medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.06.03.21258263; this version posted January 19, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Knowledge, attitude and practice towards antibiotic use and resistance among the veterinarians in Bangladesh

Md Samun Sarker[1], Iftekhar Ahmed[2], Nure Alam Siddiky[1], Shariful Islam[3], Ruhena Begum[1], Ayesha Ahmed[4], Fatema Akter Mahua[4], Md Ehsanul Kabir[1], Mohammed A. Samad[1*]

[1] Antimicrobial Resistance Action Center (ARAC), Bangladesh Livestock Research Institute (BLRI), Savar, Dhaka-1341, Bangladesh

[2] Department of Pharmacy, Jahangirnagar University, Bangladesh

[3] Institute of Epidemiology, Disease Control and Research (IEDCR), Mohakhali-1212, Bangladesh

[4] Department of Public health and Informatics, Jahangirnagar University, Bangladesh

*** Corresponding author**

E-mail: msamad@blri.gov.bd, Tel.: +88 01717047877

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.06.03.21258263; this version posted January 19, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Abstract

Background

The emergence of antimicrobial resistance is growing human and animal health concern around the world. When a number of studies have emphasized the Knowledge, Attitude and Practice (KAP) regarding antibiotic use and resistance in humans, little attention has been paid to the veterinary sector. The aim of this study was to understand the KAP towards antibiotic use and resistance among the veterinarians in Bangladesh.

Methods

A cross-sectional online based questionnaire survey was conducted from August to September 2020 among the registered veterinary practitioners. A self-administered Google form questionnaire consists of 45 questions on knowledge, attitude and practice regarding antibiotic use and resistance were used.

Results

A total of 208 registered veterinarians participated in this study. 85.1% of the participants were male and 54.8% of the participants had a Masters degree. Around 52% of the veterinarians were poultry practitioners. All respondents were familiar with antimicrobials. The participants (91.4%) knew that antibiotics can not cure viral infections while 97.6% believed that frequent antibiotic prescription rendered them less effective. Participants claimed that only they are eligible to prescribe drugs for the treatment of animals and around 80% disagreed with adding antibiotics with feed/water as a growth promoter in livestock. Of the total participants, 87% believed that a local antimicrobial guideline would be more

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.06.03.21258263; this version posted January 19, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

effective than an international one. However, gaps in practices were highlighted in our study, suggesting training deficiencies.

Conclusion

The present study for the first time conducted in Bangladesh dictates the future interventions like academic courses, workshops, and seminars on antibiotic usage and resistance are needed to ameliorate the knowledge, behavior and practice of veterinarians with regards to the rational use of antibiotics.

Introduction

The global development of intensive farming has led to an upsurge in antimicrobial use (AMU) that leads to the emergence and spread of antimicrobial resistance (AMR) [1]. Antibiotics are used as therapeutic as well as growth promotion purposes in animal farming practices in Bangladesh. Irrational use of antibiotics in animals is considered one of the key drivers of AMR evolution [2]. Worldwide consumption of antibiotics in animals is very high and it is expected to rise 67% by 2030 [1]. Most antibiotics are used in both human and animal interface, so the emergence of resistance through veterinary use is likely to have consequences on human health [3-5]. Bangladesh has been experiencing a high incidence of AMR [6,7]. Misuse and abuse of antibiotics are common both in humans and in animals in Bangladesh [6, 8-10]. A study with 73 poultry farms in Bangladesh reported usage of antibiotics without prescribing by registered veterinarians [10]. The same study found the presence of residual antibiotics in 26% of the tested samples (breast, thigh and liver) [10]. A study revealed that majority of the antibiotics used in the poultry farms were falls under Watch and Reserve group rather than Access [11]. Antibiotics in the Watch group have a greater resistance potential and comprise the majority of the top priority agents among the

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.06.03.21258263; this version posted January 19, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

critically important antimicrobials for human medicine and/or antibiotics that are at reasonably high risk of bacterial resistance selection. Reserve group antibiotics should be reserved for the treatment of infections caused by multidrug-resistant organisms, whether confirmed or suspected. Antibiotics in the reserve category should be used only as a 'last resort'. Antibiotics in the access group are active against a broad variety of regularly encountered susceptible infections while also having a lesser resistance potential than antibiotics in the other categories. The findings of other studies identified that registered veterinarians also prescribed higher classes of antibiotics widely for treating healthy and unhealthy poultry flocks [12,13].

The WHO recommends an overall reduction of medically important antimicrobial use in food-producing animals, as well as a complete cessation for disease prevention and growth promotion of food-producing animals [14]. The Government of Bangladesh has enacted "animal and fish feed act 2010" which prohibited the use of all antibiotics in animal and fish feed [15], but subsequent studies showed that such laws were not properly enforced and the use of antibiotics with animal feeds is quite common [8–10]. This shows that unless raising awareness, motivational and ownership among the veterinarians, farmers, feed sellers, drug sellers, misuse of antibiotics in livestock will most likely continue to persist.

Any change in practice must start with the animal healthcare providers, followed by changes in the antibiotic usage among the farmers. To make effective and sustainable strategies, recommendations and treatment guidelines to maximize the therapeutic efficacy and reduce AMR in both human and animals, assessing the knowledge, attitude and practice (KAP) of veterinary practitioners are pertinent. Many countries has already been conducted similar studies to do deep this issue in a numbers perspective related to human and animals [16–20]. Nevertheless, such study is still lacking from Bangladesh. In Bangladesh, the KAP regarding

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.06.03.21258263; this version posted January 19, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

antibiotic use and resistance among veterinary students has been reported previously [21]. Therefore, in this study, we have explored the KAP of the veterinarians of Bangladesh regarding antibiotic use and resistance. To our knowledge, this is the first antibiotic KAP study among the Bangladeshi veterinarians.

Methods

Study design and sampling

A cross-sectional study was conducted from August to September, 2020 using a self administered questionnaire. Using a purposive sampling, data collection was conducted among the registered veterinary practitioners of Bangladesh listed by the Bangladesh Veterinary Council (BVC)-government regulatory body of veterinary legislation and certification for veterinary practices in Bangladesh. To date, there are 7536 registered veterinarian in Bangladesh. BVC listed veterinarians are only certified person to treat and prescribe the antibiotics for the animals. Through social media(Facebook, LinkedIn and WhatsApp), the questionnaire was posted and circulated in different veterinary professional groups. The social media based survey was launched on August 05, 2020. In mid-September, 2020, the online questionnaire link of questionnaire was also messaged via mobile and facebook messanger text and emailed to each registered veterinarian to boost the response rate. Regarding the sample size, the aim was to include as many veterinarians as possible.

Questionnaire development

An online based approximate 20-30 minutes long questionnaire was developed using the Google Forms platform by a multidisciplinary team consisting of microbiologist, public health specialist and epidemiologist. The questionnaire comprised of four sections: the first one consisted of the demographic information of the veterinarians, second section included

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.06.03.21258263; this version posted January 19, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

13 questions on knowledge on antibiotics and AMR, third section contained 14 questions on attitudes and fourth section had 18 questions on practices regarding antibiotic use and their resistance. The majority of the answers were in multiple choice format. The questionnaire was pretested among the veterinarians at the Antimicrobial Resistance Action Center (ARAC), Bangladesh Livestock Research Institute (BLRI) to validate and finalize the questionnaire. Finally, minor changes has been made in compliance with participants response and was circulated to the registered veterinarians. All the participants from ARAC in the pilot study were reminded to not participate in the final survey. Respondents were asked to read the consent paper and made aware of the purpose of the study and requested to provide consent before participating in the survey. The participation in the survey was completely non-compulsory and unpaid. If participants were willing to participate in the survey, they were first asked to click the "Yes" button as a consent before continuing to the next sections. To prevent the loss of confidentiality, no identifying information of the participant was collected. In addition, all data were exported into an excel file and given a serial number. This data was only accessible to the research team and investigators.

Ethical considerations

The study protocol was reviewed and approved by the ARAC, Animal Health Research Division, BLRI, Bangladesh (Approval no: 05/06/2020:06).

Statistical analysis

Quantitative data were entered into MS excel-2013 (Microsoft Corporation, Redmond, WA 98052, USA) and analyzed in STATA/IC-13 (StataCorp, 4905, Lakeway Drive, College station, Texas 77845, USA). Descriptive analysis was conducted to determine the frequency and percentage of responses regarding KAP. We used Chi-square test or the Fisher exact test

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.06.03.21258263; this version posted January 19, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

to identify the potential association between variables with different age groups, field of expertise, type of service and years of experience of the veterinary practitioners. The statistical significance was set at $p \leq 0.05$.

