Reviewer Comments	Responses
Reviewer 1	
I would not rate it as having a high importance for publication, as it could be made available on the WPRO website, for instance.	We would like to respectfully disagree with the reviewer on this count as we believe that this tool is a vital policy innovation which will enable a number of low- and middle-income countries to be able to address the issues related to AMR in clinically significant pathogens. This tool represents a major improvement over existing tools in that it allows for evaluation of program implementation in incremental phases. Given that this represents an innovation and improvement over the existing tools, the process of peer review would augment the acceptance and credibility of the tool, enabling wider dissemination. This would encourage member states to not only adopt this tool for undertaking assessment of the AMR surveillance program, but it would also incite their interest in replicating this process across other health domains. Further, we would like to state that the application of the tool, in the form of situation analysis of the AMR surveillance in (COUNTRY) is also being published in this issue of the BMJ and this manuscript will provide context and continuity to the narrative. We welcome the observation of the reviewer and will endeavor to publish the tool and/or the published article through the WHO regional websites, or other forums as appropriate.
Reviewer 2	
The proposed situation analysis tool is worth implementing.	We appreciate the reviewer's acknowledgement of the importance of the tool and its relevance in applying this in the context of LMICs.
However, the authors have not shared in detail any information about the limitations of this tool.	A section on the strengths and limitations of the SEAR tool has been incorporated in the article.
Incorporation of the data from the pilot testing is recommended?	We appreciate the reviewer's observation about the importance of describing the pilot data. The tool has been piloted for situation analysis in Indonesia, Timor Leste and conducted in 5 additional countries of the region (Myanmar, Thailand, Sri Lanka, Nepal, Bhutan and Maldives, Bangladesh). The tool was refined using the initial experience of piloting it and further deployed for large-scale situation analyses. The data related to the deployment of the tool in Indonesia are being published as a separate situation analysis paper in the same issue of the BMJ.
What were the difficulties and the challenges they have come across during	Details of the challenges in implementing the tool will be covered in the accompanying paper discussing its implementation in Indonesia.

pilot testing?	
How well did the proposed tool fare in performance when compared to the previous 2 tools?	The primary objective of the manuscript was to describe the process of development of the tool. The current tool represents an improvement over the existing tools by providing an assessment of the levels of implementation of program. However, there is a section on the comparative strengths of the current tool over the existing ones. An accompanying paper describing the situation analysis of AMR situation in Indonesia, conducted using this tool, is also being published in the same issue, and has dealt with the matter at greater length.
In page 3, line 12 appears to be a repetition of the sentence from the previous paragraph. Also, on page 5, line 42, font size is different from the rest of the manuscript.	Cannot understand what these comments refer to. Would need the submission PDF to address these comments. But may say: We appreciate the reviewer's close reading of the manuscript and inputs on this matter and believe that these issues will be addressed in course of the process of copy editing prior to publication.
Editorial Comments	
1 Context about AMR and the need for monitoring 2 Brief methods 3 Critical analysis of the strengths and weaknesses of the current monitoring approaches. 4 Outline of the role of tools to support monitoring. 5 Analysis of the different tools and their strengths and weaknesses (i.e. all the others that aren't the SEARO tool). 6 Brief description of the SEARO tool and what problems it solves 7 Recommendations on how monitoring can be improved in the region including recommendations about the tools.	The following sections have been created in line with the editorial recommendations: 1. Context about AMR and the need for monitoring → Background: Monitoring the Emergence of Antimicrobial Resistance 2. Brief methods → Developing the SEARO Tool: Methods 3. Critical analysis of the strengths and weaknesses of the current monitoring approaches →Critical Appraisal: Strengths and Weaknesses of Existing Tools and Approaches 4. Outline of the role of tools to support monitoring. → Tools to Support Antimicrobial Resistance Surveillance 5. Analysis of the different tools and their strengths and weaknesses (i.e. all the others that aren't the SEARO tool). → Critical Appraisal: Strengths and Weaknesses of the Existing Tools and Approaches 6. Brief description of the SEARO tool → The Situation Analysis Process and Definitions 7. What problems the SEARO tool solves → The SEARO Tool: Strengths, Limitations and Recommendations 8. Recommendations on how monitoring can be

	improved in the region including recommendations about the tools. → The SEARO Tool: Strengths, Limitations and Recommendations