

1 **Title:** The global prevalence of female genital mutilation/cutting: A systematic review and meta-  
2 analysis of national, regional, facility and school-based studies.

3

4 **Short title:** Global prevalence of female genital mutilation/cutting

5

6 **Authors:** Leen Farouki BA<sup>1</sup>, Zeinab El Dirani MSc<sup>1</sup>, Sawsan Abdulrahim PhD<sup>2</sup>, Christelle Akl  
7 MS<sup>1</sup>, Chaza Akik DrPH<sup>1</sup>, Stephen J McCall DPhil<sup>1</sup>

8

9 **Affiliations:**

10 1. Center for Research on Population and Health, Faculty of Health Sciences, American  
11 University of Beirut, Lebanon

12 2. Department of Health Promotion and Community Health, Faculty of Health Sciences,  
13 American University of Beirut, Lebanon.

14

15 **Corresponding Author:** Stephen J McCall

16 Email: sm227@aub.edu.lb

17 Telephone: +961 1 350 000 ext. 4563

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29 **Abstract (459/500 words)**

30  
31 **Background:** Female Genital Mutilation/Cutting (FGM/C) is a non-medical procedure entailing  
32 the modification of the external female genitalia. A description of the prevalence and distribution  
33 of FGM/C allows the tracking of progress towards ending FGM/C by 2030 (Sustainable  
34 Development Goal (SDG) Target 5.3). This systematic review aimed to examine FGM/C  
35 prevalence and types, by World Health Organization (WHO) region and country.

36 **Methods:** A systematic search using Medical Subject Headings (MeSH) and keywords from  
37 2009 to March 24, 2022 was undertaken in MEDLINE, PubMed, PsycINFO, Web of Science,  
38 and Embase to identify studies presenting FGM/C prevalence. Abstract and full-text screening,  
39 quality assessment, and data extraction were undertaken by two reviewers. Only nationally  
40 representative studies were included in the meta-analysis. Pooled FGM/C prevalence was  
41 estimated by random-effects meta-analysis using generalised linear mixed models (GLMM).  
42 FGM/C prevalence with 95% confidence intervals (CI), prediction intervals (PI) and FGM/C  
43 type were presented separately by women aged 15-49 years and girls aged 0-14 years.

44 **Findings:** 161 studies met the inclusion criteria and 28 were included in the meta-analysis, of  
45 which 22 were from the WHO African region (AFR), 5 from the Eastern Mediterranean region  
46 (EMR), and 1 from the South-East Asia (SEAR) region. These studies included data from  
47 397,683 women across 28 countries and 283,437 girls across 23 countries; the pooled prevalence  
48 estimate of FGM/C amongst women aged 15-49 years was 38.3% (95% CI: 20.8–59.5%;  
49 PI:0.48–98.8%), and 7.25% (95% CI: 3.1–16.0%; PI: 0.1-88.9%) amongst girls aged 0-14 years.  
50 Amongst included countries, this gave a total estimated prevalence of 86,080,915 women (95%  
51 CI: 46,736,701–133,693,929) and 11,982,031 girls with FGM/C (95% CI: 5,123,351–  
52 26,476,156). Somalia had the highest FGM/C prevalence amongst women (99.2%) and Mali had  
53 the highest amongst girls (72.7%). The most common type of FGM/C amongst women was  
54 “flesh removed” (Type I or II) in 19 countries, and “not sewn closed” (Type I, II, or IV) amongst  
55 girls in 9 countries. Among repeated nationally representative studies, FGM/C decreased for  
56 women and girls in 23 and 25 countries respectively, although in several countries there was a  
57 minor decrease (0-3%) or increase in prevalence. The main limitation of the study methodology  
58 is that estimates were based on the available published data, which may not reflect the actual  
59 global prevalence of FGM/C.

60 **Discussion:** In this study, we observed large variation in FGM/C prevalence between countries,  
61 and the prevalence appears to be declining in many countries, which is encouraging as it  
62 minimises physical and physiological harm for a future generation of women. This prevalence  
63 estimate is lower than the actual global prevalence of FGM/C due to data gaps, non-comparable  
64 denominators, and unavailable surveys. Yet, considerable policy and community-level  
65 interventions are required in many countries to meet the SDG target 5.3.

66 **Funding:** None

67 **Registration:** CRD42020186937

68

## 69 **Author Summary**

### 70 **Why was this study done?**

- 71 • FGM/C is an extreme form of gender inequality that violates women's and girls' human  
72 rights, and the practice has lifelong health and economic consequences for women and  
73 girls.
- 74 • Previous studies on prevalence of FGM/C have used repeated nationally representative  
75 cross-sectional studies and found that FGM/C is decreasing in many countries.
- 76 • This study aimed to provide a baseline prevalence estimate and to understand the data  
77 gaps in prevalence required for tracking progress towards the Sustainable Development  
78 Goal (SDG) Target 5.3.

### 79 **What did the researchers do and find?**

- 80 • This was a systematic review and meta-analysis of all available studies on FGM/C and it  
81 provided a thorough overview of studies published on FGM/C prevalence at a national,  
82 sub-regional, school, facility, and community level.
- 83 • Approximately 100 million girls and women of reproductive age have experienced  
84 FGM/C across 28 countries in three WHO regions, with a prevalence of 38% in women  
85 and 7% among girls.
- 86 • There were large differences between regions and countries; where some countries  
87 practiced FGM/C universally, and FGM/C appeared to be decreasing in 23 countries for  
88 women and 25 countries for girls.

### 89 **What do these findings mean?**

- 90 • Current findings imply that progress towards SDG 5.3 is attainable in some countries, but  
91 much work is required in others, including Egypt, Somalia, Sudan, Indonesia, Guinea,  
92 and Mali.
- 93 • Evaluation of structural or community level policies and interventions in countries that  
94 had a decline in FGM/C will be beneficial for countries that have a high prevalence of  
95 FGM/C.

- 96
- 97
- 98
- 99
- 100
- 101
- 102
- 103
- The prevalence estimate of this study is accurate of the included countries but is an underestimate of the global prevalence due to gaps in available data across the world, which are important to resolve to understand actual progress towards SDG 5.3.

## 104 **Introduction**

105 Female Genital Mutilation/Cutting (FGM/C), also referred to as female circumcision, is a non-  
106 medical procedure that entails the total or partial removal of external female genitalia and other  
107 injuries to the female genital organs [1]. The United Nations Sustainable Development Goal  
108 (SDG) target 5.3 on gender equality refers to FGM/C as a harmful traditional practice and calls  
109 for ending it by 2030.

110 While the exact global prevalence of FGM/C is unknown, estimates of FGM/C range from 100-  
111 140 million women and girls in African region and the Middle East [2, 3], while UNICEF  
112 estimates the global prevalence to be over 200 million women and girls living with FGM/C [1-  
113 4]. Nationally representative data show that there is a decline in the prevalence of FMG/C but  
114 this is not universal across countries [1, 5, 6]. FGM/C persists due to religious, social, and  
115 cultural factors [7]. It is commonly believed to create better marriage prospects because it  
116 associates with morality, hygiene, and aesthetics; FGM/C is also believed to curb sexual urges  
117 and maintain virginity [8]. However, the procedure has no health benefits; it has resulted in  
118 negative health outcomes, including menstrual difficulties, infertility, urinary problems, mental  
119 health problems, pregnancy and labour complications severe pain, risk of contracting infections,  
120 septicaemia, and even death [9-11]. FGM/C is also an economic burden throughout the life  
121 course for girls and women [12].

122 FGM/C is most often performed on girls between infancy and adolescence, and has been  
123 classified into four types [13]. Type I (clitoridectomy) involves the partial or total removal of the  
124 prepuce and/or the clitoral gland. Type II involves the partial or total removal of the labia minora  
125 and clitoral glans without the excision of the labia majora. Type III (infibulation) involves  
126 narrowing the vaginal canal by modifying the labia majora and minora and may also include the  
127 removal of the clitoral glans. Type IV involves any other non-medical, harmful procedure, such  
128 as cauterization, pricking, and scraping [14]. Risks defer by type; the most severe type, Type III,  
129 has the more serious obstetric risks of FGM/C including infant resuscitation, stillbirth, and  
130 neonatal death; while Types I and II carry risks of caesarean section or postpartum bleeding [15].

