Supplementary Material

Table S1. Univariate Chi-squared analysis comparing the independent and contract farmers' opinions on AMR and antimicrobial use practices in broilers in Indonesia.

		Independent farmer	Contract farmer	Chi- squared <i>n</i> -value				
	Ability to corr	ectly define AMR		p ruide				
Knowledge on AMR definition	Unable to correctly define AMR	117 (52.7%)	173 (61.6%)	0.046				
	Able to correctly define AMR	105 (47.3%)	108 (38.4%)					
The importanc	e of AMR concerns and							
AMR will never be a problem	Disagree	70 (31.7%)	100 (35.8%)	0.605				
on my farm	Neutral	82 (37.1%)	95 (34.1%)					
	Agreed	69 (31.2%)	84 (30.1%)					
AMR is a major human health	Disagree	29 (13.1%)	38 (13.6%)	0.987				
concern in Indonesia	Neutral	75 (33.9%)	94 (33.7%)					
	Agreed	117 (52.9%)	147 (52.7%)					
Chickens are healthier if more	Disagree	120 (54.3%)	101 (36.1%)	<0.001				
antimicrobials are used	Neutral	46 (20.8%)	91 (32.7%)					
	Agreed	55 (24.9%)	87 (31.1%)					
Antimicrobials used in	Disagree	23 (10.4%)	29 (10.4%)	0.648				
chickens can affect the health	Neutral	73 (33.0%)	103 (36.9%)					
of the consumer	Agreed	125 (56.6%)	147 (52.7%)					
Antimicrobial use in animals	Disagree	15 (6.8%)	41 (14.7%)	<0.001				
should be reduced	Neutral	39 (17.6%)	104 (37.3%)					
	Agreed	167 (75.6%)	134 (48.0%)	_				
Antimicrobial use in humans	Disagree	9 (4.1%)	26 (9.4%)	<0.001				
should be reduced	Neutral	35 (15.9%)	93 (33.5%)					
	Agreed	reed 176 (80.0%) 159 (57.2%)						
Indiscriminate use of	Disagree	12 (5.4%)	26 (9.4%)	0.26				
antimicrobials can lead to AMR	Neutral	75 (33.9%)	91 (32.7%)					
	Agreed	134 (60.6%)	161 (57.9%)					
Many antimicrobials are not	Disagree	40 (18.1%)	60 (21.8%)	0.014				
effective at treating disease in chickens	Neutral	72 (32.6%)	115 (41.8%)					
chickens	Agreed	reed 109 (49.3%) 100 (36.4%)						
Indiscriminate use of	Disagree	6 (2.7%)	14 (5.1%)	<0.001				
antimicrobials in chickens is	Neutral	24 (10.9%)	73 (25.6%)					
expensive for famels	Agreed	190 (86.4%)	188 (68.4%)					
There is a need for sufficient	Disagree	5 (2.3%)	6 (2.2%)	0.001				
withdrawal time after	Neutral	26 (11.8%)	68 (25.1%)					
birds for slaughter	Agreed							
	Drivers for antimicrobial use in broiler flock							
To prevent disease in the flock	Less likely	51 (23.4%)	45 (16.2%)	0.036				
	Neutral	94 (43.1%)	112 (40.3%)					
	More likely	73 (33.5%)	121 (43.5%)					

An increased mortality rate	Less likely	32 (14.7%)	37 (13.3%)	0.872							
	Neutral	70 (32.1%)	94 (33.8%)								
	More likely	116 (53.2%)	147 (52.9%)								
The chickens are not eating	Less likely	35 (16.1%)	42 (15.1%)	0.944							
	Neutral	106 (48.6%)	139 (49.8%)								
	More likely	77 (35.3%)	98 (35.1%)								
To improve productivity and	Less likely	43 (19.7%)	36 (12.9%)	0.064							
growth in the flock	Neutral	125 (57.3%)	161 (57.7%)								
	More likely	50 (22.9%)	82 (29.4%)								
Advised by drug seller to use	Less likely	23 (10.6%)	39 (14.1%)	0.075							
antimicrobials	Neutral	131 (60.1%)	180 (65.0%)								
