STROBE Statement—Checklist of items that should be included in reports of ***cross-sectional studies***.
Manuscript Title: Antibiotic Use and Stewardship Gaps Among Fulani Women Dairy Vendors in Informal Dairy Markets, Sabon-gari and Zaria, Nigeria: A One Health Perspective
Journal: Bulletin of the World Health Organization
Corresponding author: Muhammad Muhsin Fathuddin
Date: April 2026

	Item No	Recommendation	Where reported	✅ / ❌
Title and abstract	1	(*a*) Indicate the study's design with a commonly used term in the title or the abstract	Abstract — "cross-sectional survey" stated, p.4	✅
		(*b*) Provide in the abstract an informative and balanced summary of what was done and what was found	Abstract — Methods, Findings, Conclusion, p.4	✅
Introduction				
Background/rationale	2	Explain the scientific background and rationale for the investigation being reported	Introduction, paragraphs 1–3, p.5-6	✅
Objectives	3	State specific objectives, including any prespecified hypotheses	Introduction, final paragraph: "This study examines AMU practices..." p.7	✅
Methods				
Study design	4	Present key elements of study design early in the paper	Methods — "Data collection": cross-sectional survey, p. 7	
Setting	5	Describe the setting, locations, and relevant dates, including periods of recruitment, exposure, follow-up, and data collection	Methods — Sabon Gari and Zaria markets, Kaduna State, p.7	✅
Participants	6	(*a*) Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants	Methods — 77 itinerant Fulani women; convenience sampling; exclusion of packaged-product vendors stated, p.7	✅
Variables	7	Clearly define all outcomes, exposures, predictors, potential confounders, and effect modifiers. Give diagnostic criteria, if applicable	Methods — "Data collection": five questionnaire sections defined (GI, Knowledge, Attitudes, Practices, Antibiotic use), p.7-8	✅
Data sources/ measurement	8*	For each variable of interest, give sources of data and details of methods of assessment (measurement). Describe comparability of assessment methods if there is more than one group	Methods — structured questionnaire, Python, English/Hausa/Fulfulde, p.7	✅
Bias	9	Describe any efforts to address potential sources of bias	Methods — "Data analysis: neutral prompting, anonymous coding sentence], p.8-9	✅
Study size	10	Explain how the study size was	Methods — n=77; consistent with	

		arrived at	comparable KAP studies cited, p.7	
Quantitative variables	11	Explain how quantitative variables were handled in the analyses. If applicable, describe which groupings were chosen and why	Methods — "KAP scoring and categorisation": dichotomisation, Likert means, percentage scoring — most detailed of three manuscripts, p.9	✅
Statistical methods	12	(*a*) Describe all statistical methods, including those used to control for confounding	Methods — Data management/analysis: descriptive statistics, frequencies, percentages; chi-square and Fisher's exact tests described; $p<0.05$ threshold stated; Python (SciPy) used, p. 9	✅
		(*b*) Describe any methods used to examine subgroups and interactions	Methods — cross-tabulations described, p.10	✅
		(*c*) Explain how missing data were addressed	Methods — No-response categories were retained in all analyses and reported separately in supplementary tables S1-S5, p.9	✅
		(*d*) If applicable, describe analytical methods taking account of sampling strategy	Methods — convenience sampling was employed, p.7	✅
		(*e*) Describe any sensitivity analyses	Not applicable	✅
Results				
Participants	13*	(a) Report numbers of individuals at each stage of study—eg numbers potentially eligible, examined for eligibility, confirmed eligible, included in the study, completing follow-up, and analysed	Results — "General information": 77 completed, p.10-13	✅
		(b) Give reasons for non-participation at each stage	Results — 77 consented to participate and completed the survey; no questionnaires were excluded from analysis, p.10	✅
		(c) Consider use of a flow diagram	Not applicable	
Descriptive data	14*	(a) Give characteristics of study participants (eg demographic, clinical, social) and information on exposures and potential confounders	Results — "General information": product types, education, training, milk sources, p.10-11	✅
		(b) Indicate number of participants with missing data for each variable of interest	Results — Missing responses were minimal and are reported as no response categories in supplementary tables (S1–S5), p.10	✅
Outcome data	15*	Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures	Results — Table 1: KAP categories; 0%/100%/71.4%, p.26	
Main results	16	(*a*) Give unadjusted estimates and, if applicable, confounder-adjusted estimates and their precision (eg, 95% confidence interval). Make	Results — all proportions, Likert means, composite scores, p.11-12	✅

		clear which confounders were adjusted for and why they were included		
		(*b*) Report category boundaries when continuous variables were categorized	Methods — "KAP scoring": good ≥80%, moderate 50–79%, poor <50% defined, p.9-10	✅
		(*c*) If relevant, consider translating estimates of relative risk into absolute risk for a meaningful time period	Not applicable	N/A
Other analyses	17	Report other analyses done—eg analyses of subgroups and interactions, and sensitivity analyses	Results — Chi-square analyses of education level and training received against KAP outcome categories; all non-significant (p>0.05) reported, p. 13	✅
Discussion				
Key results	18	Summarise key results with reference to study objectives	Discussion — first paragraph: 97.4% poor knowledge, 100% permissive, 71.4% poor practices, p.13	✅
Limitations	19	Discuss limitations of the study, taking into account sources of potential bias or imprecision. Discuss both direction and magnitude of any potential bias	Limitations paragraph present in manuscript, p.15	✅
Interpretation	20	Give a cautious overall interpretation of results considering objectives, limitations, multiplicity of analyses, results from similar studies, and other relevant evidence	Discussion — all sub-sections, p13-15	✅
Generalisability	21	Discuss the generalisability (external validity) of the study results, p.15	Limitations — convenience sampling restricts generalisability stated	✅
Other information				
Funding	22	Give the source of funding and the role of the funders for the present study and, if applicable, for the original study on which the present article is based	Title page — No external funding, p.2	✅

*Give information separately for exposed and unexposed groups.

Note: An Explanation and Elaboration article discusses each checklist item and gives methodological background and published examples of transparent reporting. The STROBE checklist is best used in conjunction with this article (freely available on the Web sites of PLoS Medicine at http://www.plosmedicine.org/, Annals of Internal Medicine at http://www.annals.org/, and Epidemiology at http://www.epidem.com/). Information on the STROBE Initiative is available at www.strobe-statement.org.