131 An important aspect of the SDGs is to track progress on ending harmful traditional practices,  
132 such as FGM/C. However, to our knowledge, there is no comprehensive review in the literature

133 that provides estimates of FGM/C globally, by World Health Organization (WHO) region, or  
134 specific countries, which can be used to track improvements towards SDG 5.3. A review of the  
135 prevalence of FGM/C will support efforts to understand the global burden of FGM/C and inform  
136 adequate prevention and intervention efforts, and local and international policies. A review of the  
137 types of FGM/C will contribute similarly by tracking the prevalence of the severity of the  
138 procedure. This systematic review and meta-analysis aimed to examine (1) the prevalence of  
139 FGM/C and (2) the proportion of the different types of FGM/C, amongst girls aged 0-14 years  
140 and women aged 15-49 years old by country and WHO region.

141

## 142 **Methods**

143 **Search strategy and study selection.** In this systematic review and meta-analysis of FGM/C  
144 prevalence, separate searches were conducted using MEDLINE, PubMed, PsycINFO, Web of  
145 Science, and Embase. Hand searches of the grey literature were conducted through searches of  
146 reports from international non-governmental organizations, including UNFPA and UNICEF  
147 amongst others, and other Google searches. Hand searches of the bibliographies of relevant  
148 systematic reviews were also conducted. Together, these databases provide international and  
149 interdisciplinary publications. The search strategy (S1 Methods and Results, S1 Table) was  
150 adapted to the format of each database. To present up-to-date data that can be used as a baseline  
151 to monitor progress on SDG 5.3 over the last decade, the search was limited to include  
152 publications from 2009 until 2020. The search was updated to include publications from 2009  
153 until 2022. The last search in all databases was conducted on March 24<sup>th</sup>, 2022. For nationally  
154 representative studies, the hand searches were conducted to include studies prior to 2009 in a  
155 post-hoc analysis to present FGM/C prevalence across time. The MeSH term for FGM/C was  
156 used when possible; otherwise, keywords were used, including “Female Genital Mutilation,”  
157 “Female Genital Alteration,” “Female Circumcision,” and “Female Genital Cutting”. No  
158 language restrictions were imposed. The references were imported from each database into  
159 EndNote then into systematic review software DistillerSR and duplicates were removed [16].

160 **Study protocol, registration, and reporting.** The reporting of this study was based on the  
161 Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Review (PRISMA) reporting guidelines (S2 PRISMA  
162 Checklist) [17, 18]. The prospectively written study protocol is (S3 Study Protocol) available at:  
163 <https://osf.io/h54bu/> [19] and was registered with PROSPERO, number CRD42020186937.

164 **Inclusion and exclusion criteria.** This systematic review and meta-analysis were part of a larger  
165 project on FGM/C prevalence and its determinants [7, 19]. Cohort or cross-sectional studies that  
166 reported on FGM/C prevalence at the national level, using representative samples or population-  
167 based methods, were included in the systematic review and meta-analysis. Sub-regional, facility,  
168 community and school-based studies and studies that used non population-based methods or non-  
169 probability sampling designs, including cross-sectional, cohort designs, were included in the  
170 systematic review but not in the meta-analysis. Furthermore, case-series in migrant populations



171 outside of countries that practice FGM/C were included to understand the scope of the literature  
172 on FGM/C in these countries.

173 Studies were excluded if they (i) only reported on health outcomes of FGM/C, the attitudes and  
174 knowledge of healthcare providers, economic effects, or perceptions of FGM/C, (ii) only used  
175 qualitative methods, (iii) were systematic reviews (except for referencing), or (iv) were policy  
176 reports, conference proceedings or letters to the editor. If numerous journal articles used the  
177 same data source, e.g. secondary data analysis of international surveys, only the original report  
178 was included. Other than nationally representative studies, if the same data source completed  
179 multiple studies in a given country across time, then the most recent was included. The  
180 supplementary material contains further details on the included and excluded studies (S1  
181 Methods and Results, S1 Text).

182 **Study Screening.** Titles and abstracts were screened independently by two reviewers. Articles  
183 selected for full-text review were also screened by two reviewers, independently and in  
184 duplicates. The reasons for exclusion at both the abstract and full-text stages were recorded.  
185 Disagreements between the two reviewers were resolved by discussion and consulting a third  
186 reviewer who verified the eligibility of all included studies. The supplementary material contains  
187 further details on the screening process (S1 Methods and Results, S2 Table).

188 **Data extraction and quality assessment.** Data were extracted from included articles using a  
189 structured data extraction form, uploaded into DistillerSR. Data were extracted by one reviewer  
190 and verified by a second reviewer; disagreements were resolved by a third reviewer. Data  
191 included in the final tables were verified against the original publication by a further reviewer.  
192 Items extracted from studies included study characteristics, sampling methods, design, host  
193 country and country of origin, ethnicity, age, age at FGM/C, location of procedure, performer of  
194 FGM/C, FGM/C prevalence, and proportion of the different FGM/C types. The FGM/C  
195 prevalence in each included study was extracted as a proportion or calculated from the numbers  
196 presented. All data items were extracted from the most recent nationally representative studies  
197 (e.g. MICS or DHS), while only prevalence estimates were extracted from the older nationally  
198 representative studies for the post-hoc analysis. Studies were assessed for risk of bias  
199 independently by two reviewers using an adapted tool by Hoy and colleagues, which is specific

200 to prevalence studies [20]. This tool includes nine items that collectively assess the selection  
201 bias, representativeness of the sample, validity of the tool, and appropriateness of the estimate.  
202 Each item was scored as low or high risk of bias, and each paper was given an overall score rated  
203 as low, moderate, or high risk of bias.

## 204 **Data Analysis**

205 Because the literature fell into certain categories, namely nationally representative, sub-regional,  
206 and non-probability samples, data in the present study were grouped similarly. Prevalence  
207 estimates from the different studies were grouped by country, WHO region and study design.  
208 Pooled estimates of FGM/C prevalence were only presented from studies with representative  
209 samples or population-based methods at a national level, and the most recent survey was used in  
210 the meta-analysis. Prevalence estimates were presented separately for women aged 15-49 years  
211 old and girls aged 0-14 years old as most studies collected data for women and girls separately as  
212 defined by these age groups; and it was considered inappropriate to pool these groups together  
213 due to a cohort effect [5, 21]. Studies that estimated FGM/C among girls using the number of  
214 women with at least 1 daughter with FGM/C were excluded from the meta-analysis because this  
215 does not provide an estimate of prevalence among all girls aged 0-14 years old. The denominator  
216 of FGM/C type was the total number of women and girls with FGM/C, respectively. In addition,  
217 a post-hoc summary of prevalence estimates of FGM/C for each country was presented across  
218 time for both women and girls.

219 For the meta-analysis, heterogeneity between studies is usually assessed using the  $I^2$  statistic  
220 [22]. Although high values of  $I^2$  are common in meta-analysis for prevalence studies, prediction  
221 intervals are recommended to be presented as a measure of heterogeneity [23]. The prediction  
222 interval is the range where a proportion from a future study would be expected to be located  
223 within if this study was randomly selected from the same group of studies included in the meta-  
224 analysis [24].  $\tau^2$  values were also presented as a measure of the variance of effect sizes amongst  
225 studies [25]. Using data extracted from survey reports, a random-effects meta-analysis was  
226 conducted to produce a pooled prevalence across all nationally representative studies and across  
227 each WHO region. The random-effects meta-analysis of the pooled prevalence, 95% confidence  
228 intervals (CI) and prediction intervals (PI) were estimated using Generalized Linear Mixed  
229 Models (GLMM) [26] through the 'metaprop' command within the Meta package, version 4.15-

230 1 [27]. Funnel plots were constructed to inspect visual asymmetry using the funnelR package,  
231 version 0.1.0, which was developed for proportion data (S1 Figure and S2 Figure) [28]. To  
232 provide the total number of girls (0-14 years old) and women (15-49 years old) with FGM/C, the  
233 pooled prevalence estimate was extrapolated against the age-specific population total in 2020,  
234 which only included countries that were included in the meta-analysis, using the UN Population  
235 Division [29]. All statistical analyses were conducted using R version 4.1.2.