	More likely	64 (29.4%)	58 (20.9%)								
Advised by the veterinarian or	Less likely	22 (10.1%)	21 (7.6%)	0.603							
para-veterinarian to use	Neutral	111 (50.9%)	144 (51.8%)								
antimicrobiais	More likely	85 (39.0%)	113 (40.6%)								
Advised by the production	Less likely	26 (11.9%)	25 (9.0%)	<0.001							
company to use antimicrobials	Neutral	148 (67.9%)	115 (41.5%)								
	More likely	44 (20.2%)	137 (49.5%)								
Advised by another farmer to	Less likely	38 (17.5%)	46 (16.7%)	0.512							
use antimicrobials	Neutral	134 (61.8%)	183 (66.3%)								
	More likely	45 (20.7%)	47 (17.0%)								
More likely 45 (20.7%) 47 (17.0%) Role of key actors in monitoring the responsible use of antimicrobials in broilers											
Role of key acto	rs in monitoring the 1	responsible use of anti	microbials in broilers								
Role of key acto	rs in monitoring the r	responsible use of anti 7 (3.2%)	microbials in broilers	0.001							
Role of key acto Veterinarian or para- veterinarian	rs in monitoring the r Not important Neutral	responsible use of anti 7 (3.2%) 21 (9.5%)	microbials in broilers 0 (0.0%) 48 (17.2%)	0.001							
Role of key acto Veterinarian or para- veterinarian	rs in monitoring the r Not important Neutral Important	responsible use of anti 7 (3.2%) 21 (9.5%) 193 (87.3%)	Imicrobials in broilers 0 (0.0%) 48 (17.2%) 231 (82.8%)	0.001							
Role of key acto Veterinarian or para- veterinarian Farmer	rs in monitoring the r Not important Neutral Important Not important	responsible use of anti 7 (3.2%) 21 (9.5%) 193 (87.3%) 6 (2.7%)	microbials in broilers 0 (0.0%) 48 (17.2%) 231 (82.8%) 5 (1.8%)	0.001							
Role of key acto Veterinarian or para- veterinarian Farmer	rs in monitoring the r Not important Neutral Important Not important Neutral	responsible use of anti 7 (3.2%) 21 (9.5%) 193 (87.3%) 6 (2.7%) 36 (16.3%)	microbials in broilers 0 (0.0%) 48 (17.2%) 231 (82.8%) 5 (1.8%) 58 (20.8%)	0.001							
Role of key acto Veterinarian or para- veterinarian Farmer	Intervention rs in monitoring the r Not important Neutral Important Not important Neutral Important Important Important	responsible use of anti 7 (3.2%) 21 (9.5%) 193 (87.3%) 6 (2.7%) 36 (16.3%) 179 (81.0%)	microbials in broilers 0 (0.0%) 48 (17.2%) 231 (82.8%) 5 (1.8%) 58 (20.8%) 216 (77.4%)	0.001							
Role of key acto Veterinarian or para- veterinarian Farmer Government	Intervention rs in monitoring the r Not important Neutral Important Not important Neutral Important Not important Not important Not important Not important Important Not important	responsible use of anti 7 (3.2%) 21 (9.5%) 193 (87.3%) 6 (2.7%) 36 (16.3%) 179 (81.0%) 4 (1.8%)	microbials in broilers 0 (0.0%) 48 (17.2%) 231 (82.8%) 5 (1.8%) 58 (20.8%) 216 (77.4%) 12 (4.3%)	0.001							
Role of key acto Veterinarian or para- veterinarian Farmer Government	Instrumentary rs in monitoring the r Not important Neutral Important Neutral Important Not important Not important Neutral Important Neutral Important Not important Not important Neutral	responsible use of anti 7 (3.2%) 21 (9.5%) 193 (87.3%) 6 (2.7%) 36 (16.3%) 179 (81.0%) 4 (1.8%) 19 (8.6%)	microbials in broilers 0 (0.0%) 48 (17.2%) 231 (82.8%) 5 (1.8%) 58 (20.8%) 216 (77.4%) 12 (4.3%) 57 (20.3%)	0.001							
Role of key acto Veterinarian or para- veterinarian Farmer Government	Instrumentary rs in monitoring the r Not important Neutral Important Not important Neutral Important Not important Neutral Important Not important Not important Important Important Important Important	responsible use of anti 7 (3.2%) 21 (9.5%) 193 (87.3%) 6 (2.7%) 36 (16.3%) 179 (81.0%) 4 (1.8%) 19 (8.6%) 198 (89.6%)	microbials in broilers 0 (0.0%) 48 (17.2%) 231 (82.8%) 5 (1.8%) 58 (20.8%) 216 (77.4%) 12 (4.3%) 57 (20.3%) 210 (75.3%)	0.001							
Role of key acto Veterinarian or para- veterinarian Farmer Government Retailer	rs in monitoring the r Not important Neutral Important Not important Important Not important Not important Neutral Important Neutral Important Not important	responsible use of anti 7 (3.2%) 21 (9.5%) 193 (87.3%) 6 (2.7%) 36 (16.3%) 179 (81.0%) 4 (1.8%) 19 (8.6%) 198 (89.6%) 22 (10.0%)	microbials in broilers 0 (0.0%) 48 (17.2%) 231 (82.8%) 5 (1.8%) 58 (20.8%) 216 (77.4%) 12 (4.3%) 57 (20.3%) 210 (75.3%) 45 (16.4%)	0.001							
Role of key acto Veterinarian or para- veterinarian Farmer Government Retailer	rs in monitoring the r Not important Neutral Important Not important Important Not important Neutral Important Neutral Important Not important Not important Not important Not important	responsible use of anti 7 (3.2%) 21 (9.5%) 193 (87.3%) 6 (2.7%) 36 (16.3%) 179 (81.0%) 4 (1.8%) 19 (8.6%) 198 (89.6%) 22 (10.0%) 62 (28.2%)	microbials in broilers 0 (0.0%) 48 (17.2%) 231 (82.8%) 5 (1.8%) 58 (20.8%) 216 (77.4%) 12 (4.3%) 57 (20.3%) 210 (75.3%) 45 (16.4%) 96 (35.0%)	0.001 0.367 0.001 0.001 0.009 0.009							
Role of key acto Veterinarian or para- veterinarian Farmer Government Retailer	rs in monitoring the r rs in monitoring the r Not important Important Not important Neutral Important Not important Neutral Important Not important Not important Not important Important Neutral Important Neutral Important	responsible use of anti 7 (3.2%) 21 (9.5%) 193 (87.3%) 6 (2.7%) 36 (16.3%) 179 (81.0%) 4 (1.8%) 19 (8.6%) 198 (89.6%) 22 (10.0%) 62 (28.2%) 136 (61.8%)	microbials in broilers 0 (0.0%) 48 (17.2%) 231 (82.8%) 5 (1.8%) 58 (20.8%) 216 (77.4%) 12 (4.3%) 57 (20.3%) 210 (75.3%) 45 (16.4%) 96 (35.0%) 133 (48.5%)	0.001 0.367 0.001 0.009 0.009							
Role of key acto Veterinarian or para- veterinarian Farmer Government Retailer Econo	rs in monitoring the r Not important Neutral Important Not important Neutral Important Not important Neutral Important Not important Not important Neutral Important Meutral Important Meutral Important	responsible use of anti 7 (3.2%) 21 (9.5%) 193 (87.3%) 6 (2.7%) 36 (16.3%) 179 (81.0%) 4 (1.8%) 19 (8.6%) 198 (89.6%) 22 (10.0%) 62 (28.2%) 136 (61.8%) timicrobial use for bro	microbials in broilers 0 (0.0%) 48 (17.2%) 231 (82.8%) 5 (1.8%) 58 (20.8%) 216 (77.4%) 12 (4.3%) 57 (20.3%) 210 (75.3%) 45 (16.4%) 96 (35.0%) 133 (48.5%) biler farmers	0.001 0.367 0.001 0.001 0.009 0.009							
