

- **Title and abstract**

- Does the title clearly reflect the content of the article? Yes, No (please explain), I don't know
- Does the abstract present the main findings of the study? Yes, No (please explain), I don't know

- **Introduction**

- Are the research questions/hypotheses/predictions clearly presented? Yes, No (please explain), I don't know
- Does the introduction build on relevant research in the field? Yes, No (please explain), I don't know

- **Materials and methods**

- Are the methods and analyses sufficiently detailed to allow replication by other researchers? Yes, No (please explain), I don't know
 - Not applicable
- Are the methods and statistical analyses appropriate and well described? Yes, No (please explain), I don't know

- **Results**

- In the case of negative results, is there a statistical power analysis (or an adequate Bayesian analysis or equivalence testing)? Yes, No (please explain), I don't know
 - Not applicable
- Are the results described and interpreted correctly? Yes, No (please explain), I don't know
 - Not applicable

- **Discussion**

- Have the authors appropriately emphasized the strengths and limitations of their study/theory/methods/argument? Yes, No (please explain), I don't know
- Are the conclusions adequately supported by the results (without overstating the implications of the findings)? Yes, No (please explain), I don't know

General comments:

This is a well-written and detailed article which helps to make sense of the complex value chain for veterinary medicines in Vietnam. I think the article makes an important contribution and would be of great use to actors seeking to better understand implementation of AMU-related regulation, or to conduct interventions in relation to AMU in the Vietnamese animal health sector.

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

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.”

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>

Line 97: Suggest rather “...attempt to reduce antibiotic use” or “...bring about reductions in 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.

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**

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.

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 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>

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?

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?

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.

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

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

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

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

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