Results

Participants' characteristics

A total number of 208 veterinarians responded and took part in the questionnaire survey from eight administrative divisions of all Bangladesh. Most of the participants were male (177/208; 85.1%), and 93.8% (195/208) were at the age from 25-35 years old. About 44% (92/208) had a Doctor of Veterinary Medicine (DVM) degree while about 55% (114/208) had a Master's degree. Half of the veterinarians were poultry practitioners and the rest were pet animals and large and small animals practitioners. Around 31% (65/208) had an experience of greater than 5 years. Detailed characteristics of the participants are presented in Table 1.

Table 1. Sociodemographic characteristics of the participants

Characteristic	Number (n)	Percentage (%)
Gender		
Male	177	85.1
Female	31	14.9
Education		
DVM	92	44.2
Masters	114	54.8
PhD	2	0.96
Age		
25-30 Years	109	52.4
31-35 Years	86	41.4
Above 36 Years	13	6.3
Field of expertise		
Poultry practitioner	108	51.9
Pet animals' practitioner	18	8.7
Large & Small Animals' Practitioner	82	39.4
Type of Service		
Private	155	74.5
Governmental	53	25.5
Years of practice		
>1 Year	39	18.8
1-3 Year	63	30.3
>3-5 Years	41	19.7
Above 5 Years	65	31.3
Job location (Division)		
Barisal	8	3.9
Chittagong	71	34.1

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.06.03.21258263; this version posted January 19, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Dhaka	59	28.4
Khulna	3	1.4
Mymensingh	15	7.2
Rajshahi	30	14.4
Rangpur	17	8.2
Sylhet	5	2.4

Knowledge on antibiotics and AMR

Almost all respondents were familiar with antimicrobials and antibiotics, but 17.3% were unaware that antibiotics are different from antimicrobials. Although most participants (91.4%) knew that antibiotics cannot cure viral infections, 33.6% believed the use of antibiotics would speed up recovery from common cold, cough, and other viral infections. The vets (47.6%) who had experienced of more than 1 to 3 years of practicing thought antibiotics would be effective against common cold, cough and viral infections. All of the vets were aware of antibiotic resistance and 97.6% knew that frequent prescription of antibiotics can render them less effective. However, some practitioners (6.7%) were unaware of the concept of antibiotic susceptibility testing. In addition, all vets regardless of age, field of expertise, type of service and experience believed biosecurity and improved hygiene could reduce the use of antibiotics (Table 2).

Table 2. Veterinarian's knowledge on antibiotic use and resistance

Knowledge statements	Overall n (%)	Age groups (Year) n (%)				Field of expertise n (%)					Type of Service n (%)				Years of practice n (%)					
		25-30	31-35	>36	P value	Poultry	Pet animals	Large & small animals	Chi-square value	P value	Private	Government	Chi-square value	P value	<1	1-3	>3-5	>5	Chi-square value	P value
K1. Do you know 'antimicrobial' (Ans-Yes)																				
Yes	208 (100)	109 (100)	86 (100)	13 (100)		108 (100)	18 (100)	82 (100)			155 (100)	53 (100)			39 (100)	63 (100)	41 (100)	65 (100)		
No	0	0	0	0		0	0	0			0	0			0	0	0	0		
K2. Are you familiar with the concept of antibiotics? (Ans-Yes)																				
Yes	207 (99.5)	109 (100)	85 (98.9)	13 (100)	0.49	107 (99.1)	18 (100)	82 (100)	0.93	0.63	154 (99.4)	53 (100)	0.34	0.56	39 (100)	63 (100)	40 (97.6)	65 (100)	4.09	0.25
No	1 (0.5)	0	1 (1.2)	0		1 (0.93)	0	0			1 (0.6)	0			0	0	1 (2.4)	0		
K3. Do you think that antibiotic is different from antimicrobials? (Ans-Yes)																				
Yes	169 (81.3)	88 (80.7)	70 (81.4)	11 (84.6)		89 (82.4)	13 (72.2)	67 (81.7)			128 (82.6)	41 (77.4)			31 (79.5)	52 (82.5)	33 (80.5)	53 (81.5)		
No	36 (17.3)	20 (18.4)	14 (16.3)	2 (15.4)	0.91	19 (17.6)	4 (22.2)	13 (15.9)	4.79	0.31	25 (16.1)	11 (20.8)	0.72	0.69	7 (18)	10 (15.9)	8 (19.5)	11 (17)	1.18	0.98
Blank/No Answer	3 (1.4)	1 (0.9)	2 (2.3)	0		0	1 (5.6)	2 (2.4)			2 (1.3)	1 (1.9)			1 (2.6)	1 (1.6)	0	1 (1.5)		
K4. Do you know about antibiotic withdrawal period? (Ans-Yes)																				
Yes	206 (99.04)	108 (99.1)	85 (98.8)	13 (100)	0.92	106 (98.1)	18 (100)	82 (100)	1.87	0.39	153 (98.7)	53 (100)	0.69	0.41	38 (97.4)	62 (98.4)	41 (100)	65 (100)	2.34	0.51
No	2 (0.96)	1 (0.9)	1 (1.2)	0		2 (1.9)	0	0			2 (1.3)	0			1 (2.6)	1 (1.6)	0	0		
K5. Do you know about antibiotic susceptibility testing? (Ans-Yes)																				
Yes	193 (92.8)	101 (92.7)	82 (95.4)	10 (76.9)		99 (91.7)	17 (94.4)	77 (93.9)			144 (92.9)	49 (92.5)			37 (94.9)	59 (93.7)	39 (95.1)	58 (89.2)		
No	14 (6.7)	8 (7.3)	3 (3.5)	3 (6.7)	0.08	8 (7.4)	1 (5.6)	5 (6.1)	1.12	0.89	10 (6.5)	4 (7.6)	0.42	0.81	2 (5.1)	4 (6.4)	2 (4.9)	6 (9.3)	3.31	0.77
Blank	1 (0.5)	0	1 (1.2)	0		1 (0.9)	0	0			1 (0.7)	0			0	0	0	1 (1.5)		
K6. Do you know about antibiotic resistance?(Ans-Yes)																				
Yes	208 (100)	109 (100)	86 (100)	13 (100)		108 (100)	18 (100)	82 (100)			155 (100)	53 (100)			39 (100)	63 (100)	41 (100)	65 (100)		
No	0	0	0	0		0	0	0			0	0			0	0	0	0		
K7. Do you know any antibiotics that are prohibited to use in livestock? (Ans-Yes)																				
Yes	197 (94.7)	105 (96.3)	80 (93)	12 (92.3)		101 (93.5)	17 (94.4)	79 (96.3)			146 (94.2)	51 (96.2)			38 (97.4)	58 (92.1)	40 (97.6)	61 (93.9)		
No	10 (4.8)	4 (3.7)	5 (5.8)	1 (7.7)	0.71	7 (6.5)	1 (5.6)	2 (2.4)	3.18	0.53	9 (5.8)	1 (1.9)	4.21	0.12	1 (2.6)	5 (7.9)	1 (2.4)	3 (4.6)	4.49	0.61
Blank	1 (0.5)	0	1 (1.2)	0		0	0	1 (1.2)			0	1 (1.9)			0	0	0	1 (1.5)		
K8. Antibiotics can be used to cure infections caused by bacteria (Ans -True)																				
True	205 (98.6)	107 (98.1)	85 (98.8)	13 (100)		107 (99.1)	18 (100)	80 (97.6)			153 (98.7)	52 (98.1)			38 (97.4)	63 (100)	40 (97.6)	64 (98.5)		
False	2 (0.96)	2 (1.8)	0	0	0.52	1 (0.9)	0	1 (1.2)	1.8	0.8	2 (1.3)	0	3.6	0.16	1 (2.6)	0	1 (2.4)	0	5.43	0.49
Blank	1 (0.5)	0	1 (1.2)	0		0	0	1 (1.2)			0	1 (0.5)			0	0	0	1 (1.54)		
K9. Antibiotics can be used to cure infections caused by virus(Ans-False)																				

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.06.03.1258263; this version posted January 19, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license.

