To: The editors of the British Medical Journal

Dear Sir, Madam,

Re: Revised version of our manuscript Manuscript ID BMJ.2017.039717 entitled "Trade as central to achieving the Sustainable Development Goals: a case-study of antimicrobial resistance (AMR)"

We would like to thank the editors, as well as two reviewers for the insightful guidance and comments on the draft submitted and feel that these have much improved this revised version here attached.

Our revisions focused on the four main points requested by the editors and we address these here in turn.

Comment 1. McCoy's review asked that you remove the SDG reference, and obviously this is the main point of the article. Can you make the link between this analysis of AMR and the SDGs more explicit early on?

We thank the editors for this suggestion. We have included a stronger and clearer rationale relating trade and AMR to the SDGs and have referenced specific SDGs throughout the paper to highlight how trade and AMR are key to achieving sustainable development, and how they intersect with the SDGs. We hope this greater referencing throughout provides a clearer framework of why and how the SDGs are connected to trade and AMR, and why this is worth investigating.

Comment 2: The framework that you develop is not applied in the conclusion, can you reframe the discussion around that?

We thank the editors and reviewer 1 for this comment and have included a more explicit reference to the framework, as well as visualised it in Figure 1 and 2. We now structure discussion and conclusion around these different categories.

Comment 3. The analysis of the complexity of tackling AMR is evident, and you cite examples of this being done successfully. Can you expand on the role of think-tanks and civil society in those successes?

We thank the editors for the comment. We have restructured the discussion into different sections including one which highlights the need for think tanks and civil society involvement. We illustrate this through examples from Sweden and Pakistan and discuss why their involvement is so critical. This is reiterated in the conclusion. Indeed in terms of lessons for other sectors we draw this out as particularly relevant – in response to editor comment 4: to highlight lessons learnt.

Moreover, we have addressed the specific comments from reviewer 2 as detailed in the table attached. In the overall restructuring we have taken note of the comments by reviewer 1 and feel these are now addressed, including through our responses to editors' comment as detailed here above.
We are confident this revised and much improved version will be of interest to the BMJ readership and we are very much looking forward to the debate we hope to stimulate through this paper. Thank you again for consideration and interest in this piece.

Please do not hesitate to contact us with further queries and questions.

Yours, sincerely,

Johanna Hanefeld, PhD