

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

**Manuscript Title:** Knowledge, attitudes, and practices on antimicrobial resistance among Fulani women dairy product vendors in Zaria, Nigeria: implications for One Health stewardship in informal dairy systems

**Journal:** Bulletin of the World Health Organization

**Corresponding author:** Muhammad Muhsin Fathuddin

**Date:** April 2026

	Item No	Recommendation	Where reported	✓ / ✗
<b>Title and abstract</b>	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, p.3	✓
		(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.3	✓
<b>Introduction</b>				
Background/rationale	2	Explain the scientific background and rationale for the investigation being reported	Introduction situates AMR as a global challenge, highlights invisibility of Fulani women vendors in surveillance	✓
Objectives	3	State specific objectives, including any prespecified hypotheses	Objective: assess AMR-related KAP among Fulani women milk vendors in Zaria, Nigeria	✓
<b>Methods</b>				
Study design	4	Present key elements of study design early in the paper	Methods section describes descriptive cross-sectional design	✓
Setting	5	Describe the setting, locations, and relevant dates, including periods of recruitment, exposure, follow-up, and data collection	Zaria dairy corridor; informal networks linking pastoral households to peri-urban consumers; fieldwork dates specified	✓
Participants	6	(a) Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants	Fulani identity, female gender, age $\geq 18$ , $\geq 6$ months vending; purposive sampling of 100 approached, 77 enrolled	✓
Variables	7	Clearly define all outcomes, exposures, predictors, potential confounders, and effect modifiers. Give diagnostic criteria, if applicable	Domains: husbandry context, AMR knowledge, attitudes, practices; operationalised via structured questionnaire	✓
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	Structured questionnaire adapted from validated tools; translated into Hausa/Fulfulde; interviews by trained bilingual researchers	✓
Bias	9	Describe any efforts to address potential sources of bias	Anonymous coding, neutral prompts, culturally sensitive engagement	✓
Study size	10	Explain how the study size was arrived at	100 approached, 77 enrolled; purposive sampling consistent with LMIC AMR studies	✓

Quantitative variables	11	Explain how quantitative variables were handled in the analyses. If applicable, describe which groupings were chosen and why	Composite domain scores calculated for knowledge, attitudes, practices	✓
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	N/A — no subgroup analysis	N/A
		(c) Explain how missing data were addressed	Methods — Data management: "Items with missing or unclear responses were retained as a separate category and reported accordingly." P.9	✓
		(d) If applicable, describe analytical methods taking account of sampling strategy	Methods — purposive sampling acknowledged, p.10	✓
		(e) Describe any sensitivity analyses	N/A — descriptive study	N/A
<b>Results</b>				
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 — 77 Fulani women surveyed; all questionnaires completed, p.10	✓
		(b) Give reasons for non-participation at each stage	Results — "All 77 vendors approached consented to participate; no questionnaires were excluded from analysis." p.10	✓
		(c) Consider use of a flow diagram	N/A — no exclusions	N/A
Descriptive data	14*	(a) Give characteristics of study participants (eg demographic, clinical, social) and information on exposures and potential confounders	Results — "General information and husbandry conditions": livestock housing, cleaning routines, biosecurity described, p.10	✓
		(b) Indicate number of participants with missing data for each variable of interest	Results — "Missing responses were minimal and are represented within figures as separate response categories." p.10	✓
Outcome data	15*	Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures	Results — domain scores (47.5/56.1/49.6) and composite KAP score (51.1) reported	✓
Main results	16	(a) Give unadjusted estimates and, if applicable, confounder-adjusted estimates and their precision (eg, 95% confidence interval). Make clear	Results — all proportions and means reported descriptively, p.11-12	✓

		which confounders were adjusted for and why they were included		
		(b) Report category boundaries when continuous variables were categorized	N/A	N/A
		(c) If relevant, consider translating estimates of relative risk into absolute risk for a meaningful time period	N/A	N/A
Other analyses	17	Report other analyses done—e.g., 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. 12-13	✓
<b>Discussion</b>				
Key results	18	Summarise key results with reference to study objectives	Mid-range KAP profile; favourable attitudes but weak practices; blind spots in knowledge	✓
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	Purposive sampling, self-report bias, cross-sectional design precludes causal inference	✓
Interpretation	20	Give a cautious overall interpretation of results considering objectives, limitations, multiplicity of analyses, results from similar studies, and other relevant evidence	Fulani women vendors are active agents; stewardship must be participatory, culturally grounded, gender-sensitive	✓
Generalisability	21	Discuss the generalisability (external validity) of the study results	Findings transferable to comparable informal dairy contexts in LMICs	✓
<b>Other information</b>				
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	Funding statement: "No specific grant from any funding agency" declared, p.16	✓

\*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](http://www.strobe-statement.org).