True	15 (7.2)	9 (8.3)	6 (7)	0		8 (7.4)	2 (11.1)	5 (6.1)			12 (7.7)	3 (5.7)			4 (10.3)	4 (6.4)	1 (2.4)	6 (9.2)		
False	190 (91.4)	98 (89.9)	79 (91.9)	13 (100)	0.81	99 (91.7)	16 (88.9)	75 (91.5)	1.56	0.82	141 (91)	49 (92.5)	0.34	0.84	34 (87.2)	58 (92.1)	40 (97.6)	58 (89.2)	3.46	0.75
Blank	3 (1.44)	0	3 (1.2)	0		1 (0.9)	0	2 (2.4)			2 (1.3)	1 (1.9)			1 (2.6)	1 (1.6)	0	1 (1.5)		
K10. Do you think the use of antibiotics will speed up recovery of cold, cough and other diseases caused by common flu virus?(Ans-No)																				
Yes	70 (33.6)	42 (38.5)	25 (29.1)	3 (23.1)	0.27	38 (35.2)	07 (38.9)	25 (30.5)	0.71	0.70	53 (34.2)	17 (32.1)	0.08	0.78	8 (20.5)	30 (47.6)	11 (26.8)	21 (32.3)	9.43	0.02
No	138 (66.4)	67 (61.5)	61 (70.9)	10 (76.9)		70 (64.8)	11 (61.1)	57 (69.5)			102 (65.8)	36 (67.9)			31 (79.5)	33 (52.4)	30 (73.2)	44 (67.7)		
K11. Do you think frequent prescribe of antibiotics will decrease the efficacy of drug?(Ans-Yes)																				
Yes	203 (97.6)	107 (98.2)	83 (96.5)	13 (100)		105 (97.2)	18 (100)	80 (97.6)			152 (98.1)	51 (96.2)			38 (97.4)	61 (96.8)	41 (100)	63 (96.9)		
No	4 (1.9)	1 (0.9)	3 (3.5)	0	0.58	2 (1.9)	0	2 (2.5)	1.4	0.84	3 (1.9)	1 (1.9)	0.34	0.23	0	2 (3.2)	0	2 (3.1)	6.87	0.33
Blank	1 (0.5)	1 (0.9)	0	0		1 (0.9)	0	0			0	1 (1.9)			1 (2.6)	0	0	0		
K12. Do you think antibiotic should be used for disease prevention? (Ans-No)																				
Yes	18 (8.7)	8 (7.3)	7 (8.1)	3 (23.1)	0.16	8 (7.4)	1 (5.6)	9 (10.9)	0.99	0.61	14 (9)	4 (7.6)	0.11	0.74	4 (10.3)	5 (7.9)	1 (2.4)	8 (12.3)	3.27	0.352
No	190 (91.4)	101 (92.7)	79 (91.9)	10 (76.4)		100 (92.6)	17 (94.4)	73 (89)			141 (91)	49 (92.5)			35 (89.7)	58 (92.1)	40 (97.6)	57 (87.7)		
K13. Do you think biosecurity and improved hygiene can reduce the use of antibiotics? (Ans-Yes)																				
Yes	208 (100)	109 (100)	86 (100)	13 (100)		108 (100)	18 (100)	82 (100)			155 (100)	53 (100)			39 (100)	63 (100)	41 (100)	65 (100)		
No	0	0	0	0		0	0	0			0	0			0	0	0	0		

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.06.03.21258265
(which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to
It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .
The copyright holder for this preprint
display the preprint in perpetuity.
this version posted January 19, 2022.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.06.03.21258263; this version posted January 19, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Attitude towards antibiotic use and resistance

Out of the 208 participants, 207 opinioned that only veterinarians are eligible to prescribe drugs for animals. Moreover, nearly all agreed that antibiotic abuse is prevalent in veterinary practices in Bangladesh. Practitioners also had a positive attitude towards vaccination for the purpose of preventing diseases and for reducing the use of antibiotics in animals. Most practitioners (99%) felt that national guideline on rational antibiotic use is necessary and 87% believed a local antimicrobial guideline would be more useful than an international one. Around 80% disagreed with adding antibiotics with feed/water as a growth promoter in poultry and livestock. Regarding the major reasons of antibiotic resistance, irrational use of antibiotics was identified as the primary cause by 94.71%, followed by over-the-counter use, low dose, low-quality antibiotics, and waste disposal of antibiotics (Fig 1). Around 98% vets agreed that inappropriate or half course of antibiotics lead to antibiotic resistance. The lack of exposure and training regarding antibiotics and resistance had seen in middle aged vets. In addition, 48.2% poultry practitioners, 44.5% private veterinarians and 50.8% who had experienced from 1 to 3 years of practicing did not attend any training or workshop on AMR has impacts on attitude regarding antibiotics and resistance. Importantly, all aged group vets showed indifference attitude if individual or animal could not be treated with antibiotics whereas vets in different service (A5) and practicing (A5 and 6) showed significant attitude (Table 3).

Fig 1. Major reasons of AMR indicated by the veterinarians

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.06.03.21258263; this version posted January 19, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license.

Table 3. Practitioner's attitude towards antibiotic use and resistance

Attitude statements	Overall n (%)	Age groups (Year) n (%)				Field of expertise n (%)					Type of service n (%)				Years of practice n (%)					
		25-30	31-35	>36	P value	Poultry	Pet animals	Large & small animals'	Chi-square value	P value	Private	Government	Chi-square value	P value	<1	1-3	>3-5	>5	Chi-square value	P value
A1. In your opinion, only veterinarians are eligible for drugs prescriptions for animals?																				
Yes	207 (99.5)	108 (99.1)	86 (100)	13 (100)	0.63	108 (100)	18 (100)	81 (98.8)	1.54	0.46	154 (99.4)	53 (100)	0.34	0.56	39 (100)	62 (98.4)	41 (100)	65 (100)	2.31	0.51
No	1 (0.5)	1 (0.9)	0	0		0	0	1 (1.2)			1 (0.7)	0			0	1 (1.6)	0	0		
A2. Use of antibiotic																				
For therapeutic reasons	201 (96.6)	106 (97.3)	82 (95.4)	13 (100)	0.60	105 (97.2)	18 (100)	78 (95.1)	1.32	0.52	150 (96.8)	51 (96.2)	0.04	0.85	38 (97.4)	61 (96.8)	40 (97.6)	62 (95.4)	0.51	0.918
For prophylactic reasons	7 (3.4)	3 (2.8)	4 (4.7)	0		3 (2.8)	0	4 (4.9)			5 (3.2)	2 (3.8)			1 (2.6)	2 (3.2)	1 (2.4)	3 (4.6)		
To increase growth rates or production	0	0	0	0		0	0	0			0	0			0	0	0	0		
A3. At present, there is abuse of antibiotics																				
Yes	205 (98.6)	107 (98.2)	85 (98.8)	13 (100)	0.84	106 (98.2)	18 (100)	81 (98.8)	0.42	0.81	152 (98.1)	53 (100)	1.05	0.31	38 (97.4)	63 (100)	40 (97.6)	64 (98.5)	1.56	0.67
No	3 (1.4)	2 (1.8)	1 (1.2)	0		2 (1.9)	0	1 (1.2)			3 (1.9)	0			1 (2.6)	0	1 (2.4)	1 (1.5)		
A4. Antibiotic resistance affects you and your family's health																				
Agree	206 (99)	108 (99.1)	85 (98.8)	13 (100)		106 (98.2)	18 (100)	82 (100)			153 (98.7)	53 (100)			39 (100)	62 (98.4)	41 (100)	64 (98.5)		
Disagree	0	0	0	0	0.921	0	0	0	1.87	0.393	0	0	0.69	0.406	0	0	0	0	1.26	0.738
Neutral	2 (1)	1 (0.9)	1 (1.2)	0		2 (1.9)	0	0			2 (1.3)	0			0	1 (1.6)	0	1 (1.5)		
A5. When a disease in individual can't be treated with antibiotics, how serious do you think it could be?																				
Very serious	119 (57.2)	67 (61.5)	46 (53.5)	6 (46.2)		52 (48.2)	13 (72.2)	54 (65.9)			82 (52.9)	37 (69.8)			23 (59)	35 (55.6)	27 (65.9)	34 (52.3)		
Serious	53 (25.5)	24 (22)	26 (30.2)	3 (23.1)		29 (26.9)	5 (27.8)	19 (23.2)			43 (27.7)	10 (18.9)			6 (15.4)	22 (34.9)	11 (26.8)	14 (21.5)		
Less serious	11 (5.3)	9 (8.3)	2 (2.3)	0	0.104	9 (8.3)	0	2 (2.4)	15.07	0.06	7 (4.5)	4 (7.6)	12.55	0.01	5 (12.8)	3 (4.8)	0	3 (4.6)	24.65	0.02
Not serious at all	24 (11.5)	8 (7.3)	12 (14)	4 (30.8)		18 (16.7)	0	6 (7.3)			23 (14.8)	1 (1.9)			4 (10.3)	3 (4.8)	0	14 (21.5)		
Blank	1 (0.5)	1 (0.9)	0	0		0	0	1 (1.2)			0	1 (1.9)			1 (2.6)	0	0	0		
A6. When a disease in animal cannot be treated with antibiotics, how serious do you think it could be?																				
Very serious	114 (54.8)	64 (58.7)	44 (51.2)	6 (46.2)		52 (48.2)	12 (6.7)	50 (61)			81 (52.3)	33 (62.3)			24 (61.5)	34 (54)	21 (51.2)	35 (53.9)		
Serious	60 (28.9)	28 (25.7)	29 (33.7)	3 (23.1)		33 (30.6)	6 (33.3)	21 (25.6)			45 (29)	15 (28.3)			5 (12.8)	23 (36.5)	17 (41.5)	15 (23.1)		
Less serious	10 (4.8)	8 (7.3)	2 (2.3)	0	0.18	7 (6.5)	0	3 (3.7)	7.74	0.46	8 (5.2)	2 (3.8)	4.63	0.33	4 (10.3)	4 (6.4)	0	2 (3.1)	23.25	0.03
Not serious at all	22 (10.6)	8 (7.3)	10 (11.6)	4 (30.8)		15 (13.9)	0	7 (8.5)			20 (12.9)	2 (3.8)			5 (12.8)	2 (3.2)	3 (7.3)	12 (18.5)		
Blank	2 (0.96)	1 (0.9)	1 (1.2)	0		1 (0.9)	0	1 (1.2)			1 (0.7)	1 (1.9)			1 (2.6)	0	0	1 (1.5)		
A7. Do you think vaccination can prevent disease?																				
Yes	207 (99.5)	108 (99.1)	86 (100)	13 (100)	0.63	107 (99.1)	18 (100)	82 (100)	0.93	0.63	154 (99.4)	53 (100)	0.35	0.56	39 (100)	63 (100)	40 (97.6)	65 (100)		
No	1 (0.5)	1 (0.9)	0	0		1 (0.9)	0	0			1 (0.7)	0			0	0	1 (2.4)	0	4.1	0.25