### 236 **Protocol amendments**

237 The protocol was amended to include studies in any language and to specify the disaggregation  
238 by age group; available at: <https://osf.io/h54bu/> (S3 Study Protocol). Other than studies involving  
239 migrants, case series and case-control studies were excluded as prevalence cannot be calculated.  
240 A data driven analysis was conducted to present prevalence of FMG/C across time from national  
241 surveys. A GLMM meta-analysis was used rather than a Freeman-Tukey transformation due to  
242 the limitations of the latter approach [26]. We also provided prediction intervals due to recent  
243 methodological recommendations and we present total number of women and girls with FGM/C  
244 to allow comparison with other global estimates [23].

### 245 **Ethical approval and role of the funding source**

246 This was a systematic review of published studies, so no ethical approval was required. There  
247 was no funding source for this study.

248

249 **Results**

250 Out of 2913 records retrieved from database and hand searches, 417 publications were assessed  
251 under full-text review. Of these, a total of 161 were included in the systematic review: 28  
252 nationally representative studies were included in the meta-analysis of the prevalence of FGM/C  
253 and two were included in the systematic review but not in the meta-analysis; 33 sub-regional  
254 studies; and 98 non population-based studies including 44 on migrant populations (Figure 1).  
255 The Indonesia RISKESDAS [30] was not included in the meta-analysis because it did not  
256 provide the sample size, and the Pew Research Center survey [31], Eritrea Population and Health  
257 Survey [32] and Yemen DHS survey [33] were not included in the meta-analysis of FGM/C  
258 prevalence of girls as these surveys had non-comparable denominators.

259 Nationally representative studies

260 Of the 30 nationally representative studies, 17 used data from Demographic and Health Surveys  
261 (DHS), 10 use data from Multiple Indicator Cluster Surveys (MICS), and three used other  
262 population-based surveys (S4 Results, S4 Table). Furthermore, 22 represent the African Region  
263 (AFR) [32, 34-54], five represent the Eastern Mediterranean Region (EMR) [33, 55-58], two  
264 represent the South-East Asian Region (SEAR) [30, 59], and one represented both EMR and  
265 AFR [31]. All national studies reported FGM/C prevalence among the total number of women  
266 and girls in surveyed households, except surveys from Liberia (reported on women who have  
267 heard of FGM/C) [45], Niger [49], and Uganda [54] that reported only on women, and surveys  
268 from Yemen [33], Eritrea [32] and Pew Research Center survey [31] which asked women  
269 whether at least one of their daughters had FGM/C. Apart from that of the Pew Research Center,  
270 all studies had a low risk of bias and used a cross-sectional design with multi-stage cluster  
271 sampling. The Pew Research Center survey had a moderate risk of bias, a cross-sectional design,  
272 and used stratified random sampling [31].

273 The 28 nationally representative studies included in the meta-analysis provided data on women  
274 in 28 countries and data on girls in 23 countries. Out of a total of 397,683 women aged 15-49  
275 years in 28 countries, 163,415 women had FGM/C representing a pooled prevalence of 38.3%  
276 (CI: 20.8-59.5%; PI: 0.5%-98.8%;  $\tau^2=5.4$ ) (Table 1 & Figure 2). Prevalence estimates varied  
277 considerably by country and ranged from 99.2% in Somalia [58] to 0.3% in Uganda [54]. Out of

278 a total of 283,437 girls aged 0-14 years in 23 countries, 46,713 girls had FGM/C, and this gave a  
279 pooled prevalence of 7.3% (95% CI: 3.1-16.0%; PI: 0.1-88.9%;  $\tau^2=4.8$ ). The country level  
280 prevalence ranged between 72.7% in Mali [46] and 0.1% in Ghana [41] (Table 1 & Figure 3).  
281 Amongst included countries, the total estimated prevalence was 86,080,915 women (95% CI:  
282 46,736,701–133,693,929) and 11,982,031 girls with FGM/C (95% CI: 5,123,351–26,476,156)  
283 (Table 1).

284 Within AFR, the prevalence amongst women was 32.0% (95% CI: 16.2-53.5%; PI: 0.5-97.8%;  
285  $\tau^2=4.6$ ) while amongst girls, it was 7.1% (95% CI: 2.7-17.8%; PI: 0.1-90.9%;  $\tau^2=5.0$ ). This  
286 provides a regional estimate of 53,533,504 (95% CI: 28,096,309 – 89,406,470) women with  
287 FGM/C and 9,193,035 (95% CI: 3,424,856 – 22,905,335) girls with FGM/C. Within EMR, the  
288 prevalence amongst women was 73.7% (95% CI: 21.0-96.7%; PI: 0.02-1%;  $\tau^2=7.2$ ), while  
289 amongst girls it was 12.0% (95% CI: 2.1-46.7%; PI: 0-99.9%;  $\tau^2=3.6$ ). This provides a EMR  
290 regional estimate of 42,249,544 (95% CI: 12,041,808 – 56,034,547) women with FGM/C and  
291 4,382,987 (95% CI: 762,100 – 17,014,158) girls with FGM/C.

292 Among available nationally representative surveys that ranged between 1994 and 2020, most  
293 countries showed a decline in the prevalence of FGM/C across repeated cross-sections of women  
294 (23 countries) and girls (25 countries) (Table 2). In addition, among repeated cross-sections of  
295 women, 7 countries showed a minor decrease in prevalence (0-3%) and three countries showed  
296 an increase in the prevalence of FGM/C. In particular, there was an increase from 97.9% to  
297 99.2% in Somalia (2006 to 2020), from 71.6% to 75.8% in Burkina Faso (1998-99 to 2010), and  
298 from 44.5% to 52.1% in Guinea-Bissau (2006 to 2018-19). For repeated cross-sections of girls, 5  
299 countries had a minor decrease in prevalence (0-3%) and two countries had an increase  
300 (Djibouti: 48.5% in 2006, to 58% in 2010; and Cameroon: 0.7% in 2004, to 1% in 2010). The  
301 largest decline was in Central African Republic (43.4% in 1994-95, to 21.6% in 2018-19) among  
302 repeated cross-sections of women; and in Ethiopia from 51.9% in 2000 to 15.7% in 2016, which  
303 was among women who reported having at least one daughter who had FGM/C.

304 Twenty-three of the 28 national reports recorded FGM/C type for women (Table 3). In MICS  
305 and DHS Type I and II were described as “cut with flesh removed”, Type III was described as  
306 “sewn closed” and Type IV was described as “nicked” or “cut”. Amongst women, the type “flesh  
307 removed” was the most common type in 19 countries, “nicked” was the least common type in 13

308 countries and “sewn closed” was most common amongst women in two countries (Sudan  
309 (77.0%) and Central African Republic (49.6%)). The pooled proportion of women with FGM/C  
310 that were “nicked” was 4.8% (95% CI: 2.9-8.1%) (Figure 4a), had “flesh removed” was 65.7%  
311 (95% CI: 56.7-73.8%) (Figure 4b), or had their genital area “sewn closed” was 12.1% (CI: 7.4%  
312 -19.4%) (Figure 4c). No pooled proportion of types was conducted amongst girls due to  
313 inconsistent reporting of types and because the type of FGM/C was only collected in 14 out of 23  
314 countries. Amongst girls with FGM/C, “not sewn closed” and “flesh removed” were the most  
315 common type in 6 countries each and “sewn closed” was the least common type in 7 countries  
316 although it was the most common type in Sierra Leone (83.3%). Surveys using the terms “not  
317 sewn closed” may refer to Types, I, II, and IV (Table 3).

318 In all countries, for the majority of women and girls, FGM/C was performed by traditional  
319 circumcisers, whilst a lower proportion was performed by medical professionals. The exception  
320 was girls in Egypt, where the proportion of FGM/C performed by medical professionals was  
321 81.9% (Table 4) [55]. For women, in all countries where age of FGM/C was reported, FGM/C  
322 was most commonly performed at early ages (0-5 years) except for Kenya, Egypt, Sierra Leone,  
323 Guinea, and Tanzania where the procedure was most commonly done at 9-14 years, and Somalia  
324 where it was most commonly done at 5-9 years. For girls, the highest proportion of FGM/C was  
325 performed at the lowest age category: under 1 year of age (seven countries). Exceptions include  
326 Burkina Faso, Gambia, and Tanzania where the category 1-4 years had higher proportions, Sierra  
327 Leone, Kenya, and Guinea (most commonly done at 5-9 years), Egypt (most commonly done at  
328 11-12 years) and Somalia (most commonly done at 10-14 years).

