

1 **Knowledge, attitudes and practices towards antibiotic use**
2 **and resistance in Kyegegwa district, Uganda –**
3 **a questionnaire study**

4

5 Mary Ann Kahunde¹, Terence Odoch¹, David Okello Owiny¹, Clovice Kankya¹, Marisa B.
6 Kaelin², Sonja Hartnack^{3*}

7

8 ¹ Department Biosecurity Ecosystems and Veterinary Public Health, College of Veterinary
9 Medicine, Animal Resources and Biosecurity, Makerere University, Kampala, Uganda

10 ² Division of Infectious Diseases and Hospital Epidemiology, University Hospital Zurich &
11 Department of Public and Global Health, Institute for Epidemiology, Biostatistics and
12 Prevention, University of Zurich, Zurich, Switzerland

13 ³ Section of Veterinary Epidemiology, Vetsuisse Faculty, University of Zurich, Zurich,
14 Switzerland

15

16 *Corresponding author

17 Email: sonja.hartnack@access.uzh.ch (SH)

18

19

20 NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

21 **Abstract**

22 **Background**

23 Antimicrobials are widely used to protect human and animal health. Wide scale misuse can lead
24 to the development and spread of antimicrobial resistance (AMR). In low and middle-income
25 countries, knowledge, attitudes and practices are assumed to contribute to AMR.

26 **Objective**

27 To provide empirical data on knowledge and attitudes towards antibiotic use and resistance in
28 livestock farmers, human and animal health professionals in Kyegegwa district, Uganda. To
29 assess which factors (farming, education, affiliation with health-related ministries, gender,
30 keeping cattle, goats, pigs, poultry or sheep) are associated with poor knowledge.

31 **Methods**

32 A questionnaire related to antibiotic usage (AMU) and AMR, as well as demographic data was
33 developed and administered to health practitioners of both the humanmedical and the livestock
34 sector, and (semi)-intensive livestock farmers. Polytomous latent class analysis was used to
35 cluster respondents - based on their responses - in different classes of knowledge and attitudes.
36 The association between the probability of belonging to latent classes and demographic data
37 was assessed by multinomial regression models and conditional inference trees.

38 **Results**

39 In total 1022 responses were available (response rate 68.1%). More than 50% of the cattle
40 received antibiotics at least three times during the last six months and in 39.1% members of the
41 respondents' households of this study were on antibiotics. Three latent classes related to attitude

42 towards antibiotic access, usage and disposal; and two classes regarding resistance have been
43 revealed. Class membership was associated with a number of socio-demographic factors.

44 **Conclusion**

45 Inadequate knowledge and inappropriate practices as evidenced in this study should support
46 further policy formulations and strategies to regulate AMU. It will also be useful in refining
47 the implementation of local and national action plans and efforts to control AMR. A key
48 component of this will require promotion of One Health approach and effective
49 communication to tackle prevailing misconceptions.

50

51 **Introduction**

52 Antimicrobials are widely used to protect human and animal health from pathogens.
53 Antimicrobials are pre-requisites for modern healthcare as first line of treatment for many
54 infectious diseases, and for the management of secondary infections during surgical operations.
55 Unfortunately, wide scale misuse and abuse has led to development of antimicrobial resistance
56 (AMR) in microorganisms (1–4). It has been estimated that 20 – 50% of antibiotics used is
57 either unnecessary or inappropriate (5,6). Consequently, AMR has become a global public
58 health threat. It is estimated, that by 2050 approximately 10 million people will die annually
59 due to infections related to antibiotic resistance (7). In addition, AMR is likely to significantly
60 have negative effects on the global economy - mainly in low and middle-income countries
61 (LMICs) (5). While development of AMR is a natural process that has been long recognized,
62 its spread is exacerbated by many factors, some of them related to inappropriate prescription
63 and use (8–10).

64 In LMICs, one of the factors contributing to misuse of antimicrobials is related to knowledge
65 attitudes and practices of the key players in antimicrobial usage. Many studies have reported
66 that antibiotic regime non-adherence and inappropriate antibiotic use are strongly associated
67 with public awareness and knowledge of antibiotics (11–14). Unfortunately, limited studies
68 have examined the knowledge attitudes and practices of users and prescribers of antimicrobials
69 in developing countries (15). The main aim of this study was to provide empirical data on
70 knowledge and attitudes towards antibiotic use and resistance of livestock farmers, human and
71 animal health professionals in Kyegegwa district, Uganda.

72

73 **Material and methods**

74 **Questionnaire design**

75 A questionnaire was developed based on the questions from Vallin (16) aiming to investigate
76 knowledge and attitudes regarding antibiotic use and resistance in Sweden. To adapt the
77 questions to the local situation in Uganda, the content was presented and discussed in a
78 participatory approach with participants of medical, veterinary and pharmaceutical background
79 during the 2017 Dialogue Days on Global Health Challenges between Makerere University and
80 University of Zurich.

81 The questionnaire consisted of four parts: (i) antibiotic consumption (8 questions on animals
82 and 9 on humans), (ii) antibiotic use (12 questions), (iii) antibiotic misconceptions (17
83 questions), and (iv) side effects and resistance (7 questions). The possible answers consisted of
84 (“yes”, “no”, “don’t know”), multiple options to tick and related to statements (“I agree”, “I do
85 not agree”, “I do not know”). Demographic information included questions on gender, age,
86 education, livestock enterprise, and enterprise type. The questionnaire was developed in

87 English and translated into the local language Rutooro upon administration. It was analysed and
88 revised by three independent supervisors and pre-tested on members of the target population
89 who were not repeated on the final investigation. The questionnaire is available in the
90 supplementary material (S1 Questionnaire).

91

92 **Study area and population**

93 Kyegegwa District in Uganda is bordered by Kibale District to the north, Mubende District to
94 the east, Kiruhura District to the south, Kamwenge District to the south-west, Sembabule to the
95 south-east and Kyenjojo District to the north-west. It is divided into 14 lower local governments
96 (LLGs) with nine rural Sub-Counties, five town councils, 48 parishes, 19 town wards and 266
97 villages. It is located approximately 110 kilometres (68 miles), east of Fort Portal, Kabarole
98 District, and is part of Tooro Sub region. Kyegegwa District was created by an act of the Uganda
99 Parliament on 1 July 2009. Before then, it was part of Kyenjojo District, which is also part of
100 the Tooro Sub region, from Tooro Kingdom.

101 According to the Uganda Bureau of Statistics (17), the projected population of Kyegegwa
102 district was 417'000 people. The economic activities in the district include livestock farming,
103 cultivation (maize, bananas, fruits, beans, groundnuts, cassava, millet, Irish potatoes and sweet
104 potatoes), aquaculture or fish farming, business in agricultural produce and apiary.

105

106 **Data collection**

107 The study targeted 1500 participants from 6 Sub-counties of Ruyonza, Rwentuha, Mpara,
108 Kyegegwa T/C, Kakabara and Kyegegwa Sub-counties of Kyegegwa District in autumn 2018.

109 Included were public and private health practitioners of both the medical and the livestock
110 sector, with intensive and semi-intensive livestock farmers, aged 18-75 years.

111 Percentages were purposively used for the inclusion of individual participants within the 6 Sub-
112 counties (based on those areas laying most in the cattle corridor and those not in the cattle
113 corridor). The 1500 participants were selected based on the population size of the study
114 category and level of antibiotic use in regard to exposure to antibiotic resistance (Personal field
115 experience). The aim was to select 50% livestock farmers (25% intensive and 25% semi-
116 intensive), 25% human public and private health practitioners, 25% veterinary public and
117 private practitioners.

118 Interviews were self-administered by selected Sub-county extension staff who were pre-trained
119 and guided by the researcher (MAK) before data collection. Health workers were organized in
120 common places for every health unit, and questionnaires administered at once after guidance
121 and so were the village health team workers at every parish level, from which sensitization and
122 training on antibiotic resistance were carried out. Farmers were organised in community
123 meetings, sensitized and questionnaires self-administered with assistance from the trained
124 veterinarians. Farm visits and home to home interviews were made with random sampling for
125 conclusive and evident data collection.