A8. Do you think vaccination can reduce the uses of antibiotics?																				
Yes	203 (97.6)	105 (96.3)	85 (98.8)	13 (100)	0.44	104 (96.3)	18 (100)	81 (98.8)	1.71	0.43	150 (96.8)	53 (100)	1.76	0.19	37 (94.9)	62 (98.4)	40 (97.6)	64 (98.5)	1.62	0.655
No	5 (2.4)	4 (3.7)	1 (1.2)	0		4 (3.7)	0	1 (1.2)			5 (3.2)	0			2 (5.1)	1 (1.6)	1 (2.4)	1 (1.5)		
A9. Is it necessary to establish a law on “Rational use of antibiotics” at the national level?																				
Yes	206 (99)	107 (98.2)	86 (100)	13 (100)	0.4	106 (98.2)	18 (100)	82 (100)	1.87	0.39	153 (98.7)	53 (100)	0.69	0.41	39 (100)	62 (98.4)	41 (100)	64 (98.5)	1.26	0.74
No	2 (1)	2 (1.8)	0	0		2 (1.9)	0	0			2 (1.3)	0			0	1 (1.6)	0	1 (1.5)		
A10. A local antimicrobial guideline would be more useful than international one																				
Yes	181 (87)	91 (83.5)	79 (91.9)	11 (84.6)		91 (84.3)	17 (94.4)	73 (89)			131 (84.5)	50 (94.3)			33 (84.6)	55 (87.3)	35 (85.4)	58 (89.2)		
No	26 (12.5)	17 (15.6)	7 (8.1)	2 (15.4)	0.47	17 (15.7)	1 (5.6)	8 (9.8)	3.88	0.42	23 (14.8)	3 (5.7)	3.45	0.18	5 (12.8)	8 (12.7)	6 (14.6)	7 (10.8)	4.72	
Blank	1 (0.5)	1 (0.9)	0	0		0	0	1 (1.2)			1 (0.7)	0			1 (2.6)	0	0	0		0.58
A11. It is important to add antibiotic with feed/water as growth promoter in livestock																				
Agree	10 (4.8)	2 (1.8)	8 (9.3)	0		3 (2.8)	1 (5.6)	6 (7.3)			8 (5.2)	2 (3.8)			1 (2.6)	3 (4.8)	0	6 (9.2)		
Disagree	165 (79.3)	89 (81.7)	67 (77.9)	9 (69.2)		90 (83.3)	15 (83.3)	60 (73.2)			119 (76.8)	46 (86.8)			28 (71.8)	50 (79.4)	36 (87.8)	51 (78.5)		
Neutral	32 (15.4)	17 (15.6)	11 (12.8)	4 (30.8)	0.13	15 (13.9)	2 (11.1)	15 (18.3)	5.03	0.54	27 (17.4)	5 (9.4)	2.63	0.45	9 (23.1)	10 (15.9)	5 (12.2)	8 (12.3)	12.2	0.20
Blank	1 (0.5)	1 (0.9)	0	0		0	0	1 (1.2)			1 (0.7)	0			1 (2.6)	0	0	0		
A12. Inappropriate use or half course of antibiotics leads to antibiotic resistance																				
Agree	203 (97.6)	108 (99.1)	85 (98.8)	10 (76.9)		106 (98.2)	18 (100)	79 (96.3)			151 (97.4)	52 (98.1)			38 (97.4)	62 (98.4)	41 (100)	62 (95.4)		
Disagree	1 (0.5)	0	0	1 (7.7)	0.0001	0	0	1 (1.2)	2.03	0.73	0	1 (1.9)	4.29	0.117	0	0	0	1 (1.5)	3.62	0.73
Neutral	4 (1.9)	1 (0.9)	1 (1.2)	2 (15.4)		2 (1.9)	0	2 (2.4)			4 (2.6)	0			1 (2.6)	1 (1.6)	0	2 (3.1)		
Blank	0	0	0	0		0	0	0			0	0			0	0	0	0		
A13. An appropriate withdrawal period is needed before selling to avoid antibiotic residue in food animal?																				
Agree	205 (98.6)	108 (99.1)	84 (97.7)	13 (100)		107 (99.1)	18 (100)	80 (97.6)			152 (98.1)	53 (100)			38 (97.4)	63 (100)	40 (97.6)	64 (98.5)		
Disagree	2 (1)	0	2 (2.3)	0	0.44	1 (0.9)	0	1 (1.2)	1.79	0.78	2 (1.3)	0	1.04	0.594	0	0	1 (2.4)	1 (1.5)	6.49	0.37
Neutral	1 (0.5)	1 (0.9)	0	0		0	0	1 (1.2)			1 (0.7)	0			1 (2.6)	0	0	0		
Blank	0	0	0	0							0	0			0	0	0	0		
A15. Have you ever attended any training/conference/seminar/workshop on antimicrobial resistance?																				
Yes	127 (61.1)	69 (63.3)	49 (57)	9 (69.2)	0.549	56 (51.9)	11 (61.1)	60 (73.2)	8.91	0.01	86 (55.5)	41 (77.4)	7.95	0.01	32 (82.1)	31 (49.2)	26 (63.4)	38 (58.5)	11.23	0.01
No	81 (38.9)	40 (36.7)	37 (43.)	4 (30.8)		52 (48.2)	7 (38.9)	22 (26.8)			69 (44.5)	12 (22.6)			7 (18)	32 (50.8)	15 (36.6)	27 (41.5)		

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.06.03.21258263; this version posted January 19, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.06.03.21258263; this version posted January 19, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

The practice of the veterinarians regarding antibiotic prescribing

The majority (70.2%) of the veterinarians reported that they sometimes prescribe antibiotics over the phone or without examining the animals. Also, only 9.1% of the practitioners always or often recommend antimicrobial susceptibility testing before prescribing an antibiotic agents. Half of the participants prefer broad-spectrum antibiotics while the other half prefer narrow-spectrum antibiotics. Results also showed that antibiotics constitute a large percentage of daily prescribed drugs. Moreover, combined antibiotic therapy is also preferred to single therapy by about 65% of the practitioners, and old generation antibiotics are preferred to new generation antibiotics by most (63.5%) as a first-line treatment. Some practitioners (26%) reported prescribing antibiotics without determining the bodyweight of the animals. Most practitioners (74.5) do not mention the antibiotic withdrawal period in the prescriptions. When exploring the factors considered by the vets while prescribing antibiotics, the severity of the disease was found to be the most important factor. The vets also considered other factors such as availability of an antibiotic in the local market, culture sensitivity test report, economic status of the owner, and owners' demand for antibiotics (Fig 2). There was significant variation in relation with practitioners age (P15 and 18), expertise (P4, 6, 11 and 13), type of service (P2, 10 and 17) and experienced (P2) and antibiotic practices (Table 4).