### 329 Sub-regional studies

330 Thirty-three sub-regional studies were from 13 countries, with ten from EMR and 23 from AFR.  
331 Among studies including women, the highest FGM/C prevalence was in Somaliland, Somalia  
332 (99.1%) [60] and the lowest was in Axum Town, North Ethiopia (0.7%) [61]. Regarding the 17  
333 sub-regional studies including girls, the highest FGM/C prevalence was in Kersa, Ethiopia  
334 (88.1%) [62] and the lowest was in Axum Town, Ethiopia (0%) [61] (S5 Results, S6 Table).  
335 Eight out of the 33 sub-regional studies reported on FGM/C type. Type IV was most common in  
336 one study [63], Type II was the most common in four studies [64-67] and “sewn closed” was the



337 most common in two sub-regional DHS reports on Somaliland [60] and the Northeast Zone of  
338 Somalia [68] (S5 Results, S7 Table). In 12 studies, the most common performers of FGM/C were  
339 traditional circumcisers [62, 63, 66, 69-77]. In three studies, in Egypt [78, 79] and Saudi Arabia  
340 [80] medical professionals were more common (S5 Results, S8 Table).

341 School, Community or Facility based studies excluding studies on migrant populations

342 Within 98 non population-based studies, 54 studies (excluding studies on migrant populations)  
343 were from 15 countries, with 30 studies from countries in AFR, three studies from Malaysia in  
344 SEAR, and 21 studies from countries in EMR (S6 Results, S9 Table). Thirty-one were  
345 hospital/clinic-based, 14 school-based, and nine community-based studies. School and  
346 university-based studies reported a prevalence ranging from 9.4% [81] to 83.3% [82]; hospital or  
347 clinic-based studies reported a prevalence from 13% [83] to 100% [84], and community-based  
348 studies reported a prevalence from 0.4% [85] to 99.3% [86] (S6 Results, S10 Table). Two had  
349 prospective designs, two were retrospective, one was a cohort study, and 49 were cross-sectional.  
350 Twenty-five studies reported on FGM/C types. In ten studies Type I was most common [83, 87-  
351 95], Type II was most common in four studies [96-99], Type III in three studies [100-102], and  
352 Type IV in two studies [86, 103] (S6 Results, S11 Table).

353 Studies on migrant populations

354 Within the 98 non population-based studies, 44 studies on migrant populations with FGM/C  
355 were identified. The included studies were from the Region of the Americas (AMR) (9 studies),  
356 European Region (EUR) (25 studies), Western Pacific Region (WPR) (5 studies), and EMR (5  
357 studies) (S7 Results, S13 Table). Most studies had a moderate risk of bias and four had a high  
358 risk of bias. Participants in these studies were categorized as migrants, refugees, or asylum  
359 seekers. Study designs were case control (n=1), and randomised controlled trial (n=1),  
360 population based (n=5), retrospective or database studies (n=5), and cross-sectional studies  
361 (n=15), case series (n=17). Prevalence within these migrant populations ranged from 0.32% (of a  
362 sample of 145,492) [104] to 99% (of a sample of 191) [105] (S8 Results, S14 Table). Type III  
363 [104-113] was the most common type in 10 studies, followed by Type II in 9 studies [114-122],  
364 Type I (8 studies) [123-130], and Type IV (three studies) [131-133] (S7 Results, S15 Table).

## 365 **Discussion**

366 This systematic review and meta-analysis estimated that nearly 100 million girls and women of  
367 reproductive age had FGM/C, which was among countries included in the analysis. Results  
368 indicated that the practice remains widespread in countries where it is reported. In particular,  
369 across 28 countries there was a pooled prevalence of 38% among women aged 15-49 years old,  
370 and across 23 countries, there was a pooled prevalence of 7% among girls aged 0-14 years old.  
371 Over repeated cross-sectional surveys, the prevalence of FGM/C appears to have decreased in 23  
372 countries for women and 25 countries for girls. It appears to have increased in three countries for  
373 women (Guinea-Bissau, Burkina Faso, and Somalia) and two countries for girls (Djibouti and  
374 Cameroon). For both women and girls who had FGM, most had the type “flesh removed” (Types  
375 I and II), and “sewn closed” (Type III), the most severe type of FGM/C, was practised over  
376 three-quarters of women and girls in Sudan and Sierra Leone. In most countries, FGM/C  
377 commonly occurred in early childhood and was performed by traditional circumcisers. FGM/C  
378 appears to continue in those who migrate from countries where FGM/C is prevalent.

379 The total prevalence of FGM/C specified in this study is consistent with previous estimates of  
380 FGM/C among girls and women of reproductive age where estimates of FGM/C range from 100-  
381 140 million women and girls [2, 3]. Our study findings differ to the most recent UNICEF report,  
382 which states the global prevalence of FGM/C to be over 200 million among living women and  
383 girls; although the upper end of the combined confidence interval was close to this estimate [1,  
384 4]. UNICEF extrapolated their prevalence to women of all ages and this study was unable to  
385 locate reports to provide an estimate for women from Djibouti, women and girls from Indonesia  
386 and this study excluded estimates from surveys that used a household level prevalence of FGM/C  
387 among girls.

388 The decline of FGM/C across repeated cross-sectional studies in many countries is encouraging  
389 and corresponds with previous research, which showed an absolute decline in the prevalence of  
390 FGM/C amongst girls aged 0-14 years by 51.8%; from 67.6% in 1990-1996 to 15.8% in 2015-  
391 2017 [21]. Results were consistent with previous research regarding large variations in  
392 prevalence between countries and regions [5, 21, 134].

393 Structural level changes including legislative bans and policy changes are likely to play a role in  
394 the possible decline. Globally, there are 84 countries that either have specific legislation that



395 bans FGM/C or other legislation that enables the persecution of FGM/C [135, 136]. In Egypt, the  
396 lower prevalence for girls may relate to the legal ban implemented in 2008 [55]. However, the  
397 efficacy of laws against FGM/C depend on enforcement and the specificities of the law. For  
398 example, in Liberia and Mauritania laws only protect girls below the age of 18 [136, 137] and in  
399 Indonesia, FGM/C was legalized in a medical setting in 2010, however, the repeal of that law in  
400 2014 left no explicit ban or consequences [136, 138]. In Somalia, there is no national legislation  
401 that enforces the Somalia constitution which states that “circumcision is prohibited” [135, 136].  
402 Furthermore, there is no legislative ban in Mali and the prevalence remains high at 88.6% of  
403 women and 72.7% of girls [46].

404 In addition to legislation and judicial enforcement, other mechanisms may have contributed to a  
405 reduction in FGM/C, such as education, literacy and change in social norms [139, 140]. To end  
406 the propagation of FGM/C future research should undertake process evaluations of structural,  
407 community and family level interventions and policies in countries where FGM/C has declined.  
408 Understanding the underlying mechanisms for change in FGM/C, in countries where there has  
409 been success, will be instrumental for the adoption of effective policies and interventions to meet  
410 the SDG target 5.3.

411 Consistent with other studies, the most common FGM/C type amongst women and girls was ‘cut  
412 with flesh removed’, equivalent to Type I or II [5, 141]. Koski and colleagues reported that there  
413 were no significant differences regarding the types and severity of FGM/C across cohorts [5].  
414 Similar to other findings, this review found that FGM/C most often occurs in early childhood  
415 [141].

416 Similar to the findings of this study, UNICEF reported that traditional circumcisers perform most  
417 procedures. Yet, the opposite occurs in Egypt where medicalization of FGM/C was high despite  
418 its ban [55]. WHO and UNICEF have called for the end of medicalization of FGM/C [142, 143].  
419 Discussions around the medicalisation of FGM/C are beyond the scope of this study but this has  
420 been discussed elsewhere [142, 144, 145].

421 Studies of different regions or facilities in the same countries had different prevalence reports, a  
422 phenomenon also reported by UNICEF [141], likely owing to regional or community risk  
423 factors. For example, the national prevalence in Ethiopian women was 65.2% [39], while in one

424 region, the East Gojjam Zone, it was 96% [72]. Studies based on migrant populations have  
425 widely varying prevalence estimates. They demonstrate that FGM/C is present in countries  
426 where it is not traditionally practiced; however, high quality studies are needed to understand  
427 FGM/C in these countries, and to inform policies, interventions, and relevant healthcare services.

428 The strengths of the study ensure a thorough and accurate examination of the research question.  
429 The review had broad inclusion criteria to provide a comprehensive review of all FGM/C  
430 studies. The study used robust methods to identify studies, extract data, and present findings. The  
431 broadest possible scope of research was scanned with no restrictions on language. A hand search  
432 of grey literature was conducted to be as comprehensive as possible. Moreover, DHS and MICS  
433 data, which are collected via representative sampling methodology with high response rates and  
434 a low risk of bias, ensured the quality of the meta-analyses.

435 This study had several limitations. Estimates were based on the available published data, which  
436 may not reflect the actual global prevalence of FGM/C. There were two missing country reports  
437 unavailable for analysis (S1 Methods and Results, S1 Text). The actual global total number of  
438 girls and women with FGM/C will be higher than that reported in this study due to missing data  
439 from key countries. For example, Indonesia was not included in the meta-analysis due to lack of  
440 a denominator. FGM/C was self-reported, thus the prevalence estimates may be underreported  
441 due to legal ramifications or social desirability. Furthermore, the translation of terms within  
442 surveys may impact recall and comprehension, which emphasizes the need for survey tools to be  
443 validated within each context. In addition, women and girls may not be able to accurately recall  
444 the type of procedure performed on them, or there may be confusion due to multiple ways of  
445 describing each type [146]. Furthermore, recollection of who performed the procedure may be  
446 inaccurate [147].

447 The prevalence in the 0-14 age group may be underreported as these girls are still at risk of  
448 FGM/C at the time of survey. Future research should adjust prevalence by age at FGM/C  
449 procedure or conduct analyses based on age cohorts to be inclusive of those still at risk of  
450 FGM/C. A future study examining FGM/C prevalence among five-year age cohorts will be  
451 useful to understand if trends exist across age groups [141]. This study also shows the need for  
452 consistency in future research regarding the denominator of FGM/C among girls and

453 terminology used to describe each type of FGM/C.

454 This study highlights the need to expand data collection and surveillance using robust  
455 methodologies particularly in high resource countries with migrant populations from countries  
456 that practice FGM/C. There are numerous data gaps on the national prevalence of FGM/C in  
457 multiple countries, including: Colombia, Georgia, Russia, Iran, Oman, Kuwait, Singapore,  
458 Thailand, the Philippines, India, Pakistan, Ecuador, Peru, Saudi Arabia, the State of Palestine, Sri  
459 Lanka and United Arab Emirates [148]. In Indonesia approximately 50% of girls aged 0-14 had  
460 FGM/C; however, we know relatively little about FGM/C in Indonesia, which warrants further  
461 investigation given its large population size.

462 In conclusion, approximately 100 million women and girls have had FGM/C among countries  
463 included in the analysis, and there is large variation between countries in progress to ending  
464 FGM/C by 2030. Current findings may be used as a baseline in future attempts to track progress  
465 to meeting SDG 5.3. A decline to end FGM/C across future generation of girls may be possible  
466 in the near future in low-prevalence countries such as Niger, Uganda, and Ghana. However, the  
467 decline in FGM/C must be greater in countries where the current prevalence of FGM/C is higher  
468 such as Egypt, Sudan, Indonesia, Somalia, Djibouti, Guinea, and Mali, which emphasizes the  
469 need for immediate interventions and policies to end this harmful practice.

470

471 **Declaration of interests**

472 We declare no competing interests.

473 **Data sharing statement**

474 All data generated or analysed for this study are included in this article and its supplementary  
475 files.

476 **Contributors**

477 SM conceived the study and SA, C Akl, and C Akik contributed to the study design. LF and SM  
478 wrote the protocol with contributions from SA, C Akl, C Akik. LF completed the literature  
479 search. LF and ZD selected the studies and extracted relevant data. LF analysed the data and  
480 wrote the first draft of the paper. SM, C Akl, C Akik, SA, and ZD revised drafts and approved  
481 the final manuscript. SM supervised LF, and SM is the guarantor of the study.

482 **Acknowledgements**

483 We thank Dr Marie-Claire Rebeiz, Mrs Tanya Khoury, and Ms Sara Mansour who verified the  
484 data in the tables.

485

486 **Supporting information**

487 **Captions for Figures:**

488 **Figure 2.** Footnote: There were 30 studies included in the systematic review as nationally-  
489 representative studies, however, The Pew Research Study [31] did not include women and the  
490 Indonesia RISKESDAS [30] did not report sample sizes, thus they were not included in this  
491 analysis.

492 **Figure 3.** Footnote: There were 30 studies included in the systematic review as nationally-  
493 representative studies, however, surveys from Liberia [45], Niger [49], and Uganda [54] did not  
494 include girls, and The Pew Research Study [31], Yemen [33], and Eritrea [32] only included  
495 women who reported on at least one daughter in their household who has had FGM/C, and the  
496 Indonesia RISKESDAS [30] did not report sample sizes, thus they were not included in this  
497 analysis.

498 **S1 Methods and Results**

499 S1 Table. Search Strategy

500 S2 Table. Inter-rater reliability rate at different stages of the screening process.

501 Footnote: A third reviewer confirmed the inclusion of all studies. The Cohen's kappa provided a  
502 global score across all three inclusion criteria; after the full text screening it was decided that the  
503 risk factors of FGM/C would be presented in separate paper. At stage 1, reviewers had the option  
504 to indicate if they were unsure, which may also partially explain the low score before resolution.  
505 Agreement was higher on the first two points of the inclusion criteria: (i) prevalence studies and  
506 (ii) non population-based studies examining FGM/C.

507 S1 Text. Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria.

508 S2 Text. Supplementary results.

509 **S2 Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA)**

510 **Checklist**

511 **S3 Study Protocol**

512 S1 Fig. Funnel plot of FGM/C prevalence in Women of Reproductive Age (15-49 years old) in  
513 Nationally Representative Studies.

514 S2 Fig. Funnel plot of FGM/C prevalence in Girls (0-14 years old) in Nationally Representative  
515 Studies.

#### 516 **S4 Results: Nationally representative studies**

517 S4 Table. Characteristics of nationally representative studies.

518 Footnote: Abbreviations: AFR: African Region; DHS: Demographic and Health Survey; EMR:  
519 Eastern Mediterranean Region; MICS: Multiple Indicator Cluster Surveys; SEAR: South-East  
520 Asia Region; WHO: World Health Organization.

521  
522 Legend\*Not included in meta-analysis.

523

#### 524 **S5 Results: Sub-Regional Population-Based Studies**

525 S5 Table. Characteristics of Sub-Regional Population-Based Studies.

526 Legend: \*Patient report and examination, all others: Patient Report † women reported that at  
527 least 1 daughter had FGM/C in the household.

528 Footnote: All studies used cross-sectional methods.

529 S6 Table. Prevalence of FGM/C in Women and Girls in Sub-Regional Population-Based Studies.

530 Footnote: Abbreviations: AFR: African Region EMR: Eastern Mediterranean Region, FGM/C:  
531 Female Genital Mutilation/Cutting.

532 Legend: \* Women reported that at least 1 daughter had FGM/C in the household. † Youngest  
533 daughter had FGM/C. ‡ Due to inconsistent data reported in the study, this number was  
534 calculated by the authors of this review.

535 S7 Table. Types of FGM/C in Sub-Regional Population-Based Studies.

536 Legend \* % of Women † % of youngest daughter ‡ % of girls

537 Footnote: Somaliland and Northeast Zone MICS calculate the prevalence of types out of the total  
538 number of participants, and report type II as “flesh removed” and type II as “sewn closed”.

539 Abberviations FGM/C: Female Genital Mutilation/Cutting

540 S8 Table. Characteristics of FGM/C Procedure in Sub-Regional Population-Based Studies.

541 Footnote Abbreviations: AFR: African Region EMR: Eastern Mediterranean Region Female  
542 Genital Mutilation/Cutting

543 **S6 Results: School, Community or Facility based studies excluding studies on migrant**  
544 **populations**

545 S9 Table. Characteristics of School, Community or Facility based studies excluding studies on  
546 migrant populations.

547 Legend: \*Types of FGM/C mentioned were: Clitoral tip excision, Complete clitoridectomy,  
548 Clitoridectomy/labia minora Excision, Clitoridectomy/labia minora/Inner majora excision.