126

127 **Data management and analysis**

128 The data were entered manually in an excel sheet. Data cleaning and the statistical analysis was
129 performed with the open-source software R version 4.1.3 (18). For the description of the
130 demographic variables and the questions related to knowledge and attitudes towards antibiotic
131 usage and resistance, multinomial and Jeffreys binomial 95% confidence intervals were

132 obtained with the commands MultinomCI() and BinomCI() in the package DescTools (19) .
133 With the aim to detect latent classes in the responses related to the attitude towards antibiotic
134 access, usage and disposal as well as towards resistance, polytomous latent class analyses were
135 performed with the command poLCA() in the poLCA package (20). Subsequently, 1 to 5 classes
136 were assessed with 20 repetitions and 50 000 iterations. Selection of the final model was based
137 on BIC and having at least 10% of the respondents in each class. The resulting latent classes
138 were considered as outcome variable in multinomial regression analyses. The following nine
139 factor variables were included both in a univariable and a multivariable approach: livestock
140 farming (none as baseline, intensive and semi-intensive), affiliation with a ministry (no as
141 baseline, MAAIF. Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries; MoH, Ministry of
142 Health), gender (male as baseline, and female), education (primary as baseline, ordinary,
143 tertiary and university), keeping cattle, goats, pigs, poultry and sheep (baseline always no).
144 With the aim to predict which of the nine factor variables is most closely related to the predicted
145 latent class membership, conditional inference trees, relying on a recursive partitioning
146 algorithm were performed with the command ctree() from the package partykit (21).

147

148 **Ethics**

149 Clearance for the study was sought from the School of Biosecurity, Biotechnology and
150 Laboratory Sciences (SBLS) Institutional Review Board, and the College of Veterinary
151 Medicine, Animal Resources and Biosecurity (COVAB), Makerere University. Permission to
152 conduct this study was sought from the Chief Administrative Officer and the District Council
153 of Kyegegwa District Local Government. Verbal consent was sought from the respondents who
154 were medical and veterinary professionals and livestock farmers, and confidentiality of the
155 information was guaranteed before the interview.

156

157 **Results**

158 **Response rate**

159 In total 1022 responses were available with 319 (31.3%) respondents being affiliated with the
160 MOH, 41 (4%) with the MAAIF and 660 (64.7%) being not affiliated with a ministry (2 NA).
161 The response rate was 68.1 %. The MOH employees comprised 165 (51.7%) VHT (village
162 health team), 118 (37.0%) nurses, 15 (4.7%) public health officer, 12 (3.8%) clinical officer,
163 five (1.6%) doctors and four (1.2%) pharmacists. The MAAIF employees comprised 38
164 (92.7%) animal husbandry assistants, two (4.9%) animal health officers and one (2.4%)
165 veterinarian.

166 Out of MOH employees, 27 (8.4%) described themselves as doing intensive as well as semi-
167 intensive livestock farming and 265 (83%) indicated no livestock farming activity. Amongst
168 MAAIF employees, six (14.6%) and 14 (34.1%) identified themselves as intensive and semi-
169 intensive livestock farmer, while 21 (51.2%) did not act as livestock farmer. Amongst the re-
170 spondents not being associated with a ministry, 216 (32.7%) were intensive and 444 (67.3 %)
171 semi-intensive livestock farmers. Demographic data of the respondents including education,
172 gender, as well as keeping cattle, goats, pigs, poultry and sheep are presented in Table 1.

173

174 Table 1 Demographic data of respondents classified for affiliation with a ministry and with
175 type of farming

	Ministr y			Farmer (1 NA*)			Total
--	----------------------	--	--	--------------------------	--	--	--------------

	(2 NA*)						
Characteristic	MAAIF n (%) [95%CI]	MOH n (%) [95%CI]	No n (%) [95%CI]	I n (%) [95%CI]	SI n (%) [95%CI]	No n (%) [95%CI]	
Education (7 NA*)							
Primary	8 (19.5) [7.3;35.3]	75 (23.6) [17.9;29.6]	350 (53.5) [49.5;57.5]	139 (56.8) [50.2;62.8]	243 (50.4) [45.8;55.2]	51 (17.9) [11.9;24.1]	433 (42.7) [39.4;46.0]
Ordinary	1 (2.4) [0;18.2]	97(30.5) [24.8;36.6]	203 (31.0) [27.1;35.1]	58 (23.5) [17.0;30.0]	162 (33.6) [29.0;38.4]	81 (28.4) [22.4;34.7]	302 (29.7) [26.5;33.1]
Tertiary	26 (63.4) [51.2;79.2]	120 (37.7) [32.0;43.8]	71 (10.8) [6.9;14.8]	39 (15.8) [9.7;22.3]	51 (10.6) [6.0;15.4]	128 (44.9) [38.9;51.1]	218 (21.5) [18.2;24.9]
University	6 (14.6) [2.4;30.4]	26 (8.2) [2.5;14.3]	30 (4.6) [0.6;8.6]	11 (4.4) [0;11]	26 (5.4) [5.4;10.2]	25 (28.4) [22.4;34.7]	62 (6.1) [2.8;9.5]
Gender (1 NA*)							

Female	9 (21.9) [12.2;35.5]	163 (51.1) [45.4;56.7]	219 (33.3) [29.6;36.9]	82 (33.1) [27.4;39.2]	163 (33.5) [29.4;38.0]	147 (51.4) [45.4;57.3]	393 (38.7) [35.8;41.7]
Male	32 (78.0) [68.3;91.6]	156 (48.9) [43.2;54.4]	440 (66.8) [63.1;70.5]	166 (66.9) [61.3;73.1]	323 (66.5) [62.3;70.9]	139 (48.6) [42.6;54.6]	628 (61.9) [0.59;64.8]
Cattle (16 NA*)							
Yes	30 (76.9) [66.7;91.1]	78 (25.5) [20.9;30.6]	434 (65.7) [62.1;69.5]	165 (66.5) [60.9;72.7]	317 (65.2) [60.9;69.5]	60 (22.0) [17.3;26.9]	542 (0.54) [0.51;56.9]
No	9 (23.2) [12.8;37.3]	228 (74.5) [69.9;79.6]	226 (34.2) [30.6;38.0]	83 (33.5) [27.8;39.7]	169 (34.8) [30.4;39.1]	212 (77.9) [73.2;82.8]	
Goats (16 NA*)							
Yes	23 (59.0) [46.1;76.1]	93 (30.4) [25.3;38.5]	408 (61.8) [58.0;65.7]	151 (60.9) [54.8;67.2]	308 (63.3) [59.0;67.8]	65 (23.9) [19.1;29.1]	524 (52.1) [49.0;55.2]

No	16 (41.0) [28.2;58.1]	213 (69.6) [64.7;75.1]	252 (38.2) [34.4;42.0]	97 (39.1) [33.1;45.3]	178 (36.6) [32.2;41.1]	207 (76.1) [71.3;81.3]	
Pigs (16 NA*)							
Yes	14 (35.9) [23.1;52.1]	67 (21.9) [17.6;26.7]	329 (49.8) [45.9;53.8]	86 (34.7) [29.0;41.0]	271 (55.8) [51.2;60.4]	54 (19.8) [15.4;24.7]	411 (40.8) [37.8;43.9]
No	25 (64.1) [51.3;80.3]	239 (78.1) [73.8;82.9]	331 (50.1) [46.2;54.1]	162 (65.3) [59.7;71.6]	215 (44.2) [39.7;48.8]	218 (80.1) [75.7;85.0]	
Poultry (16 NA*)							
Yes	22 (56.4) [43.6;73.8]	84 (27.4) [22.5;32.5]	467 (70.7) [67.3;74.3]	178 (71.8) [66.5;77.7]	343 (70.6) [66.7;74.8]	53 (19.5) [15.1;24.2]	574 (53.9) [50.9;56.9]
No	17 (43.6) [30.8;61.0]	222 (72.4) [67.6;77.6]	193 (29.2) [25.7;32.8]	70 (28.2) [23.0;34.1]	143 (29.4) [25.5;33.7]	219 (80.5) [76.1;85.3]	
Sheep							

(16 NA*)							
Yes	15 (38.5) [25.6; 55.2]	19 (6.2) [3.9;8.9]	173 (26.2) [22.9;29. 6]	62 (0.25) [19.7;30. 4]	128 (26.3) [22.4;30. 3]	17 (6.2) [3.7;8.9]	207 (20.6) [18.2;23. 2]
No	24 (61.5) [48.7;78. 2]	287 (93.8) [91.5;96. 4]	487 (73.8) [70.4;77, 2]	186 (75.0) [69.7;80. 4]	358 (73.7) [69.7;77. 6]	255 (93.7) [91.2;96. 4]	
Total	41 (4.0) [1.1;7.1]	319 (31.3) [28.3;34. 3]	660 (64.7) [61.8;67. 8]	249 (28.0) [24.8;31. 4]	486 (47.6) [44.3;51. 0]	286 (24.4) [21.1;27. 8]	

176 *NA missing values

177 Asked about which antibiotics the respondent has ever used him- or herself, the following four
 178 antibiotics were mentioned most often: amoxicillin, followed by penicillin, erythromycin and
 179 co-trimoxazole. In animals, penicillin, tetracycline and gentamycin were mentioned most often
 180 (Table 2a). Amongst the 844 respondents which kept one of the following five species (cattle,
 181 goats, pigs, poultry or sheep), 147 kept one species, 247 kept two species, 231 kept three spe-
 182 cies, 171 kept four species and 48 kept all five species.

183 Table 2a Antibiotics mentioned by the respondents to be used in humans and animals

Antibiotic	Humans n = 1022			Animals n = 844		
	n (%)	[95% CI]	NA	n (%)	[95% CI]	NA

Amoxicillin	678 (66.5)	[63.6;69.4]	3	107 (12.7)	[10.6;15.1]	2
Azithromycin	212 (20.8)	[18.4;23.4]	3	27 (3.2)	[2.2;4.6]	2
Cephalexin	183 (17.9)	[15.7;20.4]	2	36 (4.3)	[3.1;5.8]	2
Co-trimoxazole	425 (41.7)	[38.7;44.7]	3	100 (11.9)	[9.6;14.2]	2
Doxycyclin	253 (24.8)	[22.2;27.5]	3	221 (26.2)	[23.4;29.3]	2
Erythromycin	429 (42.1)	[39.1;45.1]	3	51 (6.1)	[4.6;7.8]	2
Gentamycin	316 (31.0)	[28.2;33.9]	3	303 (36.0)	[32.8;39.3]	2
Penicillin	481 (47.2)	[44.1;50.3]	3	585 (69.6)	[66.3;72.5]	2
Tetracycline	334 (32.8)	[30.0;35.7]	4	573 (68.1)	[64.8;71.1]	2
Trimethoprim	160 (15.7)	[13.6;18.0]	4	88 (10.4)	[8.5;12.6]	2

184

185 In Table 2b the frequencies of antibiotic usage during the last six months in cattle, goats, pigs,
 186 poultry as well as different age categories of humans are presented. More than 50% of the cattle
 187 received antibiotics at least three times during the last six months, whereas goats, pigs, poultry
 188 and sheep received considerably less often antibiotics. In humans, the majority in all age cate-
 189 gories received less than three times an antibiotic in the same time period.

190

191 Table 2b Frequencies of antibiotic usage in different animal species and human age categories

Species	Never	1-2 times	3-5 times	>5 times
	n (%) [95% CI]	n (%) [95% CI]	n (%) [95% CI]	n (%) [95% CI]
Cattle (15 NA*)	27 (5.1) [0.5;9.8]	196 (37.2) [32.6;41.9]	186 (35.3) [30.7;40.0]	118 (22.4) [17.8;27.1]
Goats (24 NA*)	213 (42.6) [38.0;47.3]	190 (38.0) [33.3;42.7]	62 (12.4) [7.8;17.1]	35 (7.0) [2.4;11.7]
Pigs (17 NA*)	141 (35.8) [30.7;41.2]	164 (41.6) [36.5;47.0]	51 (12.9) [7.9;18.3]	38 (9.6) [4.6;15.0]
Poultry (9 NA*)	311 (55.0) [50.9;59.5]	175 (30.9) [26.9;35.4]	53 (9.4) [3.1;13.8]	26 (4.6) [0.5;9.0]
Sheep (8 NA*)	142 (71.3)	29 (14.6)	18 (9.0)	10 (5.0)

	[65.8;77.8]	[9.0;21.0]	[3.5;15.5]	[0;11.5]
Humans: Respondent (31 NA*)	333 (33.6) [30.4;37.0]	403 (40.7) [37.4;44.1]	118 (11.9) [8.7;15.3]	137 (13.8) [10.6;17.2]
Humans: another adult in same household (88 NA*)	389 (41.6) [38.2;45.2]	330 (35.3) [32.0;38.9]	109 (11.7) [8.3;15.2]	106 (11.3) [8.0;14.9]
Children ≤ 2 years	167 (25.4) [21.5;29.5]	315 (47.9) [44.0;52.0]	111 (16.9) [12.9;20.9]	64 (9.7) [5.8;13.8]
Children 3-5 years	255 (41.1) [36.9;45.4]	213 (34.3) [30.2;38.6]	112 (18.1) [13.9;22.3]	40 (6.4) [2.2;10.7]
Children 6-12 years	340 (53.0) [49.1;57.2]	204 (31.8) [27.9;36.0]	57 (8.9) [5.0;13.0]	40 (6.2) [2.3;10.4]
Children 13-18 years	325 (58.9) [54.7;63.0]	142 (25.7) [21.5;29.9]	49 (8.9) [4.7;13.0]	36 (6.5) [2.3;10.7]

192 *NA missing values

193 Asked about the reasons to administer antibiotics to livestock in decreasing order the following
 194 answers were chosen: “when they are sick”, “to prevent disease”, “for growth and fattening”,
 195 and “when I feel it is necessary” (Table 2c). In decreasing order, the source of the antibiotic
 196 was the drug shop, veterinary doctor, market, pharmacy, neighbour, and mobile van. Most often
 197 the antibiotic was administered by the respondent or a family member, less often by animal
 198 health assistants, veterinary doctors, neighbours or livestock production officers. The question,
 199 whether a prescription for the antibiotic treatment of the animals was available was answered
 200 with “yes” by 335 respondents (43.7%, 95% CI [40.2;47.3]) and with “no” by 431 respondents
 201 (56.3%, 95% CI [52.7;59.7]). Observing a withholding period as recommended was answered
 202 with “yes” by 116 respondents (15.1%, 95% CI [12.7;17.8]), with “no” by 635 (82.9%, 95% CI
 203 [80.4;85.6]) and with “don’t know” by 15 (1.9%, 95% CI [0;4.7]).