Fig 2. Factors considered by veterinarians while prescribing antibiotics

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.06.03.21258263; this version posted January 19, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license.

212 **Table 4. Practice of veterinary practitioner's regarding antibiotic and resistance**

Practice statements	Overall n (%)	Age groups (Year) n (%)				Field of expertise n (%)					Type of service n (%)				Years of practice n (%)					
		25-30	31-35	>36	P value	Poultry	Pet animals	Large & small animals	Chi-square value	P value	Private	Government	Chi-square value	P value	0-1	1-3	3-5	>5	Chi-square value	P value
P1. Do you prescribe antibiotics over phone or without seeing/examining animals?																				
Often/Always	6 (2.9)	5 (4.6)	1 (1.2)	0	0.231	2 (1.85)	0	4 (4.8)	2.15	0.708	5 (3.2)	1 (1.9)	0.28	0.871	2 (5.1)	3 (4.7)	0	1 (1.5)	4.3	0.637
Sometimes	146 (70.2)	70 (64.2)	67 (77.9)	9 (69.2)		76 (70.4)	13 (72.2)	57 (69.5)			108 (69.7)	38 (71.7)			25 (64.1)	42 (66.7)	30 (73.2)	49 (75.4)		
Never/rarely	56 (26.9)	34 (31.2)	18 (20.9)	4 (30.8)		30 (27.8)	5 (27.8)	21 (25.6)			42 (27.1)	14 (26.4)			12 (30.8)	18 (28.6)	11 (26.8)	15 (23.1)		
P2. Do you have facilities in your area to test antimicrobial sensitivity?																				
Yes	93 (44.7)	46 (42.2)	43 (50)	4 (30.8)	0.321	49 (45.4)	12 (66.7)	32 (39)	4.61	0.1	76 (49)	17 (32.1)	4.6	0.032	12 (30.8)	36 (57.14)	14 (34.2)	31 (47.7)	9.09	0.028
No	115 (55.3)	63 (57.8)	43 (50)	9 (69.2)		59 (54.6)	6 (33.3)	50 (61)			79 (51)	36 (68)			27 (69.2)	27 (42.9)	27 (65.9)	34 (52.3)		
P3. How often on a first visit to a farm you suggest antimicrobial susceptibility testing if you suspect a bacterial infection is present?																				
Often/Always	19 (9.1)	8 (7.3)	10 (11.6)	1 (7.69)	0.854	9 (8.3)	1 (05.6)	09 (11)	9.8	0.044	15 (9.7)	4 (7.6)	1.98	0.371	4 (10.3)	5 (8)	4 (9.7)	6 (9.2)	2.51	0.867
Sometimes	104 (50)	57 (52.29)	41 (47.7)	6 (46.2)		60 (55.6)	13 (72.2)	31 (37.8)			81 (52.3)	23 (43.4)			16 (40)	35 (55.6)	22 (53.7)	31 (47.7)		
Never/rarely	85 (40.9)	44 (40.4)	35 (40.7)	06 (46.2)		39 (36.1)	04 (22.2)	42 (51.2)			59 (38.1)	26 (49.1)			19 (48.7)	23 (36.5)	15 (36.6)	28 (43.1)		
P4. How often do you suggest antimicrobial susceptibility testing, when a pathogen has not responded to the first antibiotic used?																				
Often/Always	41 (19.7)	25 (22.9)	14 (16.3)	2 (15.4)	0.492	29 (26.9)	2 (11.1)	10 (12.2)	10.92	0.028	34 (21.9)	7 13.2)	1.95	0.378	11 (28.2)	11 (17.5)	8 (19.5)	11 (16.9)	4.14	0.658
Sometimes	111 (53.4)	60 (55.1)	44 (51.2)	7 (53.9)		55 (50.9)	13 (72.2)	43 (52.4)			81 (52.3)	30 (56.6)			21 (53.9)	36 (57.1)	21 (51.2)	33 (50.8)		
Never/rarely	56 (26.9)	24 (22)	28 (32.6)	4 (30.8)		24 (22.2)	3 (16.7)	29 (35.4)			40 (25.8)	16 (30.2)			7 (18)	16 (24.4)	12 (29.3)	21 (32.3)		
P5. How often do you encounter a poor clinical response to an antimicrobial used?																				
Often/Always	19 (9.1)	14 (12.8)	5 (5.8)	0	0.185	10 (9.3)	0	9 (11)	4.13	0.659	2 (1.3)	0	0.83	0.842	1 (02.6)	1 (1.6)	0	0	6.66	0.673
Sometimes	170 (81.7)	82 (75.2)	75 (87.2)	13 (100)		90 (83.3)	17 (94.4)	63 (76.8)			14 (9)	5 (9.4)			5 (12.8)	6 (9.5)	4 (9.8)	4 (6.2)		
Never/rarely	17 (8.2)	11 (10.1)	6 (7)	0		7 (6.5)	1 (5.6)	9 (11)			127 (81.9)	43 (81.1)			28 (71.8)	51 (81)	33 (80.5)	58 (89.2)		
Blank	2 (1)	2 (1.8)	0	0		1 (0.9)	0	1 (1.2)			12 (7.7)	5 (9.4)			5 (12.8)	5 (07.9)	4 (9.8)	3 (4.6)		
P6. How commonly do you feel that poor clinical response may be due to antimicrobial resistance?																				
Often/Always	76 (36.5)	48 (44)	24 (27.9)	4 (30.8)	0.118	48 (44.4)	2 (11.1)	26 (31.7)	13.25	0.039	58 (37.4)	18 (34)	1.59	0.661	0	1 (1.6)	0	0	11.92	0.218
Sometimes	124 (59.6)	56 (51.4)	60 (69.8)	8 (61.5)		59 (54.6)	15 (83.3)	50 (61)			92 (59.4)	32 (60.4)			19 (48.7)	23 (36.1)	18 (43.9)	16 (24.6)		
Never/rarely	7 (3.4)	5 (4.6)	1 (1.2)	1 (7.7)		1 (0.9)	1 (5.6)	5 (6.1)			4 (2.6)	3 (5.7)			19 (48.7)	36 (57.1)	21 (51.2)	48 (73.9)		
Blank	1 (0.5)	0	1 (1.2)	0		0	0	1 (1.2)			1 (0.7)	0			1 (2.6)	3 (4.8)	2 (04.9)	1 (01.5)		
P7. How often have you had to change an antimicrobial agent because of resistance confirmed on antimicrobial susceptibility testing?																				
Often/Always	50 (24)	23 (21.1)	23 (26.7)	4 (30.8)	0.839	33 (30.6)	2 (11.1)	15 (18.3)	8.78	0.186	38 (24.5)	12 (22.6)	3.05	0.384	12 (30.8)	10 (15.8)	8 (19.5)	20 (30.8)	8.28	0.506
Sometimes	118 (56.7)	65 (59.6)	46 (53.5)	7 (53.9)		56 (51.9)	14 (77.8)	48 (58.5)			91 (58.7)	27 (50.9)			21 (53.9)	39 (61.9)	26 (63.4)	32 (49.2)		