549 Footnote: Abbreviations: AFR: African Region EMR: Eastern Mediterranean Region SEAR:  
550 South East Asian Region

551 S10 Table. Proportion of FGM/C in Women and Girls in School, Community or Facility based  
552 studies excluding studies on migrant populations.

553 Legend: \*Out of the female school teachers \*\*Without excluding those who were unsure if they  
554 had been mutilated.\*\*\* Prevalence according to clinical examination.

555 Footnote: Abbreviations: AFR: African Region EMR: Eastern Mediterranean Region, SEAR:  
556 South East Asian Region, FGM/C: Female Genital Mutilation/Cutting

557 S11 Table. Types of FGM/C in School, Community or Facility based studies excluding studies  
558 on migrant populations.

559 Footnote: Abbreviations: AFR: African Region EMR: Eastern Mediterranean Region SEAR:  
560 South East Asian Region, FGM/C: Female Genital Mutilation/Cutting

561 S12 Table. Characteristics of FGM/C Procedure in School, Community or Facility based studies  
562 excluding studies on migrant populations.

563 Footnote: Abbreviations: AFR: African Region EMR: Eastern Mediterranean Region SEAR:  
564 South East Asian Region FGM/C: Female Genital Mutilation/Cutting

565 **S7 Results: Studies on Migrant Populations.**

566 S13 Table. Characteristics of Studies on Migrant Populations.

567 Legend: \* Tissue removed and sewn closed, tissue removed and some stitching, some tissue  
568 removed, pricking. † Flesh removed, Genital area just nicked, Genital area sewn closed

569 Footnote: Abbreviations: EMR: Eastern Mediterranean Region. SEAR: South East Asian  
570 Region. EUR: European Region. WPR: Western Pacific Region AMR: American Region

571 S14 Table. Prevalence of FGM/C in Migrant Populations.

572 Footnote: Abbreviations: EMR: Eastern Mediterranean Region. SEAR: South East Asian  
573 Region. EUR: European Region. WPR: Western Pacific Region AMR: American Region

574 FGM/C: Female Genital Mutilation/Cutting

575 S15 Table. Types of FGM/C in Migrant Populations.

576 Legend: \*Flesh removed and some stitching † Flesh removed and sown closed.

577 Footnote: Abbreviations: EMR: Eastern Mediterranean Region. SEAR: South East Asian  
578 Region. EUR: European Region. WPR: Western Pacific Region AMR: American Region

579 FGM/C: Female Genital Mutilation/Cutting

580 S16 Table. Characteristics of FGM/C Procedure for Migrant Populations.

581 Footnote: Abbreviations: EMR: Eastern Mediterranean Region. SEAR: South East Asian  
582 Region. EUR: European Region. WPR: Western Pacific Region AMR: American Region

583 FGM/C: Female Genital Mutilation/Cutting

584



## References

1. UNICEF. Female Genital Mutilation: UNICEF; 2022. Available from: <https://data.unicef.org/topic/child-protection/female-genital-mutilation/> Date Accessed: 22-04-2022.
2. UNFPA. Demographic Perspectives on Female Genital Mutilation New York: UNFPA; 2015. Available from: [https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/content/documents/19961027123\\_UN\\_Demographics\\_v3%20\(1\).pdf](https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/content/documents/19961027123_UN_Demographics_v3%20(1).pdf) Date Accessed: 22-04-2022.
3. Population Reference Bureau. Female Genital Mutilation/Cutting: Data and Trends Update 2014 – Infographic 2014. Available from: <https://www.prb.org/resources/female-genital-mutilation-cutting-data-and-trends-update-2014/> Date Accessed: 22-04-2022.
4. UNICEF. Female Genital Mutilation/Cutting: A global concern New York: UNICEF; 2016. Available from: [https://www.unicef.org/media/files/FGMC\\_2016\\_brochure\\_final\\_UNICEF\\_SPREAD.pdf](https://www.unicef.org/media/files/FGMC_2016_brochure_final_UNICEF_SPREAD.pdf) Date Accessed: 22-04-2022.
5. Koski A, Heymann J. Thirty-year trends in the prevalence and severity of female genital mutilation: a comparison of 22 countries. *BMJ Global Health*. 2017;2(4):e000467. PubMed PMID: 29225952.
6. Kandala NB, Ezejimofor MC, Uthman OA, Komba P. Secular trends in the prevalence of female genital mutilation/cutting among girls: a systematic analysis. *Bmj Global Health*. 2018;3(5). doi: 10.1136/bmjgh-2017-000549. PubMed PMID: WOS:000457716300001.
7. El-Dirani Z, Farouki L, Akl C, Ali U, Akik C, McCall SJ. Factors associated with female genital mutilation: a systematic review and synthesis of national, regional and community-based studies. *BMJ Sexual & Reproductive Health*. 2022;bmjsrh-2021-201399. doi: 10.1136/bmjsrh-2021-201399.
8. Kobach A, Ruf-Leuschner M, Elbert T. Psychopathological sequelae of female genital mutilation and their neuroendocrinological associations. *BMC Psychiatry*. 2018;18(1):187. PubMed PMID: 29895282.
9. Reisel D, Creighton SM. Long term health consequences of Female Genital Mutilation (FGM). *Maturitas*. 2015;80(1):48-51. PubMed PMID: 25466303.
10. Sarayloo K. RR, Elhadi A. Health consequences of the female genital mutilation: a systematic review. *Galen Medical Journal* 2018;8:1336. 2019.
11. Lurie JM, Weidman A, Huynh S, Delgado D, Easthausen I, Kaur G. Painful gynecologic and obstetric complications of female genital mutilation/cutting: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *PLoS medicine*. 2020;17(3):e1003088-e. doi: 10.1371/journal.pmed.1003088.
12. Tordrup D, Bishop C, Green N, Petzold M, Vallejo FR, Vogel JP, et al. Economic burden of female genital mutilation in 27 high-prevalence countries. *BMJ global health*. 2022;7(2). doi: 10.1136/bmjgh-2020-004512.
13. Odukogbe ATA, Afolabi BB, Bello OO, Adeyanju AS. Female genital mutilation/cutting in Africa. *Translational Andrology and Urology*. 2017;6(2):138-48. doi: 10.21037/tau.2016.12.01.
14. World Health Organisation. Female genital mutilation 2022. Available from: <https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/female-genital-mutilation> Date Accessed: 02-05-2022.
15. Banks E, Meirik O, Farley T, Akande O, Bathija H, Ali M. Female genital mutilation and obstetric outcome: WHO collaborative prospective study in six African countries. *Lancet*. 2006;367(9525):1835-41. doi: 10.1016/s0140-6736(06)68805-3. PubMed PMID: 16753486.
16. Evidence Partners. DistillerSR. Version 2.35. Available from: <https://www.evidencepartners.com>. Accessed: March 2020-April 2022.
17. Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, Altman DG. Reprint—Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses: The PRISMA Statement. *Physical therapy*. 2009;89(9):873-80. doi: 10.1093/ptj/89.9.873.

