

RECOMMENDER

Dear Francois Meurens,

We are thankful for your valuable revision of our paper. We have addressed all your comments, and you can find our answer below in blue. All the lines references correspond to the lines in the preprint and we have also submitted word version with track change. We have also addressed all the comments of the reviewers in the same way. We believe that it will clarify our paper and bring new interesting insights.

We hope that our corrections will suit you, if not, we will be happy to revise our version again.

Best regards,

Introduction

-L104: s at the end of system is not needed.

The s at system has been removed.

Material and Methods

-L119: Please provide examples of stakeholders or tell where the different stakeholders are presented.

Thank you for this remark, the different stakeholders are presented in Table 1. We have added the reference to the text. We have also moved the section “description of the participants” that presents the different stakeholders included in our survey, initially in the result section to the method section under “data collection” lines 166-167.

-L174: Please add country for the provider.

We have added, United States as the country for the provider.

Results

-In table 1: Sex or gender? We have decided to keep gender.

-L382: A foreign research center is not a person. Thus, it should be formulated differently.

The sentence has been reformulated in the text. Please, see line 415: “A researcher working in a foreign research center”

-L397: What is the size of these companies? We don’t have the precise size of the company for all the interviews. However, we were able to determine if they were operating at the provincial, national or supra-national level. We have specified this information in the text lines 429-430: “In our 429 study, companies were operating at provincial, national or supra-national levels”.

-L429: Please re-specify the animal species in these farms.

The animal species in these farms are chickens, so we have added this precision in the text line 468.

-L593: The link with frequent changes in weather is not clear. Please provide more details.

In Vietnam, the forecast is changing rapidly. In some seasons, it is raining heavily, or it is humid which according to the participants leads to chicken illness. We have clarified this statement in the text lines 630-632: “This was exacerbated by the tropical weather in Vietnam characterized by high temperature, humidity and frequent changes in forecast that increase the infectious pressure”.

Discussion

-L686: What is the current evolution regarding farm size? Please provide more details.

The evolution of the farm size in Vietnam has been mentioned in the introduction lines 89-91. Small scale farms still represent the most common production system. But, the tendency is actually changing as we observe an increase of large farms. We have added this information

lines 735-737“Indeed, small-scale 735 production systems still predominate in Vietnam, but in recent years the number of large farms 736 has increased (Bâtie et al. 2022; GSOV 2016)”

-L729: Quite old... Can we assume the situation is similar now? This is an interesting comment as the situation might be a bit different now. However, we have assumed that because human behavior and regulations is a long process, our results might not be significantly different if the study was conducted now. We have specified that lines 779-782 “We can however assume that at the time of publication, the results will not be significantly different because as the participants pointed out, human behaviors and policies or regulations are not easy to change in the short term”.

-L824: But biosecurity can be more challenging in small farms as stated later. This element could be mentioned here too.

We have added some information regarding biosecurity and small-scale farms lines 874-876 “On the other hand, poor biosecurity in small-scale farms in Vietnam can also be challenging with outdoor systems and low farmers technicity (Thi Dien et al. 2023).”

References

-There is variation between references regarding style (see for instance L990). Please harmonize. Also, some acronyms should be defined, see GSOV.

We have harmonized the references and defined GSOV.

Table and Figures

-Good

REVIEWER 1

Dear Reviewer,

Thank you very much for your valuable comments on our paper. We have answered all your comments/questions and brought the necessary modifications to our manuscript. You will find the details of our answer written in blue below. All the lines references correspond to the lines in the preprint. We have also submitted a Word version of the document with Track changes. If our answers are not clear enough, or if you think that we must revise a second time our paper we will be happy to send you a second version.

Best regards,

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

Thank you for notifying us of this mistake. We have made the necessary changes to all the manuscript including in the figures.

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.

You are right and we have rephrased this sentence lines 87-89, using past tense: “The circular also included a roadmap of implementation, that started in 2020 for big-scale farms, 2022 for medium-scale farms, 2023 for small-scale farms, and will be implemented in 2025 for household farms”

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.

We have, as you suggested, removed the second “map” from this 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 WOA.

We have modified the legend of the figures and tables to help the readers to understand them without the main text. For figure 1, we have removed the indication regarding the arrow as it is already written in the legend of the figure. We will be happy to put it back if you think it is useful.

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

We have modified the figure to include also company veterinarian (see your other comments bellow).

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.

We have included these definitions where they were first mentioned lines 310-314: “Technical and social capital are two concepts used in sociology as usable resources, skills, abilities and power by individuals 311 (Brock, Kvasny, and Hales 2010). In particular, social capital refers to the set of resources that an individual can mobilize related to he/she permanent more or less institutionalized relationship network (Bourdieu 1980)”.

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.

We have moved this information in the method section in Data collection line 192. We hope that this will fit the expectations of the editor.

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.

In this sentence, we are referring to farmers (users). To be clearer we have modified the sentence lines 240-242: “level-1 agencies are directly connected to drug companies, veterinarians and farmers and sometimes provide level-2 agencies, whereas level-2 agencies target mostly small-scale farmers)”

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.).

Thank you for raising this point. We have made a change in the terminology by distinguishing company veterinarians from company technicians and included the definition in the result section lines 256-259: “Company veterinarians or technicians were stakeholders employed by a company (pharmaceutical, feed, alternative feed, or integrator) with a university degree in veterinary medicine or college degree in a technique (veterinary technician, feed technician, ...)”

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. Indeed, they are providing farmers with advice if they are their clients. We have removed ‘free’ from the sentence.

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

Thank you for this comment. Indeed, we are referring to the agencies in this sentence. We have thus replaced “they” by “these agencies”.

Figure 3: WOAHA = 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.

We have deleted this information in the legend of Figure 3. For figure 4, we have added WOA and agencies definitions as well as the terminology used (see your previous comment on figures).

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

We have corrected this mistake.

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

One of the limitations of Sub-DAHLP to control the veterinary drug shops is human resources. They are not enough to be able to control all the shops. We have added this point in the revised manuscript lines 380-382: “However, participants suggested that their mission had limitations as they are too few to control all the shops”.

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.

In Vietnam and from our interviews, many stakeholders are called veterinarians by other stakeholders or themselves without holding a doctorate in veterinary medicine. They sometimes hold a college or intermediate degree in veterinary medicine (2 to 3 years of training) or are practicing without a degree but with experiences in the field. This is the case for the stakeholders that also run agencies but also for those that the participants call “communal veterinarians” knowing that this is a word translated like that by the Vietnamese researchers.

To stay true to what participants called these stakeholders with have kept “private veterinarian” and “communal veterinarian” and added their definition according to the content of our interviews in the result section lines 249-251 “Private veterinarians in Vietnam are stakeholders called veterinarians by other participants or themselves, with a university, college degree, or without any degree but with some experiences in veterinary medicine” and lines 277-281 for communal veterinarian: “In Vietnam, communal veterinarians are stakeholders mandated by the government and are responsible for the sanitary situation, disease control and vaccination campaign. Of the two communal veterinarians interviewed, one did not hold a university or college degree in veterinary medicine. They both had a side-job: private veterinarian or working in another field”. We hope that these modifications will bring enough clarity to this important point.

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....

In the regulations on mandatory prescriptions, stakeholders allowed to prescribe drugs including antibiotics are those holding a doctorate in veterinary medicine or a college degree (technicians) in veterinary medicine. We have modified the sentence by including veterinarians and veterinary technicians' line 431.

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

We have changed the sentence following your proposition line 437.

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.

Thank you very much for this comment. They are involved in the sense that they are being consulted. We have clarified this sentence by changing the verb lines 467 "consulted".

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

In this sentence "they" should be replaced by "these stakeholders". As it is not clear, we have made the changes.

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

Speakers are community loudspeakers. We have added this information line 551.

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

In this sentence, we are speaking about the central level that includes the government but also some companies that are operating nationally. We have added "(private, public, and foreign partners)" at the sentence for a better understanding line 554.

Line 520: should be "No technical...."

We have corrected this mistake.

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

In this sentence, producers are referring to feed producers. We have added "feed" to the manuscript line 562.

Line 601: "study districts" should be "studied districts" or districts under study

We have modified this sentence by "studied district".

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.

In the discussion section we have added a sentence lines 858-859 related to this issue: "This is a worrying situation as counterfeit or sub-standards antibiotics contribute to the emergence of ABR (Kelesidis & Falagas, 2015)."

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....")

We have added the missing word "capture" to this sentence line 786.

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”.

We have changed “identified” by “elaborated” line 811.

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.

It is right that this doesn’t happen in all countries but it still quite common practice in Vietnam. We have added “Vietnam” to avoid any confusion line 833.

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.

We have added “in Vietnam” line 836 to this sentence and we hope that this, together with our previous answers and modifications within the text, will bring some clarification. If you feel that it is still not clear enough, we will revise it in a second version.

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

Thank you very much for revising our reference and we apologize for our mistakes. All URL have been added to the incomplete references. When the access was only available in Vietnamese we have indicated (In Vietnamese).

REVIEWER 2

Dear Rebecca Hibbard,

Thank you very much for revising our paper. We have addressed all your comments carefully and you can find our answer for each of them in blue below. All the lines references correspond to the lines in the second preprint version. We have also submitted a Word version with Track change. We hope that our answers and the subsequent modifications of our manuscript will suit you. Otherwise, we will be happy to discuss it and to send a revised version of our manuscript if needed.

Best regards,

General comments:

- The article is quite dense, though given the complexity of the subject material I do not think this could be avoided. It may assist the reader, however, to include a short sentence at the start of the results indicating the structure of the results to follow (e.g. “The results are presented in three parts: 1) Structural position of the stakeholders, 2) Technical and social capital of stakeholders, and 3) Factors influencing the implementation of new regulations”), and adding numbering to these sections (if the journal requirements allow it). This matches the three-pronged approach of the SMA described in the material and methods, but it would help to indicate explicitly in the results that they are presented in this manner.

Thank you very much for this interesting comment. We have, as you recommend, added the suggested sentence at the beginning of the result section and numbered the three sub-sections. However, this will need to match the journal requirements and be validated.

- I would suggest including a paragraph on researcher reflexivity (the characteristics of the researcher(s) and how this may have influenced the results and their interpretation) for transparency. For example, it would be useful to know the experience of the researchers in conducting interviews/workshops or with qualitative data analysis, or how their previous knowledge/experience of Vietnam or other contexts may have influenced interpretation. It may be useful to review the Standards for Reporting Qualitative Research:
 - o O'Brien, B.C., Harris, I.B., Beckman, T.J., Reed, D.A., Cook, D.A., 2014. Standards for Reporting Qualitative Research: A Synthesis of Recommendations. *Academic Medicine* 89, 1245. <https://doi.org/10.1097/ACM.0000000000000388>

Thank you for this comment. To address this, we have added some information about the research team in the methodology section lines 140-144 indicated their background, research experiences and their knowledge of the Vietnamese context: “Data collection was conducted by four researchers from the Vietnam National University of Agriculture (VNUA) having either a background in sociology or in veterinary medicine, and one researcher from Cirad with a background in veterinary medicine. All the researchers were experienced in participatory epidemiology and/or in conducting qualitative studies and were familiar with the Vietnamese veterinary and animal production context”

In the discussion, lines 773-775, we reflected on how the identification of stakeholders was also driven by the knowledge and experience of the Vietnamese context of the researchers: “The identification of stakeholders was also driven by the knowledge and experience of the Vietnamese context of the authors”.

To follow the recommendations of (O'Brien and all.), we have also included some further details on how the participants were recruited and on the iteration in the method section lines 151-152: “The participants were invited based on the list of contacts of one researcher of the team” and in the

discussion section lines 748-757: "Our process was iterative as the data collection and data analysis were deepened until all categories of stakeholders have been identified, their positions and relationships mapped and their motivations and barriers explored (Varvasovszky & Brugha, 2000)."

- If it is possible, it would be interesting to know in the results section who the perspectives belong to. For example, many sentences are structured beginning with something similar to "According to many respondents" (e.g. lines 433-435), or "Others believed that the majority of respondents" (line 491) – it would be of interest for the interpretation of the results to know what type of stakeholder expressed this opinion.

Regarding lines 433-435, we have rephrased the sentence to be more explicit on the type of respondent, now at the lines 471-473: "According to government authorities, private national and local stakeholders, and researchers many respondents, farmers lacked knowledge of regulations and prudent ABU practices". Regarding the line 491, this sentence have been rephrased to be more explicit now lines 533-535: "Except for farmers, all other stakeholder categories perceived users, national and local private stakeholders and government authorities operating at different levels as not having enough knowledge on ABU and ABR."

- As a suggestion, inclusion of additional verbatims in the results would help support the interpretation of the results provided by the researchers.

We do agree that adding verbatims would help to support our findings. But we also had to consider that our paper is already long. So, we have added only three verbatims lines 462-464, lines 637-638 and lines 671-672.

Lines 58-59: I have a slight issue with the grandeur of this first sentence, which implies a direct link between AMU reduction and prevention of unnecessary deaths, but references only the O'Neil report and not any scientific papers. Yes, changing AMU practices is one of the main pillars in approaches to try to minimise the risk of AMR development, but I think, particularly if referencing only policy documents, it would be more nuanced to indicate that AMU reduction is a policy objective implemented in response to AMR. E.g. Something along the lines of: "The rise in antimicrobial resistance threatens to cause a significant number of unnecessary deaths. To address this growing threat, a number of policy objectives in recent years have targeted AMU reduction in the human, animal and environmental sectors to attempt to address this issue."

Thank you for raising this point. We have thus modified the sentence to be more nuanced lines 58-62: "The rise in antimicrobial resistance (AMR) threatens to cause a significant number of unnecessary deaths (O'Neill 2016; Naghavi et al. 2024). To address this growing threat, policies have targeted antibiotic usage (ABU) reduction in the human, animal and environmental sectors (Chua et al. 2021). Indeed, AMR is a complex issue that must be addressed from a One Health perspective (McEwen and Collignon 2018)".

Lines 77-78: It would be nice to have some additional references for the claim "Antimicrobial growth promoters, which were widely used by Vietnamese farmers", as I fear the claim of widespread country-wide use for growth promotion is too broad to be made on the basis of one article alone. Given the quantity of literature on AMU in Vietnam that has been published in recent years there should be other material that could support this claim (and you even have some cited in your discussion in lines 773-775). Also for example (but not limited to):

- Cuong, N.V., Kiet, B.T., Hien, V.B., Truong, B.D., Phu, D.H., Thwaites, G., Choisy, M., Carrique-Mas, J.J., 2021. Antimicrobial use through consumption of medicated feeds in chicken flocks in the Mekong Delta of Vietnam: A three-year study before a ban on antimicrobial growth promoters. PLoS ONE 16, e0250082. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0250082>

Thank you for addressing this point. Indeed, the usage of antibiotics as growth promoters have been

reported in Vietnam prior the ban of it in 2018. We have added the reference suggested line 79.

Line 97: Suggest rather "...attempt to reduce antibiotic use" or "...bring about reductions in antibiotic use". We have modified this sentence in the revised version lines 97-98: "Regulations are one of the most common solutions developed to attempt to reduce antibiotic use".

Lines 472-479: It seems to me a bit contradictory to suggest "The vast majority of value chain stakeholders were positive about the new regulations" and also "they all stated that they would be difficult to implement and lacked confidence in their short-term implementation." My interpretation of how you have presented the results is that to the extent stakeholders are positive about the regulations, this is for their implementation in the longer-term. You could perhaps consider rephrasing to resolve this. In this paragraph, we wanted to explain that all respondents think that adopting new regulations to reduce the usage of antibiotics was a good thing, it is something that must be done. However, they are not confident regarding their short-term implementation for various reasons as detailed in the paper. We have modified this sentence lines 508-509 by: "The vast majority of value chain stakeholders were positive in favor of the new regulations, but they were not confident in their short-term implementation." and we hope that it is clearer now.

Lines 493-496: Consider prefacing this sentence with "Stakeholders reported/believed/expressed that" as otherwise it appears to be a statement of fact,

rather than someone's opinion. In particular, as this sentence is about farmers' response to resistance, it would be interesting to know if this opinion was expressed by the farmers themselves, or if it is a judgement made by other stakeholders of farmers' behaviours. Similar comment for **Line 555-556** beginning "They had poor farming management practices...", and **Lines 590-591**

We have added this precision at the beginning of each sentence that you have suggested. Regarding lines 493-496, farmers also expressed this opinion. So, we have clearly mentioned the farmers in sentence 529: "Stakeholders, including farmers".

Regarding Lines 555-556, we have added the practice of farmers described by themselves, now lines 594-599: "This practice was confirmed family commercial farmer that explained not always following the recommendations of the drug sellers or the district or province veterinarians because they relied more on their own experience or other farmer's experience but also to treat the animals faster. However, the household farmer reported calling the veterinarians and the family commercial farmers going or calling the veterinarian for unknown disease."

Regarding Lines 590-591: It is mostly companies and agencies that raised the poor biosecurity measure of farmers. The sentence is now lines 628-629 "Companies and agencies expressed that small-scale farm lacked adequate biosecurity measures ..."