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.06.03.21258263; this version posted January 19, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Never/rarely	39 (18.8)	21 (19.3)	16 (18.6)	2 (15.4)		18 (16.7)	2 (11.1)	19 (23.2)			25 (16.1)	14 (26.4)			6 (15.4)	14 (22.2)	7 (17)	12 (18.5)		
Blank	1 (0.5)	0	1 (1.2)	0		1 (0.3)	0	0			01 (0.6)	0			0	0	0	1 01.5)		
P8. What are the factor/factors you consider for prescribing antibiotics?																				
Severity of the disease	91 (43.8)	53	32	6		46 (42.6)	6 (33.3)	39 (47.6)			65 (41.9)	26 (49.1)			16 (41)	28 (44.4)	18 (43.9)	29 (44.6)		
Culture sensitivity test report	9 (4.3)	5	4	2		5 (4.6)	0	4 (4.9)			8 (5.2)	1 (1.9)			1 (2.6)	2 (3.2)	2 (4.9)	4 (6.2)		
Economic status of the owner	1 (0.5)	1				0	0	1 (1.2)			0	1 (1.9)			0	1 (1.6)	0	0		
Availability at the local market	3 (1.4)	3				1 (0.9)	0	2 (2.4)			2 (1.3)	1 (1.9)			1 (2.6)	2 (3.2)	0	0		
Owner`s demand, Severity of the disease, Availability at the local market	1 (0.5)	1				1 (0.9)	0	0			1 (0.7)	0			0	1 (1.6)	0	0		
Severity of the disease, Culture sensitivity test report	15 (7.2)	9	4			8 (7.4)	1 (5.6)	6 (7.3)			11 (7.1)	4 (7.6)			2 (5.1)	4 (6.4)	5 (12.2)	4 (6.2)		
Severity of the disease, Availability at the local market, Culture sensitivity test report	16 (7.7)	10	6			10 (9.3)	5 (27.8)	1 (1.2)			13 (8.4)	3 (5.7)			1 (2.6)	9 (14.3)	2 (4.9)	4 (6.2)		
Severity of the disease, Availability at the local market	15 (7.2)	4	11			9 (8.3)	1 (5.6)	5 (6.10)			12 (7.7)	3 (5.7)			5 (12.8)	4 (6.4)	2 (4.9)	4 (6.2)		
Economic status of the owner, Severity of the disease	7 (3.4)	5	2			3 (2.8)	0	4 (4.9)			1 (0.7)	0			0	0	0	1 (1.5)		
Economic status of the owner, Severity of the disease, Availability at the local market, Culture sensitivity test report	17 (8.2)	8	8	1		10 (9.3)	4 (22.2)	3 (3.7)			5 (3.2)	2 (3.8)			3 (7.7)	1 (1.6)	2 (4.9)	1 (1.5)		
Economic status of the owner, Severity of the disease, Availability at the local market	19 (9.1)	7	11	1	0.059	10 (9.3)	0	9 (10.9)	43.64	0.082	5 (3.2)	2 (3.8)	13.24	0.655	4 (10.3)	3 (4.7)	6 (14.6)	6 (9.2)	45.39	0.581
Availability at the local market, Culture sensitivity test report	1 (0.5)		1			0	0	1 (1.2)			0	1 (1.9)			0	0	0	1 (1.5)		
Economic status of the owner, Availability at the local market	1 (0.5)			1		1 (0.9)	0	0			14 (9)	3 (5.7)			4 (10.3)	4 (6.4)	3 (7.3)	6 (9.2)		
Economic status of the owner, Severity of the disease, Culture sensitivity test report	2 (1)	1	1			1 (0.9)	1 (0.9)	0			2 (1.3)	0			0	2 (3.2)	0	0		
Owner`s demand, Economic status of the owner, Severity of the disease	1 (0.9)	1				1 (100)	0	0			5 (3.2)	1 (1.9)			1 (2.6)	2 (3.2)	1 (2.4)	2 (3.1)		
Owner`s demand, Economic status of the owner, Severity of the disease, Availability at the local market	6 (3)	2	3	1		1 (0.9)	0	5 (6.1)			1 (0.65)	2 (3.8)			0	0	0	3 (4.6)		
Owner`s demand, Economic status of the owner, Severity of the disease, Availability at the local market, Culture sensitivity test report	3 (1.4)		2	1		1 (0.9)	0	2 (2.4)			1 (0.65)	0			1 (2.6)	0	0	0		
Owner`s demand, Economic status of the owner, Severity of the disease, Availability at the local market, Culture sensitivity test report	1					1 (100)	0	0												
P9. Which spectrum of antibiotics do you prefer most?																				
Broad spectrum	104 (50)	55 (50.5)	41 (47.7)	8 (61.5)	0.664	60 (55.6)	6 (33.3)	38 (46.3)	3.77	0.152	81 (52.3)	23 (43.4)	1.24	0.265	22 (56.1)	29 (46)	16 (39)	37 (56.9)	4.26	0.235
Narrow spectrum	104 (50)	54 (49.5)	45 (52.3)	5 (38.5)		48 (44.4)	12 (66.7)	44 (53.7)			74 (47.7)	30 (56.6)			17 (43.6)	34 (54)	25 (61)	28 (43.1)		
P10. What percentage of your daily prescriptions has antibiotics?																				
<20	54 (26)	29 (26.6)	21 (24.42)	4 (30.8)	0.972	27 (25)	8 (44.4)	19 (23.2)	5.21	0.267	47 (30.3)	7 (13.2)	6.08	0.048	10 (25.6)	19 (30.16)	12 (29.27)	13 (20)	5.76	0.451

20% to 40%	95 (45.7)	48 (44)	41 (47.7)	6 (46.2)		47 (43.5)	8 (44.4)	40 (48.8)			66 (42.6)	29 (54.7)			15 (38.5)	32 (50.79)	18 (43.90)	30 (46.2)		
41% to 60%	59 (28.4)	32 (29.4)	24 (27.9)	3 (23.1)		34 (31.5)	2 (11.1)	23 (28.1)			42 (27.1)	17 (32.1)			14 (35.9)	12 (19.1)	11 (26.8)	22 (33.9)		
Above 60%	0	0	0	0		0	0	0			0	0								
P11. Do you mention withdrawal period in the prescription?																				
Yes	53 (25.5)	35 (32.1)	16 (18.6)	2 (15.4)	0.087	20 (18.5)	08 (44.4)	25 (30.5)	7.25	0.027	40 (25.8)	13 (24.5)	0.034	0.854	15 (38.5)	19 (30.2)	8 (19.5)	11 (16.9)	7.5	0.059
No	155 (74.5)	74 (67.9)	70 (81.4)	11 (84.6)		88 (81.5)	10 (55.6)	57 (69.5)			115 (74.2)	40 (75.5)			24 (61.5)	44 (69.8)	33 (80.5)	54 (83.1)		
P12. Do you suggest keeping drug register of animals?																				
Yes	155 (74.5)	83 (76.2)	65 (75.6)	7 (53.9)		83 (76.9)	15 (83.3)	57 (69.5)			114 (73.6)	41 (77.4)			27 (69.2)	45 (71.4)	34 (82.9)	49 (75.4)		
No	52 (25)	26 (23.9)	21 (24.4)	5 (38.5)	0.072	24 (22.2)	03 (16.7)	25 (30.5)	3.29	0.511	40 (25.8)	12 (22.6)	0.577	0.749	12 (30.8)	18 (28.6)	7 (17.1)	15 (23.1)	4.79	0.571
Blank	1(0.5)	0	0	1 (7.69)		1 (0.9)	0	0			1 (0.7)	0			0	0	0	1 (1.5)		
P13. Do you prefer combine antibiotics to ensure therapeutic success?																				
Yes	135 (64.9)	70 (64.2)	57 (66.3)	8 (61.5)	0.919	67 (62)	8 (44.4)	60 (73.2)	6.16	0.046	102 (65.8)	33 (62.3)	0.22	0.641	28 (71.8)	40 (63.5)	23 (56.1)	44 (67.7)	2.49	0.478
No	73 (35.1)	39 (35.8)	29 (33.7)	5 (38.5)		41 (38)	10 (55.6)	22 (26.8)			53 (34.2)	20 (37.7)			11 (28.2)	23 (36.5)	18 (43.9)	21 (32.3)		
P14. Do you administer antibiotics to animals without determining their body weight properly?																				
Yes	54 (26)	28 (25.7)	22 (25.6)	4 (30.8)		23 (21.3)	04 (22.2)	27 (32.9)			44 (28.4)	10 (18.8)			11 (28.2)	16 (25.4)	12 (29.3)	15 (23.1)		
No	153 (73.6)	80 (73.4)	64 (74.4)	9 (69.2)	0.95	84 (77.8)	14 (77.8)	55 (67.1)	4.24	0.375	110 (7)	43 (81.1)	2.28	0.321	28 (71.8)	46 (73.1)	29 (70.7)	50 (76.9)	2.93	0.818
Blank	1 (0.5)	1 (0.9)	0	0		1 (00.9)	0	0			1 (0.7)	0			0	1 (1.6)	0	0		
P15. Do you consider whether an infection is self-limiting before prescribing antibiotics?																				
Yes	162 (77.9)	93 (85.3)	59 (68.6)	10 (76.9)		82 (75.9)	16 (88.9)	64 (78.1)			116 (74.8)	46 (86.8)			33 (84.6)	47 (74.6)	32 (78.1)	50 (76.9)		
No	46 (22.1)	16 (14.7)	25 (29.1)	3 (23.1)	0.032	26 (24.1)	2 (11.1)	18 (22)	1.51	0.471	39 (25.2)	7 (13.2)	3.28	0.07	6 (15.4)	16 (25.4)	9 (22)	15 (23.1)	1.46	0.693
Blank	0	0	2 (2.3)	0		0	0	0			0	0								
P16. As the first line of treatment, do you choose new generation antibiotics rather than older generations like penicillin?																				
Yes	76 (36.5)	34 (31.2)	36 (41.9)	6 (46.2)	0.22	45 (41.7)	5 (27.8)	26 (31.7)	2.65	0.266	62 (40)	14 (26.4)	3.14	0.076	13 (33.3)	19 (30.2)	12 (29.3)	32 (49.2)	6.73	0.081
No	132 (63.5)	75 (68.8)	50 (58.1)	7 (53.9)		63 (58.3)	13 (72.2)	56 (68.3)			93 (60)	39 (73.6)			26 (66.7)	44 (69.8)	29 (70.7)	33 (50.8)		
P17. Do you consult with other veterinarian/other educational resources when in doubt of a drug's mechanism of action?																				
Yes	199 (95.7)	104 (94.4)	83 (96.5)	12 (92.3)	0.615	104 (96.3)	17 (94.4)	78 (95.1)	0.23	0.893	151 (97.4)	48 (90.6)	4.48	0.034	37 (94.8)	61 (96.8)	41 (100)	60 (92.3)	3.9	0.273
No	9 (4.3)	5 (4.6)	3 (3.5)	1 (7.7)		4 (3.7)	1 (5.6)	4 (4.9)			4 (2.6)	5 (9.4)			2 (5.1)	2 (3.2)	0	5 (7.7)		
P18. Do you suggest clients to vaccinate their animals against preventable diseases?																				
Yes	205 (98.6)	108 (99.1)	86 (100)	11 (84.6)	0.01	106 (98.2)	18 (100)	81 (98.8)	0.42	0.811	152 (98.1)	53 (100)	1.04	0.308	38 (97.4)	63 (100)	41 (100)	63 (96.9)	3.09	0.378
No	3 (1.44)	1 (0.9)	0.00	2 (15.4)		2 (1.9)	0	1 (1.2)			03 (1.9)	0			1 (2.56)	0	0	2 (3.1)		