204

205 Table 2c Administration and source of antibiotics in livestock

Question	“yes” n (%) [95% CI]	NA*
When do you administer antibiotics to your livestock?		
When they are sick	692 (90.8)	82

	[88.6;92.7]	
To prevent disease	485 (63.2) [59.8;66.6]	77
For growth and fattening	247 (32.1) [28.9;35.5]	75
When I feel it is necessary	166 (21.7) [18.9;24.7]	78
What was the source of your antibiotic?		
Drug shop	508 (66.0) [62.6;69.2]	74
Veterinary doctor	221 (28.7) [25.6;32.0]	75
Market	172 (22.4) [19.5;25.4]	76
Pharmacy	100 (13.0) [10.8;15.5]	75
Neighbour	64 (8.3) [6.5;10.4]	76
Mobile van	21 (2.7) [1.7;4.1]	75
Who administered for you the antibiotic?		
Family member or myself	555 (72.3) [69.1;75.4]	77
Animal health assistant	251 (32.7) [29.4;36.0]	76
Veterinary doctor	99 (12.9) [10.7;15.4]	79
Neighbour	72 (9.4) [7.5;11.6]	78
Livestock production officer	70 (9.2) [7.3;11.4]	80

206 *NA missing values

207 In humans, whether anyone is currently taking antibiotics in the household, answered 378
 208 (39.1%, 95% CI [36.0;42.4]) respondents with “yes”, 580 (60.0, 95% CI [56.9;63.3]) with “no”
 209 and 9 (0.9%, 95% CI [0;4.2]) with “don’t know” (NA 55).

210 Regarding the prescription, source and administration of antibiotics in humans, further details
 211 are presented in Table 2d. Information related to patient experience, patient-doctor relationship
 212 and antibiotic usage is presented in table 2e. Solely between 60 and 75% of the respondents
 213 have experienced antibiotic prescriptions for a family member or their animals by a doctor and

214 even less by a pharmacy. A clear majority of the respondents agree that doctors provide
 215 adequate information and conduct thorough examinations if antibiotics are needed or not.
 216 Confidence in a doctor’s decision not to prescribe antibiotics was expressed by more than 70%
 217 of the respondents. While farmers and respondents affiliated with a ministry agreed in a similar
 218 way with most of the statements, for the statement that “a doctor who does not prescribe
 219 antibiotics when the patient thinks that they are needed, is not a good doctor” - a majority of
 220 the farmers agreed, but respondents affiliated with MAAIF/MOH did not.

221

222 Table 2d Prescription, source and administration of antibiotics in humans

Question	“yes” n (%) [95% CI]	NA*
Is anyone on your household taking antibiotics at the moment?	378 (39.1) [36.0;42.2]	55
Who prescribed antibiotics for you?		
Nurse	367 (42.0) [38.7;45.3]	148
Doctor	316 (36.1) [33.0;39.4]	143
VHT	212 (24.2) [21.5;27.1]	145
Myself	114 (13.0) [10.9;15.3]	145
Clinical officer	89 (10.2) [8.3;12.3]	147
Pharmacist	69 (7.9) [6.2;9.8]	146
What was the source of your antibiotic?		
Clinic	364 (41.7) [38.4;45.0]	147
Hospital	345 (39.4) [36.2;42.6]	144
Drug shop	292 (33.3) [30.3;36.5]	144
VHT	207 (23.6) [20.9;26.5]	144
Pharmacy	91 (10.4)	144

	[85.0;12.5]	
Leftover	70 (8.0) [6.3;9.9]	144
Neighbour	13 (1.5) [0.8;2.4]	144
Who administered the antibiotic?		
Myself	481 (54.8) [51.5;58.1]	143
Nurse	412 (47.0) [43.7;50.3]	143
Doctor	166 (18.9) [16.4;21.6]	143
VHT	125 (14.2) [12.0;16.7]	143
Health assistant	36 (4.1) [2.9;5.6]	144
Neighbour	24 (2.7) [1.8;4.0]	143

223 *NA missing values

224

225 Table 2e Attitudes towards antibiotic prescription in humans and patient-doctor relationship

Question	Ministry or farming			Total	NA*
	MAAIF	MOH	Farmer		
	«yes» n (%) [95% CI]	«yes» n (%) [95% CI]	«yes» n (%) [95% CI]	«yes» n (%) [95% CI]	
Did you seek medical help?	13 (61.9) [40.7;80.0]	135 (52.7) [46.6;58.8]	329 (57.5) [53.4;61.5]	477 (56.1) [52.8;59.4]	172
I have experienced antibiotic prescription for myself or my kin or my animals/birds.	19 (61.3) [43.8;76.8]	227 (75.7) [70.6;80.3]	469 (75.4) [71.9;78.7]	716 (75.0) [72.2;77.7]	68
When antibiotics are prescribed (whether for myself or my animals), the doctors take time to provide information on how they should be used, in an understandable manner.	22 (84.6) [67.4;94.6]	252 (84.6) [80.1;88.3]	520 (82.4) [79.3;85.2]	795 (83.1) [80.7;85.4]	66
I usually know how antibiotics should be used/taken, even if I was given information about their use.	15 (46.9) [30.5;63.8]	161 (53.5) [47.8;59.1]	301 (47.7) [43.8;51.6]	478 (49.5) [46.4;52.7]	57

I often know before I visit a doctor, whether I need antibiotics or not.	11 (36.7) [21.3;54.5]	126 (41.4) [36.0;47.0]	319 (50.1) [46.2;53.9]	457 (47.0) [43.9;50.1]	50
Doctors always conduct a thorough examination regarding whether a patient/animal is in need of antibiotics or not.	24 (75.0) [58.3;87.4]	258 (83.8) [79.3;87.6]	490 (76.8) [73.4;79.9]	772 (78.8) [76.2;81.3]	43
Doctors prescribe antibiotics when a patient expects it.	12 (37.5) [22.4;54.7]	97 (32.5) [27.4;38.0]	335 (52.6) [48.7;56.4]	445 (46.0) [42.8;49.1]	54
I am confident in a doctor's decision if he/she does not prescribe antibiotics.	23 (71.9) [54.9;85.1]	232 (77.1) [72.1;81.5]	501 (78.5) [75.2;81.6]	757 (77.9) [75.2;80.4]	50
A doctor who does not prescribe antibiotics when the patient thinks that they are needed, is not a good doctor.	7 (22.6) [10.7;39.3]	85 (28.2) [23.4;33.5]	371 (58.8) [54.9;62.6]	464 (48.1) [45.0;51.3]	58
I usually know how infections should be treated.	17 (54.8) [37.5;71.3]	146 (47.7) [42.1;53.3]	277 (44.0) [40.2;47.3]	441 (45.6) [42.5;48.7]	55
I have experience, as patient or a kin, of acquiring prescribed antibiotics from pharmacy.	20 (64.5) [47.0;79.5]	211 (70.8) [65.5;75.7]	434 (69.0) [65.3;72.5]	665 (69.3) [66.4;72.2]	63
Pharmacy staff take their time to inform me on how antibiotics should be used.	16 (64.0) [44.5;80.5]	152 (55.5) [49.5;61.3]	371 (68.4) [64.4;72.2]	540 (64.1) [60.8;67.3]	180

226 *NA missing values

227 Regarding awareness of antibiotic resistance, nearly 80% agreed that antibiotic resistance and
 228 fake antibiotics are big problems in Uganda. About 52% are confident that pharmaceutical
 229 companies will be able to develop new medicine which will solve the problem. Less than half
 230 of the respondents have experienced a sensitization campaign (36.5%) or are aware of
 231 organisations involved in minimising the development of antibiotic resistance.

232

233 Knowledge, attitude and practice towards antibiotic access, usage and
 234 disposal (questions Q1 to Q9)

235 The proportions of the correct, wrong and “don’t know” answers are displayed in Table 3. The
 236 first three questions Q1 to Q3 asking about acquiring antibiotics without visiting a doctor and
 237 confirming the dosage before administration were answered correctly with a clear majority
 238 above 70%. Regarding Q4 and Q5 asking about usage and disposal of leftover antibiotics, less
 239 than 60% answered correctly. The majority of the respondents (70%) took the wrong answer
 240 regarding the questions Q6 that antibiotics fasten recovery for any sickness. More than half of
 241 the respondents (52.8%) agreed with the statement in Q7 “as soon as you have fever you should
 242 have an antibiotic”. Similarly, in Q8, a slight majority of 55.6% will not “see if the infection
 243 goes away on its own”, assuming that antibiotics will be taken immediately after onset of
 244 clinical symptoms. Most of the respondents (68.2%) agreed with Q9 that “the body can usually
 245 fight mild infections on its own without antibiotics”.