Role of key acto Veterinarian or para-veterinarian Farmer Government Retailer Econor Does a health issue in the	rs in monitoring the r rs in monitoring the r Not important Important Not important Neutral Important Not important Not important Not important Not important Meutral Important Neutral Important Neutral Important Neutral Not important Neutral Not important Not important	responsible use of anti 7 (3.2%) 21 (9.5%) 193 (87.3%) 6 (2.7%) 36 (16.3%) 179 (81.0%) 4 (1.8%) 19 (8.6%) 198 (89.6%) 22 (10.0%) 62 (28.2%) 136 (61.8%) timicrobial use for bro 26 (11.8%)	microbials in broilers 0 (0.0%) 48 (17.2%) 231 (82.8%) 5 (1.8%) 58 (20.8%) 216 (77.4%) 12 (4.3%) 57 (20.3%) 210 (75.3%) 45 (16.4%) 96 (35.0%) 133 (48.5%) oiler farmers 32 (11.6%)	0.001 0.367 0.001 0.009 0.009 0.927							
Role of key acto Veterinarian or para-veterinarian Farmer Government Retailer Does a health issue in the broiler flock have a negative effect on the farm profit marcin?	rs in monitoring the r Not important Neutral Important Not important Neutral Important Not important Not important Not important Not important Meutral Important Neutral Important Neutral Mot importance of and No Yes	responsible use of anti 7 (3.2%) 21 (9.5%) 193 (87.3%) 6 (2.7%) 36 (16.3%) 179 (81.0%) 4 (1.8%) 19 (8.6%) 198 (89.6%) 22 (10.0%) 62 (28.2%) 136 (61.8%) timicrobial use for bro 26 (11.8%) 194 (88.2%)	microbials in broilers 0 (0.0%) 48 (17.2%) 231 (82.8%) 5 (1.8%) 58 (20.8%) 216 (77.4%) 12 (4.3%) 57 (20.3%) 210 (75.3%) 45 (16.4%) 96 (35.0%) 133 (48.5%) oiler farmers 32 (11.6%) 245 (88.4%)	0.001 0.367 0.001 0.009 0.009 0.927							
Role of key acto Veterinarian or para-veterinarian Farmer Government Government Does a health issue in the broiler flock have a negative effect on the farm profit margin? Does the farm collect any	rs in monitoring the r Not important Neutral Important Not important Neutral Important Not important Not important Not important Not important Meutral Important Neutral Important Meutral Important Neutral Not important Neutral Not important Neutral Not important Neutral Not important Neutral Not important Not important Not important Not important Not important Not important Not important Not important Not important No Yes	responsible use of anti 7 (3.2%) 21 (9.5%) 193 (87.3%) 6 (2.7%) 36 (16.3%) 179 (81.0%) 4 (1.8%) 19 (8.6%) 198 (89.6%) 22 (10.0%) 62 (28.2%) 136 (61.8%) timicrobial use for bro 26 (11.8%) 194 (88.2%) 38 (39.2%)	microbials in broilers 0 (0.0%) 48 (17.2%) 231 (82.8%) 5 (1.8%) 58 (20.8%) 216 (77.4%) 12 (4.3%) 57 (20.3%) 210 (75.3%) 45 (16.4%) 96 (35.0%) 133 (48.5%) oiler farmers 32 (11.6%) 245 (88.4%) 64 (43.0%)	0.001 0.367 0.001 0.009 0.009 0.927 0.557							
Role of key acto Veterinarian or para-veterinarian Farmer Government Government Does a health issue in the broiler flock have a negative effect on the farm profit margin? Does the farm collect any productivity data on the broiler flock?	rs in monitoring the r rs in monitoring the r Not important Important Not important Neutral Important Not important Not important Not important Not important Meutral Important Meutral Important Meutral Mo Yes	responsible use of anti 7 (3.2%) 21 (9.5%) 193 (87.3%) 6 (2.7%) 36 (16.3%) 179 (81.0%) 4 (1.8%) 19 (8.6%) 198 (89.6%) 22 (10.0%) 62 (28.2%) 136 (61.8%) timicrobial use for bro 26 (11.8%) 194 (88.2%) 38 (39.2%) 59 (60.8%)	Imicrobials in broilers 0 (0.0%) 48 (17.2%) 231 (82.8%) 5 (1.8%) 58 (20.8%) 216 (77.4%) 12 (4.3%) 57 (20.3%) 210 (75.3%) 45 (16.4%) 96 (35.0%) 133 (48.5%) oiler farmers 32 (11.6%) 245 (88.4%) 64 (43.0%) 85 (57.0%)	0.001 0.367 0.001 0.009 0.009 0.927 0.557 0.557							
Role of key acto Veterinarian or para-veterinarian Farmer Government Government Does a health issue in the broiler flock have a negative effect on the farm profit margin? Does the farm collect any productivity data on the broiler flock? Is there an economic advantage	rs in monitoring the r rs in monitoring the r Not important Important Not important Neutral Important Not important Not important Not important Meutral Important Meutral Important Mo yes No Yes No	responsible use of anti 7 (3.2%) 21 (9.5%) 193 (87.3%) 6 (2.7%) 36 (16.3%) 179 (81.0%) 4 (1.8%) 199 (86.%) 198 (89.6%) 22 (10.0%) 62 (28.2%) 136 (61.8%) timicrobial use for bro 26 (11.8%) 194 (88.2%) 38 (39.2%) 59 (60.8%) 63 (28.6%)	microbials in broilers 0 (0.0%) 48 (17.2%) 231 (82.8%) 5 (1.8%) 58 (20.8%) 216 (77.4%) 12 (4.3%) 57 (20.3%) 210 (75.3%) 45 (16.4%) 96 (35.0%) 133 (48.5%) oiler farmers 32 (11.6%) 245 (88.4%) 64 (43.0%) 85 (57.0%) 24 (8.7%)	0.001 0.367 0.001 0.009 0.009 0.927 0.557 0.557							

	No.	DOC	Feed	Disinfectant	Litter	Medicines	Labour	Heating	Other	Vaccine	Total
Smaller farms	255	570	1638	11	12	22	66	13	40	12	2384
Central Java	33	474	1401	41	16	35	37	20	15	5	2043
Lampung	8	508	952	2	13	21	69	21	0	64	1651
West Kalimantan	214	583	1665	7	12	21	71	13	58	12	2442
Larger farms	254	492	1381	10	13	23	35	16	19	16	2005
Central Java	132	474	1442	17	18	30	32	20	18	15	2067
Lampung	43	463	1266	1	9	31	31	17	17	20	1855
West Kalimantan	79	525	1349	5	7	12	43	12	26	17	1996
Average		536	1522	11	12	22	47	15	22	14	2201

Table S2. Differentiating smaller-scale farms from larger-scale farms with regard to on-farm costs (\$US/1000 birds).

	No.	DOC	Feed	Disinfectant	Litter	Medicines	Labour	Heating	Other	Vaccine	TOTAL
Independent	222	568	1668	6	10	19	61	11	13	13	2370
Central Java	5										
Lampung	11	513	1071	2	12	21	59	18	7	42	1745
West Kalimantan	206	572	1680	7	10	18	62	11	15	13	2387
Contract	281	503	1377	2	14	28	36	18	23	15	2017
Central Java	159	476	1436	3	18	32	33	20	18	13	2049
Lampung	40	460	1272	1	9	31	31	17	27	0	1848
West Kalimantan	82	557	1333	8	11	22	56	15	70	18	2089

Table S3. Differentiating contract and independent farmers with regard to on-farm costs (\$US/1000 birds).

Note: six farmers, one in Central Java and five in West Kalimantan did not identify as either contract or independent farmers. The sample of five independent farmers in Central Java was insufficient to elicit representative data.