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.06.03.21258263; this version posted January 19, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.06.03.21258263; this version posted January 19, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Discussion

The present study explored the knowledge, attitude, and practice of the Bangladeshi veterinary practitioners regarding antibiotic use and resistance. It was found that some vets had gaps in knowledge in certain crucial concepts, for example, many practitioners (17.3%) considered antibiotics and antimicrobials to be the same. Failure to differentiate between antimicrobials and antibiotics and their roles can be a major reason for inappropriate antibiotic prescribing such as prescribing antibiotics for viral infections. Another surprising finding was that although most knew that antibiotics cannot cure viral infections, one-third of the vets believed antibiotics would speed up cold, cough, or other viral infections. However, there is no evidence that antibiotics can cure viral infections or speed up recovery of viral infections such as common cold [22,23].

Nearly all veterinarians were aware of antibiotic withdrawal period and considered it important to maintain an appropriate withdrawal period prior to selling animals treated with antibiotics in order to avoid antibiotic residues in animals. However paradoxically, while prescribing antibiotics, only one out of four practitioners mentioned the withdrawal period in the prescriptions. This may happen probably because practitioners do not have the knowledge of the withdrawal periods of the specific antibiotics they prescribe, or because they think the farmers will not understand or follow instructions related to withdrawal periods anyway. Besides, previous studies have shown that most Bangladeshi farmers do not have knowledge on antibiotic withdrawal period [10,11]. Hence, non adherence to the required withdrawal periods by either parties may result in the presence of residual antibiotics in food animal products [24]. Antibiotic residues can be toxic to humans as well as may contribute to the development of AMR [24,25].

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.06.03.21258263; this version posted January 19, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Prescribing antibiotics based on the results of susceptibility testing is recommended to make sure that the prescribed regimen is effective against the infection. However, in this study, such practice was not often followed by the practitioners even after the initial treatment failed. This can partially be explained by the fact that most areas of Bangladesh did not have any facility to test antimicrobial sensitivity, as reported by the veterinarians. The absence of susceptibility data can also promote combined antibiotic therapy since the vets may want to prescribe more than one drug for maximizing the chance of therapeutic success with the hope that if one drug is found ineffective, the others will work. A study of the veterinary surgeons of the United Kingdom also reported similar findings where the surgeons only occasionally carried out susceptibility testing [26].

The use of antibiotics for disease prevention of animals by farmers and poultry dealers have been reported in Bangladesh [8], although such practices are not recommended [14]. Most veterinarians in this study do not consider the use of antimicrobials for disease prevention. Instead, the participants have shown a very positive attitude towards vaccination for both infection prevention and lowering the use of antibiotics. Given the fact that about half of the most significant animal diseases are of viral origins [27], vaccination can be very effective and efficient in lowering the occurrences of infectious diseases in animals and will subsequently confer financial gains to the farmers as well as help to minimize unnecessary use of antibiotics. Vaccines have also been recommended for infection prevention by WHO [14].

Participants were knowledgeable about antibiotic resistance, its causes, and its consequences. However, unless such knowledge is translated into practice, no real benefit will be achieved. We have identified a number of inappropriate practices by the veterinarians including excessive antibiotic prescribing, prescribing antibiotics over the phone without examining

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.06.03.21258263; this version posted January 19, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

animals, not relying on susceptibility testing, not mentioning antibiotic withdrawal period in prescription, etc.

This survey revealed the varied difference in knowledge, attitude and practice of antibiotics use among different aged group of veterinarians in Bangladesh. It was not conclusively established the variation of predefined questions answer with the different aged group of vets. From this study it revealed that old aged vets with higher training or field based training have a higher knowledge of appropriate use of antibiotics and AMR. The difference has observed among vets aged groups that possibly could have the link to work experiences over time. To understand the perceptions and barriers, further investigation is required to appropriate use of antibiotics in livestock and in poultry among the vets subpopulation. It would help the policy makers and academicians to ensure proper training and impart practical field based knowledge of appropriate use of antibiotics and AMR to the vets students, young vets and all level aged groups of vets.

Another major problem is Bangladeshi farmers rely more upon village doctors, traditional healers and drug sellers and consider government veterinarians as the last resort for seeking health services for their livestock [9]. This trend needs to change and qualified veterinarians should be the primary source of advice in order to promote rational antibiotic use. Veterinarians should also play an active role in dispelling misconceptions of the farmers surrounding antibiotics, and themselves should adopt the appropriate practices. The government should focus on implementing the laws pertaining to judicious use of antibiotics, as well as recruiting more qualified veterinarians so that farmers can have easy access to them.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.06.03.21258263; this version posted January 19, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Limitations

A few limitations were witnessed during conduct the current study. The number of participants in the survey was low that may be due to several factors such as unwillingness to participate or lack of internet access or long questionnaire or some questions seemed too difficult. Sometimes respondents may have declined to share information they considered inappropriate or mistaken, resulting in an under-reporting of certain aspects on antibiotics and AMR knowledge and practices. The study could not meet the exact proportional number of respondents with anticipated geographic locations due to freedom of choice of the respondents.

Conclusions

The study findings suggest policy guidelines and advocacy to the public and private veterianrians in improving prudent use of antibiotics. Antimicrobial stewardship program in the public and private veterinary hospitals are needed to be initiated to promote the rational use of antibiotics. Improved knowledge and awareness of the veterinarians through continuous education and training can enhance the rational use of antibiotics. Dissemination of regularly updated national antibiotic use guidelines in food animals, understanding the role of good biosecurity and vaccination practices in disease prevention, including antimicrobial susceptibility testing at affordable costs with easy accessibility are the significant factors that need attention to combat the rising AMR in veterinary sector in Bangladesh.

Supporting Information

S1 Text. Questionnaire for KAP survey on antibiotics and AMR.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.06.03.21258263; this version posted January 19, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Acknowledgments

The author highly acknowledge the cooperation of the veterinarieans of Bangladesh. We also extend our gratitude to the lab members of ARAC, BLRI. We would like to thank Dr Md Ahaduzzaman for proofreading and copyediting our manuscript.