246

247 Table 3 Manifest variables (questions) to assess the attitude towards antibiotic access, usage
 248 and disposal

Questions	Answers		
	Correct	Wrong	Don't Know
	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)
	[95% CI]	[95% CI]	[95% CI]
Q1. I think that it is good to be able to acquire antibiotics from relatives or acquaintances, without having to be examined by a doctor. (13 NA*)	739 (73.2) [70.6;76.0]	210 (20.8) [18.1;23.6]	60 (5.9) [3.3;8.7]

Q2. I think that it is good to be able to buy antibiotics over the counter, without having to see a doctor. (19 NA*)	784 (78.2) [75.7;80.7]	182 (18.1) [15.6;20.7]	37 (3.7) [1.2;6.2]
Q3. I confirm dosage before administration of antibiotics. (15 NA*)	791 (78.5) [76.1;81.1]	196 (19.5) [17.0;22.0]	20 (2.0) [0;4.5]
Q4. Leftover antibiotics can be saved for personal future use or to give to someone else. (11 NA*)	569 (56.3) [53.1;59.5]	386 (38.2) [35.0;41.4]	56 (5.5) [2.4;8.8]
Q5. I dispose my leftover antibiotics with other household garbage or even in the farm. (15 NA*)	563 (55.9) [52.7;59.1]	402 (39.9) [36.7;43.1]	42 (4.2) [1.0;7.4]
Q6. Antibiotics make one recover faster when having any disease. (10 NA*)	240 (23.7) [20.9;26.6]	716 (70.7) [68.0;73.6]	56 (5.5) [2.8;8.4]
Q7. As soon as you have fever you should have an antibiotic. (14 NA*)	451 (44.7) [41.6;48.0]	532 (52.8) [49.6;56.0]	25 (2.5) [0;5.8]
Q8. If I get an infection, I often wait and see/rest and take it easy, and see if the infection goes away on its own. (23 NA*)	427 (42.7) [39.5;46.0]	556 (55.6) [52.4;58.9]	16 (1.6) [0;4.8]
Q9. The body can usually fight mild infections on its own without antibiotics. (14 NA*)	688 (68.2) [65.4;71.2]	293 (29.1) [26.2;32.0]	27 (2.7) [0;5.7]

249 *NA missing values

250

251 Polytomous latent class analysis: questions Q1 to Q9

252 For the polytomous latent class analyses, the answers of 952 respondents with complete answers
 253 were included. Based on BIC and the attempt to have a least a proportion of 0.1 in each class,
 254 the best latent class model comprised three classes with the predicted class probabilities of 68.5

255 % (class I), 13.1 % (class II) and 18.3 % (class III) displayed in Figure 1. The classes were
256 named “accurate knowledge”, “moderate knowledge and restricted use” and “moderate
257 knowledge and relaxed use” because the highest proportion of correct answers for all questions
258 - with the exception of Q8 - were found in class I, the highest proportion of “don’t know”
259 answers were found in class II and the highest proportion of wrong answers was found in class
260 III.

261

262 Multinomial regression for predicted class membership: questions Q1 to Q9

263 Based on the multinomial regression, assessing potential associations between latent class
264 membership and nine predictors, the following results were obtained (S5 Table). Intensive
265 farmers compared to no farming activity were more likely to be in class II than in class I.
266 Respondents affiliated with MAAIF or MOH compared to respondents not affiliated with these
267 ministries were more likely in class I than in class III. Gender was not significantly associated
268 with class membership. Respondents with increased levels of education compared to primary
269 education were in general more likely to be in class I than in class III or II. Respondents, which
270 keep cattle or goats, were - compared to respondents not keeping these species - more likely to
271 be in class III or class II and III than in class I. Respondents which keep poultry were –
272 compared to those not keeping poultry – more likely in class I than in class II or III. Keeping
273 pigs or sheep was not significantly associated with latent class membership.

274

275 Similarly, in a conditional inference tree including all nine potential factors, ministry, educa-
276 tion, and keeping cattle were found to be significantly associated with class membership (Figure
277 2). Respondents affiliated with MAAIF or MOH compared to respondents not affiliated with
278 one of these two ministries were less likely to be on class III. Amongst respondents not affiliated

279 with either MAAIF or MOH, having a higher than a primary education was associated with a
280 higher probability of being in class I. In respondents being not affiliated with MAAIF or MOH
281 and having at least an ordinary education, keeping cattle was associated with a lower proportion
282 of correct and a higher proportion of “don’t know” answers.

283

284 Knowledge, attitude and practice towards resistance (questions Q10 to 285 Q17)

286 The proportions of the correct, wrong and “don’t know” answers are displayed in Table 4.
287 Nearly half of the respondents did not choose the correct answer for questions Q10 and Q11
288 related to the usage of antibiotics for food preservation or cooking. A majority assumed that
289 antibiotics can prevent sickness in Q12. Correctly answered by a majority was the question Q13
290 related to usage of animal drugs in humans and vice versa. A majority agreed with the wrong
291 statement in Q14 to take antibiotics any time of sickness. In contrast, a majority took the correct
292 answer in Q15 regarding the question to stop antibiotics when feeling well again. The majority
293 of the respondents agreed with the statement in Q16 to switch the antibiotic if another type has
294 failed. More than 40% of the respondents either assumed that a “cocktail of antibiotics is a
295 solution to resistance” or were uncertain.

296

297 Table 4 Manifest variables (questions) to assess the attitude towards antibiotic resistance

Questions	Answers		
	Correct	Wrong	Don't Know
	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)

	[95% CI]	[95% CI]	[95% CI]
Q10. I have heard/learnt that antibiotics can be used to preserve food especially milk. (17 NA*)	548 (54.5) [51.3;57.8]	209 (20.8) [17.6;24.1]	248 (24.7) [21.5;28.0]
Q11. I have heard/ learnt that antibiotics quicken and soften food when cooking especially beans and meat. (17 NA*)	459 (45.7) [42.4;49.0]	436 (43.4) [40.1;46.7]	110 (10.9) [7.7;14.3]
Q12. Antibiotics can prevent sickness. (11 NA*)	392 (38.8) [35.7;42.0]	589 (58.2) [55.2;61.5]	30 (3.0) [0;6.2]
Q13. I think it is okay to use animal drugs in humans and vice versa. (11 NA*)	765 (75.7) [73.1;78.3]	157 (15.5) [12.9;18.1]	89 (8.8) [6.2;11.4]
Q14. One can take antibiotics anytime of sickness.(13 NA*)	393 (38.9) [35.9;42.2]	588 (58.3) [55.2;61.5]	28 (2.8) [0;6.0]
Q15. I can stop antibiotics anytime I feel well from sickness. (13 NA*)	629 (62.3) [59.3;65.4]	341 (33.8) [30.7;36.9]	39 (3.9) [0.8;7.0]
Q16. One can switch to another type of antibiotics if another type has failed.(20 NA*)	213 (21.2) [18.7;24.0]	752 (75.0) [72.4;77.8]	37 (3.7) [1.1;6.4]
Q17. Cocktail of different antibiotics is a solution to resistance. (15 NA*)	573 (56.9) [53.7;60.1]	239 (23.7) [20.5;26.9]	195 (19.4) [16.2;22.6]

298 *NA missing values

299 Polytomous latent class analysis: questions Q10 to Q17

300 Based on BIC and the attempt to have at least a proportion of 0.1 in each class, the best latent
301 class model comprised three classes with predicted class probabilities of 57.5 % (class I), 17.7
302 % (class II) and 24.8 % (class III) displayed in figure 3. These classes were named “fair
303 knowledge”, “moderate” and “low knowledge” as (with the exception of Q16), class I com-
304 prised the highest proportion of the correct and the lowest proportion of wrong answers. Class

305 II had the highest proportion of “don’t know” answers and class III had the highest proportion
306 of wrong answers for most of the questions.

