

STROBE Statement—Checklist of items that should be included in reports of *cross-sectional studies*.

Manuscript Title: Antimicrobial Residues and Milk-Handling Practices among Fulani Women Vendors in Informal Dairy Markets, Northern Nigeria: A Cross-Sectional Survey

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 in Methods heading, p.4	✓
		(b) Provide in the abstract an informative and balanced summary of what was done and what was found	Abstract — Objective, Methods, Findings, Conclusion all present, p.4	✓
Introduction				
Background/rationale	2	Explain the scientific background and rationale for the investigation being reported	Introduction, paragraphs 1–3, p.6	✓
Objectives	3	State-specific objectives, including any prespecified hypotheses	Introduction, final paragraph, p.7	✓
Methods				
Study design	4	Present key elements of the study design early in the paper	Methods — "Study Design and Sampling": cross-sectional study, p.8	
Setting	5	Describe the setting, locations, and relevant dates, including periods of recruitment, exposure, follow-up, and data collection	Methods — "Study Setting": Sabon Gari and Zaria LGAs, Kaduna State, Nigeria, described, p.8	✓
Participants	6	(a) Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants	Methods — "Study Design and Sampling": Fulani women vendors, convenience sampling, 77 enrolled, p.8	✓
Variables	7	Clearly define all outcomes, exposures, predictors, potential confounders, and effect modifiers. Give diagnostic criteria, if applicable	Methods — "Questionnaire Development": four domains defined (general info, knowledge, attitudes, practices), p.9	✓
Data sources/ measurement	8*	For each variable of interest, give sources of data and details of methods of assessment (measurement). Describe the comparability of assessment methods if there is more than one group	Methods — "Data Collection": face-to-face interview, Hausa/Fulfulde/English, p.8	✓
Bias	9	Describe any efforts to address potential sources of bias	Methods — acknowledging potential recall/social desirability bias and how it was minimised (neutral prompts, anonymous coding), p.9	✓
Study size	10	Explain how the study size was arrived	Methods — "Study Design and	✓

		at	Sampling": n=77 stated as consistent with comparable KAP studies, p.8	
Quantitative variables	11	Explain how quantitative variables were handled in the analyses. If applicable, describe which groupings were chosen and why	Methods — "Data Management and Analysis": Likert means, composite scoring described, p.9	✓
Statistical methods	12	(a) Describe all statistical methods, including those used to control for confounding	Methods — "Data Management and Analysis": Python descriptive statistics, frequencies, percentages, p.10	✓
		(b) Describe any methods used to examine subgroups and interactions	N/A — no subgroup analysis conducted	N/A
		(c) Explain how missing data were addressed	Methods — Items with missing or unclear responses were retained as a separate 'no response' category and reported accordingly, p.9	✓
		(d) If applicable, describe analytical methods taking account of the sampling strategy	Methods — convenience sampling acknowledged, p.8	✓
		(e) Describe any sensitivity analyses	N/A — not applicable to descriptive KAP study	✓
Results				
Participants	13*	(a) Report numbers of individuals at each stage of study—e.g., numbers potentially eligible, examined for eligibility, confirmed eligible, included in the study, completing follow-up, and analysed	Results — 77 respondents; all completed questionnaires stated, p.10	✓
		(b) Give reasons for non-participation at each stage	Result — All 77 vendors approached consented to participate; no questionnaires were excluded, p.10	✓
		(c) Consider the use of a flow diagram	Not required for a simple cross-sectional KAP study with no exclusions	N/A
Descriptive data	14*	(a) Give characteristics of study participants (e.g., demographic, clinical, social) and information on exposures and potential confounders	Results — Sociodemographic and Production Characteristics": herd ownership, yield, storage described, p.10	✓
		(b) Indicate the number of participants with missing data for each variable of interest	Results — Missing responses were minimal and are represented as 'no response' categories in Figures 2–4, p.10	✓
Outcome data	15*	Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures	Results — composite KAP scores (19/11/23/18) reported with frequencies, p.11-12	✓
Main results	16	(a) Give unadjusted estimates and, if	Results — descriptive proportions	✓

		applicable, confounder-adjusted estimates and their precision (e.g., 95% confidence interval). Make clear which confounders were adjusted for and why they were included	and means reported throughout, p.10-12	
		(b) Report category boundaries when continuous variables were categorised	N/A — not applicable	N/A
		(c) If relevant, consider translating estimates of relative risk into absolute risk for a meaningful time period	Results — "Sociodemographic and Production Characteristics": herd ownership, yield, and storage described	✓
Other analyses	17	Report other analyses done—eg analyses of subgroups and interactions, and sensitivity analyses	N/A — not applicable	N/A
Discussion				
Key results	18	Summarise key results with reference to study objectives	Discussion — first paragraph summarises key findings, p.12	
Limitations	19	Discuss limitations of the study, taking into account sources of potential bias or imprecision. Discuss both the direction and the magnitude of any potential bias	Discussion — Limitations subsection present, p.14	✓
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 address this, p.12-14	✓
Generalisability	21	Discuss the generalisability (external validity) of the study results	Discussion — Limitations acknowledge that convenience sampling restricts generalisability, p.14	✓
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" declared, p.2	✓

*Give information separately for exposed and unexposed groups.

Note: An Explanation and Elaboration article discusses each checklist item, provides methodological background, and presents published examples of transparent reporting. The STROBE checklist is best used in conjunction with this article (freely available on the websites 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.