Author Contributions

Conceptualization: Md Samun Sarker

Data curation: Md Samun Sarker, Ayesha Ahmed, Fatema Akter Mahua

Formal analysis: Iftekhar Ahmed, Shariful Islam

Investigation: Md Samun Sarker, Ruhena Begum

Methodology: Md Samun Sarker, Ruhena Begum

Software: Md Samun Sarker, Shariful Islam

Supervision: Mohammed A. Samad, Nure Alam Siddiky

Validation: Mohammed A. Samad, Nure Alam Siddiky

Visualization: Md Samun Sarker, Nure Alam Siddiky

Writing-original draft: Md Samun Sarker, Iftekhar Ahmed

Writing-review & editing: Mohammed A. Samad, Nure Alam Siddiky, Md Ehsanul Kabir, Ayesha Ahmed, Fatema Akter Mahua

Disclosure of potential conflicts of interest

The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.06.03.21258263; this version posted January 19, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

References

1. Van Boeckel TP, Brower C, Gilbert M, Grenfell BT, Levin SA, Robinson TP, et al. Global trends in antimicrobial use in food animals. Proc Natl Acad Sci USA. 2015; 112(18):5649–54. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1503141112

2. Holmes AH, Moore LSP, Sundsfjord A, Steinbakk M, Regmi S, Karkey A, et al. Understanding the mechanisms and drivers of antimicrobial resistance. Lancet. 2016; 387(10014):176–87. https://doi.org/10.1016/s0140-6736(15)00473-0

3. Aidara-Kane A, Angulo FJ, Conly J, Minato Y, Silbergeld EK, McEwen SA, et al. World Health Organization (WHO) guidelines on use of medically important antimicrobials in food-producing animals. Antimicrob Resist Infect Control. 2018; 7(1):1–8. https://doi.org/10.1186/s13756-017-0294-9

4. Jim O'Neill. Tackling Drug-Resistant Infections Globally: Final Report and Recommendations. 2016. https://apo.org.au/node/63983

5. Tang KL, Caffrey NP, Nóbrega DB, Cork SC, Ronksley PE, Barkema HW, et al. Restricting the use of antibiotics in food-producing animals and its associations with antibiotic resistance in food-producing animals and human beings: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Lancet Planet Heal. 2017; 1(8):e316–27. https://doi.org/10.1016/s2542-5196(17)30141-9

6. Ahmed I, Rabbi MB, Sultana S. Antibiotic resistance in Bangladesh: A systematic review. Int J Infect Dis. 2019; 80:54–61. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijid.2018.12.017

7. Hasan B, Faruque R, Drobni M, Waldenström J, Sadique A, Ahmed KU, et al. High prevalence of antibiotic resistance in pathogenic Escherichia coli from large- and small-scale poultry farms in Bangladesh. Avian Dis. 2011; 55(4):689–92. https://doi.org/10.1637/9686-021411-reg.1

8. Masud A Al, Rousham EK, Islam MA, Alam MU, Rahman M, Mamun A Al, et al. Drivers of Antibiotic Use in Poultry Production in Bangladesh: Dependencies and Dynamics of a Patron-Client Relationship. Front Vet Sci. 2020; 7(February):1–9. https://doi.org/10.3389/fvets.2020.00078

9. Roess AA, Winch PJ, Ali NA, Akhter A, Afroz D, El Arifeen S, et al. Animal husbandry practices in rural Bangladesh: Potential risk factors for antimicrobial drug resistance and emerging diseases. Am J Trop Med Hyg. 2013; 89(5):965–70. https://doi.org/10.4269/ajtmh.12-0713

10. Saiful Islam KBM, Shiraj-Um-Mahmuda S, Hazzaz-Bin-Kabir M. Antibiotic usage patterns in selected broiler farms of Bangladesh and their public health implications. J Public Heal Dev Ctries J Public Heal Dev Ctries. 2016; 2(3):276–84. http://www.jphdc.org/

11. Ferdous J, Sachi S, Al Noman Z, Hussani SMAK, Sarker YA, Sikder MH. Assessing farmers' perspective on antibiotic usage and management practices in small-scale layer farms of Mymensingh district, Bangladesh. Vet World. 2019; 12(9):1441–7. https://doi.org/10.14202/vetworld.2019.1441-1447

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.06.03.21258263; this version posted January 19, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

12. Rahman MA, Rahman MM, Abdullah MS, Sayeed MA, Rashid MH, Mahmud R, et al. Epidemiological assessment of clinical poultry cases through the government veterinary hospital-based passive surveillance system in Bangladesh: a case study. Trop Anim Health Prod. 2019; 51(4):967–75. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11250-018-1782-5

13. Sarker MS, Ahaduzzaman M, Ghosh SK, Sayeed MA, Bary MA. Crosssectional survey on prescribing patterns for food animal medications in Bangladesh. J Dairy Vet Anim Res. 2016; 3(4):151-153. https://doi.org/10.15406/jdvar.2016.03.00089

14. World Health Organization. WHO guidelines on use of medically important antimicrobials in food-producing animals. World Health Organization. 2017. pp. 1–88. https://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/handle/10665/258970/9789241550130-eng.pdf?sequence=1%0Ahttp://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/handle/10665/258970/9789241550130-eng.pdf?sequence=1

15. Bangladesh National Parliament (BNP). Bangladesh Gazette. 2013; 205: 2811-2818.

16. Hughes LA, Pinchbeck G, Callaby R, Dawson S, Clegg P, Williams N. Antimicrobial prescribing practice in UK equine veterinary practice. Equine Vet J. 2013; 45(2):141–7. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2042-3306.2012.00602.x

17. Cattaneo AA, Wilson R, Doohan D, LeJeune JT. Bovine veterinarians' knowledge, beliefs, and practices regarding antibiotic resistance on Ohio dairy farms. J Dairy Sci. 2009; 92(7):3494–502. https://doi.org/10.3168/jds.2008-1575

18. Barden LS, Dowell SF, Schwartz B, Lackey C. Current attitudes regarding use of antimicrobial agents: Results from physicians' and parents' focus group discussions. Clin Pediatr (Phila). 1998; 37(11):665–72. https://doi.org/10.1177/000992289803701104

19. De Briyne N, Atkinson J, Pokludová L, Borriello SP, Price S. Factors influencing antibiotic prescribing habits and use of sensitivity testing amongst veterinarians in Europe. Vet Rec. 2013; 173(19):475. https://doi.org/10.1136/vr.101454

20. Busani L, Graziani C, Franco A, Di Egidio A, Binkin N, Battisti A. Survey of the knowledge, attitudes and practice of Italian beef and dairy cattle veterinarians concerning the use of antibiotics. Vet Rec. 2004; 155(23):733–8. PMID: 15623086

21. Chapot L, Sarker MS, Begum R, Hossain D, Akter R, Hasan MM, et al. Knowledge, Attitudes and Practices Regarding Antibiotic Use and Resistance among Veterinary Students in Bangladesh. Antibiotics. 2021 Mar; 10(3):332. https://doi.org/10.3390/antibiotics10030332

22. Allan GM, Arroll B. Prevention and treatment of the common cold: making sense of the evidence. CMAJ. 2014; 186(3):190–9. https://doi.org/10.1503/cmaj.121442

23. Kenealy T, Arroll B. Antibiotics for the common cold and acute purulent rhinitis. Cochrane Database Syst Rev. 2013 June 4; CD000247. https://doi.org/10.1002/14651858.cd000247.pub3

24. Kaneene JB, Miller R. Problems associated with drug residues in beef from feeds and therapy. Rev Sci Tech. 1997; 16(2):694–708. https://doi.org/10.20506/rst.16.2.1055

25. Beyene T. Veterinary Drug Residues in Food-animal Products: Its Risk Factors and

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.06.03.21258263; this version posted January 19, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Potential Effects on Public Health. J Vet Sci Technol. 2015; 07(01). https://doi.org/10.4172/2157-7579.1000285

26. Coyne LA, Latham SM, Dawson S, Donald IJ, Pearson RB, Smith RF, et al. Antimicrobial use practices, attitudes and responsibilities in UK farm animal veterinary surgeons. Prev Vet Med. 2018; 161(October):115–26. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.prevetmed.2018.10.021

27. Brun A. Vaccines and vaccination for veterinary viral diseases: A general overview. Methods Mol Biol. 2016; 1349:1–24. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4939-3008-1_1

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.06.03.21258263; this version posted January 19, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint
(which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .