of reliable and significant factors that could predict variations in behavior, as is the case in quantitative approaches. Instead, our goal is to gain an in-depth understanding of the cognitive contexts and rationalizations behind these variations in behavior” belong to the discussion section.

Author’s Response: completely agree. We moved these statements to “limitation” part of Discussion.

Please leave 26 from “Twenty-Six (26)” in the method section.

Author’s Response: Done

Your result presentation improved much but still you have a huge amount of information in the quotations. You need to reduce them. It do recommend to have your main findings in the first paragraph of the discussion section and then discuss them in the next paragraph.

Author’s Response: With all due respect to this reviewer, we revised the Results and the Discussion sections based on the comments of the first reviewer, that is, we kept Results and Discussion separate; reduced some of the respondents’ quotations, and swapped some information between Results and Discussion to evenly distribute information in these sections. Please note the underlined texts in these sections.

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Acceptable
**Statistical review:** No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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