307

308 **Multinomial regression for predicted class membership: questions Q10 to Q17**

309 Based on the multinomial regression assessing potential associations between latent class mem-
310 bership and nine predictors, the following results were obtained (S6 Table). Being a farmer, in-
311 tensive or semi-intensive, compared to no farmer was not significantly associated with class
312 membership. Respondents affiliated with MAAIF or MOH were less likely to be in class II or
313 III, respectively compared to class I. Females compared to males were more likely in class III
314 than I. Respondents with higher levels of education (tertiary), compared to primary education,
315 were more likely to be in class I, than in class III. Keeping cattle, compared to not keeping
316 cattle, was associated with being more likely in class II than class I. Keeping pigs compared to
317 not keeping pigs, was associated with being more likely in class I compared to II. Keeping
318 poultry, compared to not keeping poultry, was associated with being more likely in class III
319 than in class I. Respondents keeping sheep were more likely in class I than in classes II and III.

320 Based on a conditional inference tree, keeping poultry, sheep cattle or goats as well as type of
321 farming and education level was found to be significantly associated with predicted class mem-
322 bership (Figure 4). Keeping poultry was associated with a lower probability of being in class I,
323 unless respondents had tertiary or university education. Amongst poultry keepers with primary
324 or ordinary education, keeping goats was associated with a higher proportion of class I mem-
325 bers. Amongst those who did not keep poultry, being a semi-intensive farmer compared to in-
326 tensive or no farming was significantly associated with class membership. Amongst semi-in-
327 tensive farmers keeping sheep and cattle was significantly associated with class membership.

328 While keeping sheep was associated with a higher probability of class I, keeping cattle was
329 associated with a lower probability of class I membership.

330

331 **Discussion**

332 This study assessed knowledge, attitudes and practices related to antibiotic resistance, access
333 and usage in both animals and humans amongst respondents being affiliated with Uganda's
334 Ministry of Health (MOH) and Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries
335 (MAAIF) or those with a background of farming in Kyegegwa, Uganda. This is one of the few
336 studies undertaken in LMICS, particularly in East Africa. The respondents of this are key
337 players in the prescription and use of antimicrobials in humans and livestock. Misuse of
338 antimicrobials is reported as critical in the development and spread of antimicrobial resistance
339 (22,23) and this can be perpetuated by uninformed users or reckless professionals.

340 In this study amoxicillin, penicillin, erythromycin and co-trimoxazole were found to be the
341 most commonly used antibiotics in humans. This is similar to what is reported in other studies
342 in Tanzania (24,25), Ethiopia (26), Uganda (27,28), Sudan (29). However, some studies report
343 metronidazole as the most commonly used antibiotic (30). A number of factors in LMICS
344 influence the decision to self-medicate. These include poverty, long distance to health facilities,
345 easy access to drugs from pharmacies and drug shops, mild illness, ignorance, poor attitudes of
346 health workers, knowledge of diagnosis (retreatment of similar illness), convenience, and non-
347 availability of doctors (28,31,32).

348 In 39.1% members of the respondents' households of this study were on antibiotics, a
349 manifestation of the large-scale use of antibiotic in Uganda. Self-medication is so widespread
350 that WHO now considers it as a component of self-care (32). Self-medication is one of the

351 major drivers of drug resistance (33,34) and reflects a lack of access to appropriate health care.
352 The commonly used drugs in self-medication are prone to increased resistance, especially when
353 inappropriately used.

354 For the livestock sector, penicillins, tetracyclines and gentamycin were mentioned as the most
355 commonly used. Some studies in Africa and elsewhere have reported similar results and trends
356 (35–37). Unfortunately, similar studies in LMIC are still scarce, particularly those focussing on
357 prescribers. Several factors drive farmers and livestock keepers to self-medicate their animals.
358 This can be attributed to readily available, easy access, cheaper drugs, weak regulatory measure
359 and lack of qualified personnel. One of the main drivers to use antibiotics is commercial both
360 by the suppliers and the consumers. Livestock farmers and animal keepers want their animals
361 healthy and productive.

362 Since just a subset of all respondents kept animals in this study, comparing the frequencies in
363 humans and animals is only of limited sense. However, it is worthwhile mentioning, that all
364 antibiotics used in humans are also used in animals. Surprisingly high was the frequency of
365 antibiotics given to cattle, even higher than to any human age category. This might be explained
366 by part of the study region lying in the cattle corridor, a zone stretching from south-west to
367 north-east Uganda, dominated by pastoral rangelands, and cattle being very valuable compared
368 to other species.

369 These data are self-reported frequencies and need therefore to be carefully interpreted in terms
370 of a potential social desirability bias. What is yet missing in Uganda is a national surveillance
371 system to monitor antibiotic consumption in animals and humans. Some efforts have been put
372 in place by Ministries of Health and Agriculture and a National Antimicrobial Resistant
373 Action plan for Uganda has been drafted. These action plans have been developed within the
374 framework of tripartite agreements by the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO), World
375 Health Organization (WHO) and World Organization for Animal Health (WOAH) (38,39). It

376 is desirable to understand the amount of antibiotics used both in livestock and humans as well
377 as their effects on humans, animals and the environment, and the drivers of resistance in order
378 to improve on the rational use.

379 In this study, the majority of respondents in all categories have experienced prescription and
380 contented, that doctors provide adequate advice. The fact, that a majority seek prescription
381 from a doctor is a positive attribute and a good prospect of judicious antibiotic use, however
382 these results need to be interpreted with caution, since in many communities in Uganda, the
383 word ‘doctor’ is more or less synonymous with health worker or provider, regardless of the
384 level of qualification and/or position in the health care service provisions.

385 Alarming is the high proportion of 82.9% of the respondents who indicated that they were not
386 following the recommendation of withholding periods when administering antibiotics to
387 livestock. Thus, milk and meat containing antibiotic residues from treated animals potentially
388 enter the food chain and pose risks to consumers. Similar findings of not observing the
389 withholding period were also observed in animals in Tanzania (40). Presumably, the lack of
390 observing a withholding period is not due to a lack of knowledge, but due to financial
391 constraints and a lack of control for residues along the food chain (41). Antibiotics will continue
392 to be used in livestock production, particularly to treat and control pathogenic infections. But
393 lack of observance of withholding periods will potentially pose public health hazards in terms
394 of effects of drug residues like carcinogenicity and toxicity associated with consumption of
395 animal products and development of antimicrobial resistance.

396 About a third (32.1%) of the respondents indicated administering antibiotics for growth and
397 fattening. This is slightly higher than what is reported in a neighbouring country of Uganda,
398 Rwanda, 26.5% (42). Currently, in Uganda, officially there is a ban on the use of antibiotics for
399 growth promotion in livestock. In Africa, a recent survey by the World Organisation for Animal
400 Health (43) found out that 15% of countries who participated, still use antibiotics for growth

401 promotion. Use of antibiotics for growth promotion normally entails use of lower
402 concentrations of the active ingredients over a longer period and this puts an extensive pressure
403 leading to emergence of antimicrobial resistance strains of bacteria (44). Consequently, a
404 number of countries have banned use of antibiotics for growth promotion.