Lines 700-706: This description of the methodology used (stakeholder mapping and analysis) I would have expected to find rather in the material and methods section.

The description of the methodology has been moved in the methods section lines 128-134.

Lines 712-717: There is research suggesting a similar quality of evidence can be garnered from remote interviews to those conducted in-person. It is just a suggestion, but you could consider include a reference in relation to this, for example one of:

- Namey, E., Guest, G., O'Regan, A., Godwin, C.L., Taylor, J., Martinez, A., 2020. How Does Mode of Qualitative Data Collection Affect Data and Cost? Findings from a Quasi-experimental Study. *Field Methods* 32, 58–74. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1525822X19886839>
- Krouwel, M., Jolly, K., Greenfield, S., 2019. Comparing Skype (video calling) and in-person qualitative interview modes in a study of people with irritable bowel syndrome – an exploratory comparative analysis. *BMC Medical Research Methodology* 19, 219. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12874-019-0867-9>

This is an interesting point as we thought about the data quality of our interviews. Following Covid, other papers have reflected about the difference between in person and online interviews and as the

suggested paper didn't find a lot of difference in the data collection. To me, the difficulties were in understanding the context (without seeing the drug stores or the farms) but also without smooth discussions with the team that could have happened during lunchtime or transportation for example. These elements have brought some difficulties in the analysis. We have modified this part as follows lines 758-765: "However, we recognize that our study has some limitations. To begin, almost all of the interviews were conducted online due to the health crisis. This format present a great interest and no significant difference in thematic content (length of the interviews, number of words, number of codes generated) with in-person interviews have been shown(Krouwel et al., 2019; Namey et al., 2020). However, we have identified several biases that could have hampered our study. Direct observations are reduced, and information is lost (lack of informal discussions, misunderstandings, longer time to build trust, and more complicated debriefing with the teams)"

Lines 771-775: The phrase "respondents still reported mixing AB with feed on the farm" implies to me oral administration, but not necessarily for growth promotion. Yet you imply this means growth promotion in the subsequent sentence when saying this finding contradicted studies which found evidence of growth promotion. Did participants specifically report antibiotic use for growth promotion? Or prophylactic use?

Thank you very much for raising this. I have checked carefully the transcripts and indeed, respondents didn't mention that farmers or themselves were mixing AB in feed for growth promotion but rather for prophylactic use. We have corrected this mistake and modified this paragraph lines 822-826 by "Indeed, respondents stressed that the use of antibiotics for preventive purposes, by mixing antibiotics themselves with feed, is deeply rooted in the practices of farmers and drug sellers. In addition, these practices are difficult to control due to the large number of small-scale farmers in the country".

Lines 840-845: The statement "Small scale and medium scale farms in Vietnam have poor biosecurity resulting in high disease incidences." needs to be supported. Did the respondents express this opinion (and in which case, which type of respondents?) or is this based on findings from the literature?

This statement refers to the results in the "Technical and financial barriers to the implementation of regulations at local level" section. It can also be found in the literature and we have added a reference lines 874-876: "On the other hand, poor biosecurity in small-scale farms in Vietnam can also be challenging with outdoor systems and low farmers technicity (Thi Dien et al. 2023)".

Some minor suggestions for English/rephrasing/clarity:

The word “antibiotics” and the acronym “AB” are used interchangeably throughout the paper. My preference would be to use “antibiotics” as I do not think the word is long enough to merit an acronym, but I do not think it matters as long as you are consistent with the usage of either one or the other.

We have replaced all the acronyms AB but antibiotics to be more consistent within the text.

For the title, I believe this should be “...antimicrobial resistance policy implementation in Vietnam...” or “...implementation of antimicrobial resistance policies in Vietnam...”

We have modified the title by “Understanding the implementation of antimicrobial resistance policies in Vietnam: a multilayer analysis of the veterinary drug value chain”

Line 106: I would remove the word “reluctances” from this sentence

We have removed it from the sentence.

Line 253: For clarity, please indicate who is meant by “they” and “them” in this sentence

“They” corresponds to DAH and “them” to Sub-DAHLP. We have modified the sentence lines 273-274

Line 705: Suggest replacing “In fine” with “In detail” (or similar)

We have modified it accordingly.

Lines 732-733: Suggest replacing “small farmers” with “small-scale farmers”

We have modified it accordingly.