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Reviewer's report:

Is the question posed by the authors well defined?
Major revision
The question posed is very interesting and ‘research-worthy’. A significant amount of effort is being put into the development and evaluation of preventive measures and subsequent safety policies. However, when it comes to implementation, the real-life workability of these efforts, problems arise. Therefore, this is a very interesting and highly needed topic of research. My only comment would be that the research question has a too wide scope. The study is on association between infrastructure and implementation of safety policies in general. It is reasonable to assume that for certain safety policies the existing infrastructure is more equipped than for others. This renders any general results inapplicable for different safety policies that need implementation. My advice would be to focus on one (e.g. the swimming example given in the results section) or two (one successful and a less successful) specific safety policies. In that case a more detailed description of pitfalls and success stories can be presented to the reader.

Discretionary revision
In addition the positioning of the research question within the introduction is a bit awkward. The actual question is in the middle of the introductory section.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
Major revision
As the authors point out in the discussion, the results of this study are to a certain extent only applicable to the Swedish community. In order for the reader to fully be able to place or extrapolate results to their own context full disclosure on the included communities is needed. For instance, ten municipalities which were declared as ‘Safe communities’ were included. On basis of what criteria were these municipalities declared as ‘safe’? This is crucial information in order to understand the results. The division of participating municipalities into the two categories is puzzling. On what premises was this subcategorization made. This does not become clear form the text.

Were there 4 focus group interviews per municipality?
How were the focus groups humanized. Was each focus group with five persons
form the same group of interest (e.g. school boards) or were the groups equipped with 5 persons from different acting parties? If the latter, were the four groups of equal division?

Are the data sound?

Major revision

That is hard to judge. I’m not completely clear on the way the focus groups were humanized. From what I can tell only local government administrators and politicians were interviewed. As these only form a small of number of pieces of the puzzle (even mostly with a subjective meaning), I find it difficult to understand how it is possible to sketch the whole acting infrastructural network and draw conclusions form that. This also falls back to my previous comment on the research question. A narrowed down focus on a single safety policy would have made results more explicit.

Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?

Major revision

It should be said that this is a qualitative study. Although there are some standards for the reporting of these studies, there is still a lot of discussion on how to report these studies best. To me the results read more like the personal opinion of the authors, backed up by what was derived from interviews. It should at least be the other way around.

Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?

Major revision

In my opinion this is not the case, see also point 3 and 4. Even so, the conclusion is not a direct answer to the stated research question.

Are limitations of the work clearly stated?

Yes, nothing to comment here

Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished?

Yes

Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?

In part they do. This is an actor network theory analysis. However, the scope of the study seems to be much wider that was being promised by the title.

Is the writing acceptable?

Writing is perfect.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

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