405 Following the approach from (16) we assessed knowledge by analysing response patterns to a
406 number of questions with a clustering approach. A first set of nine questions was dedicated to
407 assess knowledge and attitude towards antibiotic access, usage and disposal. Based on a
408 polytomous latent class analysis we obtained three classes which we named “class I: accurate
409 knowledge” (68.5%), “class II: moderate knowledge & restricted use” (13.1%) and “class III
410 moderate knowledge and relaxed use”. A clear majority of respondents in class I answered
411 correctly questions related to unrestricted antibiotic access and dosage confirmation, thus
412 giving evidence that unrestricted access is perceived as a driving factor for antibiotic resistance.
413 Less respondents answered correctly questions related to saving leftover antibiotics for future
414 use. This might be contextual and be explained by potential anticipated antibiotic shortage.
415 Similarly, the questions related to disposal of leftover with the household garbage or even on
416 the farm might indicate the absence of appropriate waste management. Worrisome are some
417 misconceptions, also being present in the class I with the most accurate knowledge with regard
418 to using antibiotics immediately with the onset of fever and the assumption that recovery for
419 any disease is achieved earlier with antibiotics.

420 Based on the discussions during the dialogue days, a symposium in the context of a
421 collaboration between Makerere university and university of Zurich, it became evident that not
422 all questions from (16) are directly applicable to the situation in Uganda. Participants mentioned
423 (mis-)use of antibiotics to preserve milk in the absence of suitable storage conditions, to obtain
424 “stronger” self-brewed alcoholic beverages or to soften meat and beans when cooking. These
425 practices are particularly worrisome and should be considered in sensitization campaigns.

426

427 **Conclusions**

428 Inadequate knowledge, inappropriate attitudes and practices along the antimicrobial supply is
429 a potential danger to the development and spread of antimicrobial resistance. Similar generic
430 drugs or surrogates are used both in human and animal treatment, moreover with unrestricted
431 access and self-prescriptions if not appropriately addressed will exacerbate the challenges of
432 antimicrobial resistance. One of the weakest points in the use of antimicrobial is enforcement
433 of the existing laws and guidelines. This can be complicated by poverty, ignorance and other
434 socio-economic factors. Evidence generated in this study should support further policy
435 formulations and strategies to regulate AMU and implementation of local and national action
436 plans. It can be used in sensitizations and promotions of judicious use of antibiotics in
437 livestock and communities, encouraging alternative options for disease control in livestock
438 like promotion of vaccinations. A key component of combating the increase of antibiotic
439 resistance will require a shift and promotion of One Health approach, that promotes
440 intersectoral, multidisciplinary collaborations and effective communication.

441

442 **Acknowledgements**

443 To the respondents.

444 Special appreciation goes to Kyegegwa district extension staff with which data for this report
445 thesis was successfully collected. Field supervisor Mr. Friday Kyomya.

446

447 **Author contributions**

448 Conceived the study: MAK, SH, MK, DO, CK, TO. Designed the questionnaire: MAK, DO,
449 TO, SH. Tested and applied the questionnaire: MAK. Analyzed the data: MAK, SH. Wrote
450 the paper: SH, TO, MAK, MK, DO.

451

452 **References**

- 453 1. Rohr JR, Barrett CB, Civitello DJ, Craft ME, Delius B, DeLeo GA, et al. Emerging human
454 infectious diseases and the links to global food production. *Nat Sustain*. 2019;2(6):445–56.
- 455 2. Padget M, Guillemot D, Delarocque-Astagneau E. Measuring antibiotic consumption in low-
456 income countries: a systematic review and integrative approach. *Int J Antimicrob Agents*
457 [Internet]. 2016;48:27–32. Available from:
458 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ijantimicag.2016.04.024>
- 459 3. Bebell LM, Muiru AN. Antibiotic use and emerging resistance: How can resource-limited
460 countries turn the tide? *Glob Heart*. 2014;9(3):347–58.
- 461 4. Jasovsky D, Littmann J, Zorzet A, Cars O. Antimicrobial Resistance - a threat to the world's
462 sustainable development. *Ups J Med Sci [Internet]*. 2016;121(3):159–64. Available from:
463 [http://www.daghammarskjold.se/publication/antimicrobial-resistance-threat-worlds-](http://www.daghammarskjold.se/publication/antimicrobial-resistance-threat-worlds-sustainable-development/)
464 [sustainable-development/](http://www.daghammarskjold.se/publication/antimicrobial-resistance-threat-worlds-sustainable-development/)
- 465 5. World Bank. Drug-Resistant Infections: A Threat to Our Economic Future. Washington, DC:
466 World Bank. License: Creative Commons Attribution CC BY 3.0 IGO; 2017. p. 172.
- 467 6. Dellit TH, Owens RC, McGowan JE, Gerding DN, Weinstein RA, Burke JP, et al. Summary of the
468 Infectious Diseases Society of America and the Society for Healthcare Epidemiology of
469 America guidelines for developing an institutional program to enhance antimicrobial
470 stewardship. *Infectious Diseases in Clinical Practice*. 2007;15(44):159–77.
- 471 7. O'Neill J. Tackling Drug-Resistant Infections Globally: Final Report and Recommendations.
472 [Internet]. Government of the United Kingdom; 2016. Available from: [http://amr-](http://amr-review.org/sites/default/files/160525_Final_paper_with_cover.pdf)
473 [review.org/sites/default/files/160525_Final paper_with cover.pdf](http://amr-review.org/sites/default/files/160525_Final_paper_with_cover.pdf)
- 474 8. Bhullar K, Waglechner N, Pawlowski A, Koteva K, Banks ED, Johnston MD, et al. Antibiotic
475 resistance is prevalent in an isolated cave microbiome. *PLoS One*. 2012;7(4):e34953.
- 476 9. Mukerji S, O'Dea M, Barton M, Kirkwood R, Lee T, Abraham S. Development and transmission
477 of antimicrobial resistance among Gram-negative bacteria in animals and their public health
478 impact. *Essays Biochem*. 2017;61(1):23–5.
- 479 10. Rosenblatt-Farrell N. The landscape of antibiotic resistance. *Environ Health Perspect*.
480 2009;117(6):A244–50.
- 481 11. Napolitano F, Izzo MT, di Giuseppe G, Angelillo IF. Public knowledge, attitudes, and experience
482 regarding the use of antibiotics in Italy. *PLoS One*. 2013;8(12):e84177.

- 483 12. Kamulegeya A, William B, Rwenyonyi CM. Knowledge and Antibiotics Prescription Pattern
484 among Ugandan Oral Health Care Providers: A Cross-sectional Survey. *J Dent Res Dent Clin*
485 *Dent Prospects* [Internet]. 2011;5(2):61–6. Available from:
486 <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23019511><http://www.pubmedcentral.nih.gov/articlerender.fcgi?artid=PMC3429993>
487
- 488 13. Chan YH, Fan MM, Fok CM, Lok ZL, Ni M, Sin CF, et al. Antibiotics nonadherence and
489 knowledge in a community with the world’s leading prevalence of antibiotics resistance:
490 Implications for public health intervention. *Am J Infect Control* [Internet]. 2012;40(2):113–7.
491 Available from: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ajic.2011.03.017>
- 492 14. You JHS, Yau B, Choi KC, Chau CTS, Huang QR, Lee SS. Public knowledge, attitudes and
493 behavior on antibiotic use: A telephone survey in Hong Kong. *Infection*. 2008;36(2):153–7.
- 494 15. Muloi D, Fèvre EM, Bettridge J, Rono R, Ong’are D, Hassell JM, et al. A cross-sectional survey
495 of practices and knowledge among antibiotic retailers in Nairobi, Kenya. *J Glob Health*.
496 2019;9(2):020412.
- 497 16. Vallin M, Polyzoi M, Marrone G, Rosales-Klitz S, Wisell KT, Lundborg CS. Knowledge and
498 attitudes towards antibiotic use and resistance - A latent class analysis of a Swedish
499 population-based sample. *PLoS One*. 2016;11:e0152160.
- 500 17. UBOS. Uganda Bureau of Statistics [Internet]. Available from:
501 <https://www.citypopulation.de/en/uganda/admin/>
- 502 18. R Core Team. R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R Foundation for
503 Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria. 2022;
- 504 19. Signorell A; et al. DescTools: Tools for descriptive statistics. R package version 0.99.45. 2022.
- 505 20. Linzer DA, Lewis JB. polCA: An R Package for Polytomous Variable Latent Class Analysis. *J Stat*
506 *Softw*. 2011;42:1–29.
- 507 21. Hothorn T, Zeileis A. partykit: A Modular Toolkit for Recursive Partytioning in R. *Journal of*
508 *Machine Learning Research*. 2015;16:3905–9.
- 509 22. Zeina K, Pamela AK, Fawwak S. Quantification of Antibiotic Residues and Determination of
510 Antimicrobial Resistance Profiles of Microorganisms Isolated from Bovine Milk in Lebanon.
511 *Food Nutr Sci*. 2013;04(07):1–9.
- 512 23. World Health Organization. Antibiotic resistance [Internet]. 2020. Available from:
513 <https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/antibiotic-resistance>
- 514 24. Sindato C, Mboera LEG, Katale BZ, Frumence G, Kimera S, Clark TG, et al. Knowledge, attitudes
515 and practices regarding antimicrobial use and resistance among communities of Ilala, Kilosa
516 and Kibaha districts of Tanzania. *Antimicrob Resist Infect Control*. 2020;9(1):194.
- 517 25. Mbwambo G, Emidi B, Mgabo MR, Sigalla GN, Kajeguka DC. Community knowledge and
518 attitudes on antibiotic use in Moshi Urban, Northern Tanzania: Findings from a cross sectional
519 study. *Afr J Microbiol Res*. 2017;11(25):1018–26.
- 520 26. Gebeyehu E, Bantie L, Azage M. Inappropriate use of antibiotics and its associated factors
521 among urban and rural communities of Bahir Dar city administration, northwest Ethiopia.
522 *PLoS One*. 2015;10(9):e0138179.

- 523 27. Nayiga S, Kayendeke M, Nabirye C, Willis LD, Chandler CIR, Staedke SG. Use of antibiotics to
524 treat humans and animals in Uganda: A cross-sectional survey of households and farmers in
525 rural, urban and peri-urban settings. *JAC Antimicrob Resist.* 2020;2(4):1–11.
- 526 28. Ocan M, Bwanga F, Bbosa GS, Bagenda D, Waako P, Ogwal-Okeng J, et al. Patterns and
527 predictors of self-medication in northern Uganda. *PLoS One.* 2014;9(3):e92323.
- 528 29. Awad A, Eltayeb I, Matowe L, Thalib L. Self-medication with antibiotics and antimalarials in the
529 community of Khartoum State, Sudan. *Journal of Pharmacy and Pharmaceutical Sciences.*
530 2005;8(2):326–31.
- 531 30. Vialle-Valentin CE, Lecates RF, Zhang F, Desta AT, Ross-Degnan D. Predictors of antibiotic use
532 in African communities: Evidence from medicines household surveys in five countries. *Tropical
533 Medicine and International Health.* 2012;17(2):211–22.
- 534 31. Babatunde OA, Fadare JO, Ojo OJ, Durowade KA, Atoyebi OA, Ajayi PO, et al. Self-medication
535 among health workers in a tertiary institution in South-West Nigeria. *Pan African Medical
536 Journal.* 2016;24:1–8.
- 537 32. James H, Handu SS, al Khaja KAJ, Otoom S, Sequeira RP. Evaluation of the knowledge, attitude
538 and practice of self-medication among first-year medical students. *Medical Principles and
539 Practice.* 2006;15(4):270–5.
- 540 33. Muhie OA. Antibiotic Use and Resistance Pattern in Ethiopia: Systematic Review and Meta-
541 Analysis. *Int J Microbiol.* 2019;2019:2489063.
- 542 34. Rather IA, Kim BC, Bajpai VK, Park YH. Self-medication and antibiotic resistance: Crisis, current
543 challenges, and prevention. *Saudi J Biol Sci.* 2017;24(4):808–12.
- 544 35. Geta K, Kibret M. Knowledge, attitudes and practices of animal farm owners/workers on
545 antibiotic use and resistance in Amhara region, north western Ethiopia. *Sci Rep.* 2021;11(1):1–
546 13.
- 547 36. Adebowale OO, Adeyemo OK, Awoyomi O, Dada R, Adebowale O. Antibiotic use and practices
548 in commercial poultry laying hens in Ogun State Nigeria. *Rev Elev Med Vet Pays Trop.*
549 2016;69(1):41.
- 550 37. de Briyne N, Atkinson J, Borriello SP, Pokludová L. Antibiotics used most commonly to treat
551 animals in Europe. *Veterinary Record.* 2014;175(13):325.
- 552 38. World Health Organisation. Monitoring Global Progress on Addressing Antimicrobial
553 Resistance [Internet]. 2018. Available from: <https://www.fao.org/3/CA0486EN/ca0486en.pdf>
- 554 39. WHO, FAO, OIE. Antimicrobial Resistance: A Manual for Developing National Action Plans
555 [Internet]. 2016. Available from: <https://apps.who.int/iris/rest/bitstreams/908090/retrieve>
- 556 40. Caudell MA, Quinlan MB, Subbiah M, Call DR, Roulette CJ, Roulette JW, et al. Antimicrobial
557 use and veterinary care among agro-pastoralists in Northern Tanzania. *PLoS One [Internet].*
558 2017;12(1):e0170328. Available from: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0170328>
- 559 41. Caudell MA, Dorado-Garcia A, Eckford S, Creese C, Byarugaba DK, Afakye K, et al. Towards a
560 bottom-up understanding of antimicrobial use and resistance on the farm: A knowledge,
561 attitudes, and practices survey across livestock systems in five African countries. *PLoS One*
562 [Internet]. 2020;15(1):e0220274. Available from:
563 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0220274>

- 564 42. Manishimwe R, Nishimwe K, Ojok L. Assessment of antibiotic use in farm animals in Rwanda.
565 Trop Anim Health Prod. 2017;49(6):1101–6.
- 566 43. World Organisation for Animal Health (OIE). OIE Annual report on antimicrobial agents
567 intended for use in animals: Better understanding of the global situation [Internet]. OIE
568 annual report. 2016. Available from:
569 [http://www.oie.int/fileadmin/Home/eng/Our_scientific_expertise/docs/pdf/AMR/Annual_Re](http://www.oie.int/fileadmin/Home/eng/Our_scientific_expertise/docs/pdf/AMR/Annual_Report_AMR_2.pdf)
570 [port_AMR_2.pdf](http://www.oie.int/fileadmin/Home/eng/Our_scientific_expertise/docs/pdf/AMR/Annual_Report_AMR_2.pdf)
- 571 44. Pavlov, A., Lashev, L., Rusev V. Studies on the Residue Levels of Tobramycin in Stored Poultry
572 Products. Trakia Journal of Sciences. 2005;3(5):20–2.

573

574 **Supporting information**

575 S1 Questionnaire in English

576

577 S2 Data

578

579 S3 Code for analysis

580

581 S4 Table Results of the multinomial logistic regression to assess the association between
582 demographic factors and latent class membership of attitude towards antibiotic access, usage
583 and disposal

584

585 S5 Table Results of the multinomial logistic regression to assess the association between
586 demographic factors and latent class membership of attitude towards antibiotic resistance

587

588 **Figures**

589 Figure 1 Results of the polytomous latent class analysis for the manifest variables (questions)
590 to assess the attitude towards antibiotic access, usage and disposal

591

592 Figure 2 Conditional inference tree for predicted class membership and association with risk
593 fact factors

594

595 Figure 3 Results of the polytomous latent class analysis for the manifest variables (questions)
596 to assess the attitude towards antibiotic resistance


597

598 Figure 4 Conditional inference tree for predicted class membership and association with risk
599 fact factors


600

601


Class 1: population share = 0.644




Class 2: population share = 0.164



Class 3: population share = 0.191




Figure




Figure


Class 1: population share = 0.545




Class 2: population share = 0.177



Class 3: population share = 0.278



Figure



Figure