

Line 62: it should be the World Organisation for Animal Health

Line 87: it is awkward to read that something will go into effect in 2020 and 2023 when we are in 2024. I would rephrase.

The introduction is well done and nicely sets the stage for the purpose statement. The objectives are clearly stated.

Lines 155-156: "A map of the veterinary drug value chain map was shared with all participants."; I would rephrase, removing the second "map" in the sentence.

Under figure 1 I read "In bold: sell and give advice; VietGAHP: Vietnamese Good Animal Husbandry Practices"; At first, for this review I wrote "I do not know why this is there because I do not see words in bold on my copy"; then I realized that you must be referring to the arrows. I would clearly state this: arrows in bold....; also, Agency 1 and 2 are not defined. The interpretation of the word agency will likely vary depending on the origin of each reader. We get the information on lines 228-231. Tables and Figures should normally be as stand alone as possible. Right now, it is not possible to fully understand this figure without reading the text. Same thing for Figure 4: you need to put the definition of abbreviations like WOAHP.

In Figure 1, I see "Technician company"; I believe it should be "Company technician"

This article is very well written and easy to read. But to increase understanding by a broad readership, I would include somewhere (maybe when first mentioned) a brief definition of social capital; because most non-social scientists and veterinarians will not know what this is.

Lines 201 – 210 and Table 1: I leave it to the editor to decide, but I would say that this information should be part of material and method.

Line 231: you state that supply-level 2 agencies target consumers. You are referring to their clients (farmers, users?) or to actual consumers (term normally understood as referring to people buying a product, such as chicken in a grocery store)? This is not clear.

Lines 238-239: "Technicians were veterinarians employed by a company."; in my country, veterinarians would be really upset to be told that they are technicians! Readers from the USA, Canada, Europe, at the very least, would not think about a veterinarian as a technician. We do have veterinary technicians, but these people do not have a doctorate in veterinary medicine and they work under the supervision of veterinarians. So, some change in terminology is really needed here. I would simply put "company veterinarians" and I would stay away from the word technician, unless you are referring to individuals who received training in a given technique (like veterinary technician, laboratory technician, etc.).

Line 241: "they also offer farmers free advice"; I understand that they charge only for a product, technically, and include "free" advice; you can leave as is, but I would likely remove "free" because they would not provide any advice to anyone not paying a fee.

Line 242: I would replace "they" by "these agencies" (assuming you are referring to them; not clear)

Figure 3: WOAHP = World Organisation for Animal Health; also, "veterinarian" would be "private veterinarian"?; finally, see comment above regarding Agency 1 and Agency 2 (also for Figure 4). Under Figure 3 we read: "Actors belonged to public sector (orange), international partners (green), and private sector (blue)."; this is not needed because the same information is directly in the figure.

Table 2: “World Animal Health Organisation (WAHO)” should be World Organisation for Animal Health.

Line 347: “participants suggested that their mission had limitations”; such as?

Lines 373-374: “The majority of our communal veterinarian interviewees were not qualified veterinarians”; in many countries, to be known as veterinarian means that you are a member in good standing of the state veterinary board; otherwise, you cannot call yourself “veterinarian”. So, when you say that some communal veterinarians are not qualified veterinarians are you indicating that they do not have a certification regarding ABU or they are not really veterinarians? Because if they are not really individuals with a veterinary degree and recognized as veterinarian by an official state or provincial board, it is a problem to call these individuals “veterinarians” for this paper. I mention this because I read your paper knowing how many international readers understand the meaning of “being a veterinarian”. They will be confused by your current wording. For example, on line 587 we read “veterinarians who do not have practice certificates”; you will have to really explain the veterinary situation in Vietnam, because many readers will wonder about this. My understanding, based on your text, is that many individuals practice veterinary medicine illegally in Vietnam. If this is the case, you need to clearly state this.

Line 398: “Their technicians studied veterinary medicine”; rewording needed. If someone studied veterinary medicine and earned the right to prescribe, this person is a veterinarian. Maybe you can state that their field personnel are veterinarians, so they are authorized to write prescriptions, giving them an advantage....

Lines 402-403: “feed companies replaced antibiotics with supplemented feed”; supplemented with what? I propose “feed companies replaced antibiotics with alternative supplements (or additives)”

Lines 431-432: the fact that large integrated companies may be involved in the law-making process will raise some eyebrows in many countries! What do you mean by being involved? They contribute by being consulted, or they actually have a say in the law-making process? I mention this because “being involved” has to be clearly defined.

Line 476: I would replace “they” by “these regulations” or “these rules”

Line 513: “loudspeakers” ...who manages the speakers? I would specify this.

Line 518: I would add “government” after “central”; because it will not be obvious to all what you mean by central, even if it is mentioned elsewhere

Line 520: should be “No technical....”

Line 526: what is the difference between farmers and producers?

Line 601: “study districts” should be “studied districts” or districts under study

Lines 611-614: having diluted antibiotic products would actually contribute to ABR (possibly more than doubling the dose in order to get an adequate dosage). This could be discussed.

Lines 733-734: “However, our sample lacked small farmers compared to other stakeholders, and we did not their perspectives on their role in ABR”; a word is missing (“we did not their....”

Good assessment of the limitations of the study.

Lines 759-760:” Regulations were sometimes identified too far away from Vietnamese reality.”; “identified” may not be the best term here. Do you mean that regulations were sometimes elaborated or designed too far away from the Vietnamese reality? If yes, I would use “elaborated” or “designed” instead of “identified”.

Line 785: I would add in Vietnam, because buying antibiotic over the counter in some countries in veterinary medicine is very much illegal and the consequences are such that veterinarians are very unlikely to do this. In my country, about 20 years ago, a poultry veterinarian was found guilty and lost his right to practice for life. We all got the message.

Lines 788-789:” people without a practice certificate or veterinary training sell drugs”; as mentioned previously, in many countries, if you have a practice permit, you are a veterinarian. It does not seem to be necessarily the case in Vietnam, based on the current wording. It would be important to make sure that readers understand the set up in Vietnam.

Lines 983-986: these references appear to be incomplete. I would expect to see a web link allowing readers to gain access to the documents, with the understanding that it may be only available in Vietnamese.

Lines 1007-1015, 1023, 1024, 1039-1041, 1061-1062, 1078-1080, 1085-1087: incomplete references