18. Page MJ, McKenzie JE, Bossuyt PM, Boutron I, Hoffmann TC, Mulrow CD, et al. The PRISMA 2020 statement: an updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. *BMJ (Online)*. 2021;372. doi: 10.1136/bmj.n71.
19. Farouki L, Abdulrahim, S., Akl, C., Akik, C., McCall, S. The global prevalence, distribution and determinants of female genital mutilation: a protocol for a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Open Science Framework*. 2020.
20. Hoy D, Brooks P, Woolf A, Blyth F, March L, Bain C, et al. Assessing risk of bias in prevalence studies: modification of an existing tool and evidence of interrater agreement. *Journal of clinical epidemiology*. 2012;65(9):934-9. doi: 10.1016/j.jclinepi.2011.11.014.
21. Kandala NB, Ezejimofor MC, Uthman OA, Komba P. Secular trends in the prevalence of female genital mutilation/cutting among girls: a systematic analysis. *BMJ Global Health*. 2018;3(5):e000549. PubMed PMID: 30483404.
22. Higgins JPT, Thompson SG, Deeks JJ, Altman DG. Measuring inconsistency in meta-analyses. *BMJ*. 2003;327(7414):557. doi: 10.1136/bmj.327.7414.557.
23. Migliavaca CB, Stein C, Colpani V, Barker TH, Ziegelmann PK, Munn Z, et al. Meta-analysis of prevalence: I 2 statistic and how to deal with heterogeneity. *Research synthesis methods*. 2022.
24. Spinelì LM, Pandis N. Prediction interval in random-effects meta-analysis. *American journal of orthodontics and dentofacial orthopedics*. 2020;157(4):586-8. doi: 10.1016/j.ajodo.2019.12.011.
25. Higgins JPT. Commentary: Heterogeneity in meta-analysis should be expected and appropriately quantified. *International Journal of Epidemiology*. 2008;37(5):1158-60. doi: 10.1093/ije/dyn204.
26. Lin L, Chu H. Meta-analysis of Proportions Using Generalized Linear Mixed Models. *Epidemiology (Cambridge, Mass)*. 2020;31(5):713-7. doi: 10.1097/EDE.0000000000001232.
27. Nyaga VN, Arbyn M, Aerts M. Metaprop: a Stata command to perform meta-analysis of binomial data. *Archives of Public Health*. 2014;72(1):39. doi: 10.1186/2049-3258-72-39.
28. Kumar M. Funnel Plots for Proportion Data 2018. Available from: <https://cran.r-project.org/web/packages/funnelR/index.html> Date Accessed: 23-04-22.
29. UN Department of Economic and Social Affairs Population Dynamics. *Quinquennial Population by Five-Year Age Groups - Female*. 2019.
30. Health Research and Development Agency. *Riset Kesehatan Dasar (RISKESDAS) 2013*. Indonesia: Government of Indonesia, 2013.
31. Pew Research Center. *Tolerance and Tension: Islam and Christianity in Sub-Saharan Africa*. Pew Research Center, 2010.
32. National Statistics Office Fafo Institute For Applied International Studies. *Eritrea Population and Health Survey 2010*. Asmara, Eritrea: World Health Organisation, 2013.
33. Ministry of Public Health and Population. *Yemen National Health and Demographic Survey 2013*. Rockville, Maryland, USA: MOPHP, CSO, PAPPAM, and ICF International, 2015.
34. Institut national de la statistique et de l'analyse économique (INSAE). *Enquête par grappes à indicateurs multiples 2014, Rapport final*. Cotonou, Bénin: UNICEF, 2015.
35. Institut National de la Statistique et de la Démographie IBF, International ICF. *Burkina Faso Enquête Démographique et de Santé et Indicateurs Multiples (EDSBF-MICS IV) 2010*. Calverton, Maryland, USA: Institut National de la Statistique et de la Démographie - INSD/Burkina Faso and ICF International, 2012.
36. Institut Centrafricain des Statistiques et des Etudes Economiques et Sociales. *Central African Republic Multiple Indicator Cluster Survey 2018-2019* Bangui, République Centrafricaine: UNICEF, 2021.
37. INSEED and UNICEF. *Enquête par grappes à indicateurs multiples Tchad 2019*. N'Djamena, Tchad: UNICEF, 2021.
38. Institute National de la Statistique. *Enquête par grappes à indicateurs multiples - Côte d'Ivoire 2016*. Cote D'Ivoire: UNICEF, 2017.
39. Central Statistical Agency & ICF. *Ethiopia Demographic and Health Survey 2016*. Addis Ababa, Ethiopia: CSA and ICF, 2017.

40. Gambia Bureau of Statistics. The Gambia Demographic and Health Survey 2019-20. Banjul, The Gambia: The DHS Program ICF Rockville, Maryland, USA, 2021.
41. Ghana Statistical Service. Multiple Indicator Cluster Survey (MICS2017/18), Survey Findings Report. Accra, Ghana: UNICEF, 2018.
42. Institut National de la Statistique Ministère du Plan et du Développement Economique & ICF. République de Guinée Enquête Démographique et de Santé 2018. Conakry, Guinée: The DHS Program, ICF Rockville, Maryland, USA, 2019.
43. Ministério da Economia e Finanças D-GdP, Instituto Nacional de Estatística,. Inquérito aos Indicadores Múltiplos (MICS6) 2018-2019, Relatório Final. Bissau, Guiné-Bissau: UNICEF, 2020.
44. Kenya National Bureau of Statistics & ICF. Kenya Demographic and Health Survey 2014. Rockville, MD, USA: Kenya National Bureau of Statistics and ICF International, 2015.
45. Liberia Institute of Statistics and Geo-Information Services. Liberia Demographic and Health Survey 2019-20 - Key Indicators Report. Monrovia, Liberia: LSGIS ICF International, 2020.
46. Institut National de la Statistique (INSTAT) Cellule de Planification et de Statistique Secteur Santé-Développement Social et Promotion de la Famille (CPS/SS-DS-PF) & ICF. Mali Demographic and Health Survey 2018. Bamako, Mali: INSTAT/CPS/SS-DS-PF and ICF, 2019.
47. Mauritania National Statistics Office. Enquête par Grappes à Indicateurs Multiples, 2015, Résultats clés. Nouakchott, Mauritanie: UNICEF, 2016.
48. National Population Commission (NPC) [Nigeria] & ICF. Nigeria Demographic and Health Survey 2018 - Final Report. Abuja, Nigeria: NPC and ICF, 2019.
49. Institut National de la Statistique INSN, International ICF. Niger Enquête Démographique et de Santé et ‡ Indicateurs Multiples (EDSN-MICS IV) 2012. Calverton, Maryland, USA: INS/Niger and ICF International, 2013.
50. Agence Nationale de la Statistique et de la Démographie (ANSD). Enquête Démographique et de Santé Continue - EDS-Continue 2019. Dakar, Sénégal: The DHS Program ICF Rockville, Maryland, USA 2020.
51. Statistics Sierra Leone & ICF. Sierra Leone Demographic and Health Survey 2019. Freetown, Sierra Leone: Ministry of Health and Sanitation and ICF International, 2020.
52. Ministry of Health Tanzania and Zanzibar National Bureau of Statistics Office of Chief Government Statistician Zanzibar ICF. Tanzania Demographic and Health Survey and Malaria Indicator Survey 2015-2016. Dar es Salaam, Tanzania: MoHCDCGEC, MoH, NBS, OCGS, and ICF, 2016.
53. Institut National de la Statistique et des Etudes Economiques et Démographiques. Togo - Enquête à Indicateurs Multiples 2017, Rapport final. Lomé, Togo: UNICEF, 2018.
54. Uganda Bureau of Statistics and ICF. Uganda Demographic and Health Survey 2016. Kampala, Uganda: UBOS and ICF, 2018.
55. Ministry of Health Population El Zanaty and associates and ICF International. Egypt Demographic and Health Survey 2014. Cairo, Egypt: Ministry of Health and Population and ICF International, 2015.
56. Central Statistical Organization. Iraq Multiple Indicator Cluster Survey 2018 Survey Findings Report. Iraq: UNICEF, 2019.
57. Central Bureau of Statistics & UNICEF Sudan. Multiple Indicator Cluster Survey 2014 of Sudan, Final Report. Khartoum, Sudan: UNICEF, 2016.
58. Directorate of National Statistics. Somalia Health and Demographic Survey 2020. Federal Government of Somalia, United Nations Population Fund, 2020.
59. Ministry of Health and ICF. Maldives Demographic and Health Survey 2016-17. Malé, Maldives: MOH and ICF, 2018.
60. Phadungkiatwattana P, Rujivejpongathron J, Tunsatit T, Yanase Y. Analyzing pregnancy outcomes in women of extremely advanced maternal age (> or = 45 years). J Med Assoc Thai. 2014;97(1):1-6. PubMed PMID: 24701722.

61. Gebrekirstos K, Abebe M, Fantahun A. A cross sectional study on factors associated with harmful traditional practices among children less than 5 years in Axum town, north Ethiopia, 2013. *Reproductive Health*. 2014;11:46. PubMed PMID: 24952584.
62. Yirga WS, Kassa NA, Gebremichael MW, Aro AR. Female genital mutilation: prevalence, perceptions and effect on women's health in Kersa district of Ethiopia. *International Journal of Women's Health*. 2012;4:45-54. PubMed PMID: 22371659.
63. Gudeta TA, Regassa TM, Gamtessa LC. Female genital mutilation: prevalence, associated factors and health consequences among reproductive age group women in Keffa Zone, Southwest, Ethiopia. *Reproductive Health*. 2022;19(1):9. doi: 10.1186/s12978-022-01364-3. PubMed PMID: WOS:000764993700001.
64. Bogale D, Markos D, Kaso M. Prevalence of female genital mutilation and its effect on women's health in Bale zone, Ethiopia: a cross-sectional study. *BMC public health*. 2014;14:1076. doi: 10.1186/1471-2458-14-1076.
65. Johnson OE, Okon RD. Perception and practice of female genital cutting in a rural community in southern Nigeria. *African journal of reproductive health*. 2012;16(4):132-9.
66. Greis A, Barnighausen T, Bountogo M, Ouermi L, Sie A, Harling G. Attitudes towards female genital cutting among adolescents in rural Burkina Faso: a multilevel analysis. *Tropical Medicine & International Health*. 2020;25(1):119-31. PubMed PMID: 31698528.
67. Greis A, Barnighausen T, Bountogo M, Ouermi L, Si A, Harling G. Attitudes towards female genital cutting among adolescents in rural Burkina Faso: a multilevel analysis. *Tropical Medicine & International Health*. 2020;25(1):119-31. doi: 10.1111/tmi.13338. PubMed PMID: WOS:000509501600013.
68. Northeast Somalia Ministry of Planning and International Cooperation. Northeast Zone, Somalia Monitoring the situation of children and women Multiple Indicator Cluster Survey 2011 Nairobi, Kenya: UNICEF, 2014.
69. Oljira T, Assefa N, Dessie Y. Female genital mutilation among mothers and daughters in Harar, eastern Ethiopia. *International Journal of Gynaecology & Obstetrics*. 2016;135(3):304-9. PubMed PMID: 27609740.
70. Gajaa M, Wakgari N, Kebede Y, Derseh L. Prevalence and associated factors of circumcision among daughters of reproductive aged women in the Hababo Guduru District, Western Ethiopia: a cross-sectional study. *BMC Women's Health*. 2016;16:42. PubMed PMID: 27449648.
71. Mitike G, Deressa W. Prevalence and associated factors of female genital mutilation among Somali refugees in eastern Ethiopia: a cross-sectional study. *BMC Public Health*. 2009;9:264. PubMed PMID: 19635149.
72. Andualem M. Determinants of Female Genital Mutilation Practices in East Gojjam Zone, Western Amhara, Ethiopia. *Ethiopian Medical Journal*. 2016;54(3):109-16. PubMed PMID: 29115777.
73. Abebe S, Dessalegn M, Hailu Y, Makonnen M. Prevalence and Barriers to Ending Female Genital Cutting: The Case of Afar and Amhara Regions of Ethiopia. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*. 2020;17(21):16. doi: 10.3390/ijerph17217960. PubMed PMID: WOS:000588904300001.
74. Ifeanyichukwu OA, Oluwaseyi A, Adetunji L. Female genital mutilation: Attitude and practices among women in Okada community, Edo state. *Journal of Medicine and Biomedical Research*. 2015;14(2):138-50.
75. Johnson OE, Okon RD. Perception and practice of female genital cutting in a rural community in southern Nigeria. *African Journal of Reproductive Health*. 2012;16(4):132-9. PubMed PMID: 23444550.
76. Bjalkander O, Leigh B, Harman G, Bergstrom S, Almroth L. Female genital mutilation in Sierra Leone: who are the decision makers? *African Journal of Reproductive Health*. 2012;16(4):119-31. PubMed PMID: 23444549.
77. Mohammed ES, Seedhom AE, Mahfouz EM. Female genital mutilation: current awareness, believes and future intention in rural Egypt. *Reproductive Health*. 2018;15(1):175. PubMed PMID: 30333019.



78. Salama I, Sami S, Rabah T, Salama S, Mohsin AA. Female genital mutilation among Egyptian school children. *European Journal of Pediatrics*. 2017;176(11):1463-4. doi: 10.1007/s00431-017-2979-8.
79. Zayed AA, Ali AA. Abusing female children by circumcision is continued in Egypt. *Journal of Forensic & Legal Medicine*. 2012;19(4):196-200. PubMed PMID: 22520370.
80. Milaat WA, Ibrahim NK, Albar HM. Reproductive health profile and circumcision of females in the Hali semi-urban region, Saudi Arabia: A community-based cross-sectional survey. *Annals of Saudi Medicine*. 2018;38(2):81-9. doi: 10.5144/0256-4947.2018.81.
81. Chinawa AT, Chinawa JM, Ossai EN, Aronu AE, Ozokoli GE, Enebe J. Pattern of Female Genital Mutilation among Adolescents Attending Secondary Schools' in Enugu Metropolis. *Journal of Tropical Pediatrics*. 2021;67(1):10. doi: 10.1093/tropej/fmaa103. PubMed PMID: WOS:000637542600031.
82. Ali AA, Okud A, Mohammed AA, Abdelhadi MA. Prevalence of and factors affecting female genital mutilation among schoolgirls in Eastern Sudan. *International Journal of Gynaecology & Obstetrics*. 2013;120(3):288-9. PubMed PMID: 23219094.
83. Garba ID, Muhammed Z, Abubakar IS, Yakasai IA. Prevalence of female genital mutilation among female infants in Kano, Northern Nigeria. *Archives of Gynecology & Obstetrics*. 2012;286(2):423-8. PubMed PMID: 22491808.
84. Bjälkander O, Bangura L, Leigh B, Berggren V, Bergström S, Almroth L. Health complications of female genital mutilation in Sierra Leone. *International Journal of Women's Health*. 2012;4(1):321-31. doi: 10.2147/ijwh.s32670.
85. Jimoh AO, Adaji SE, Adelaiye H, Olorukooba AA, Bawa U, Ibrahim HI, et al. A cross-sectional study of traditional practices affecting maternal and newborn health in rural Nigeria. *The Pan African medical journal*. 2018;31:64. PubMed PMID: 31007811.
86. Rashid A, Iguchi Y. Female genital cutting in Malaysia: a mixed-methods study. *BMJ Open*. 2019;9(4):e025078. PubMed PMID: 30940756.
87. Suleiman IR, Maro E, Shayo BC, Alloyce JP, Masenga G, Mahande MJ, et al. Trend in female genital mutilation and its associated adverse birth outcomes: A 10-year retrospective birth registry study in Northern Tanzania. *Plos One*. 2021;16(1):13. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0244888. PubMed PMID: WOS:000607915500017.
88. Kaplan A, Forbes M, Bonhoure I, Utzet M, Martin M, Manneh M, et al. Female genital mutilation/cutting in The Gambia: long-term health consequences and complications during delivery and for the newborn. *International Journal of Women's Health*. 2013;5:323-31. PubMed PMID: 23843705.
89. Gebremariam K, Assefa D, Weldegebreal F. Prevalence and associated factors of female genital cutting among young adult females in Jigjiga district, eastern Ethiopia: a cross-sectional mixed study. *International Journal of Women's Health*. 2016;8:357-65. PubMed PMID: 27563257.
90. Mitwaly A AB, Abd El Aal DEM, Aziz PA, Hassanin AI, Abbas AM. A recent look for the implication and attitude of practicing female genital mutilation in upper Egypt: a cross-sectional study. *International Journal of Reproduction, Contraception, Obstetrics and Gynecology*; Vol 6, No 10 (2017): October 2017 DO - 1018203/2320-1770/ijrcog20174398. 2017.
91. Abdel-Aleem MA, Elkady MM, Hilmy YA. The relationship between female genital cutting and sexual problems experienced in the first two months of marriage. *International Journal of Gynaecology & Obstetrics*. 2016;132(3):305-8. PubMed PMID: 26686766.
92. Yasin BA, Al-Tawil NG, Shabila NP, Al-Hadithi TS. Female genital mutilation among Iraqi Kurdish women: a cross-sectional study from Erbil city. *BMC Public Health*. 2013;13:809. PubMed PMID: 24010850.
93. Saleem RA, Othman N, Fattah FH, Hazim L, Adnan B. Female genital mutilation in Iraqi Kurdistan: description and associated factors. *Women & Health*. 2013;53(6):537-51. PubMed PMID: 23937728.
94. Adiguzel C, Bas Y, Erhan MD, Gelle MA. The Female Genital Mutilation/Cutting Experience in Somali Women: Their Wishes, Knowledge and Attitude. *Gynecologic & Obstetric Investigation*. 2019;84(2):118-27. PubMed PMID: 30227436.

95. Dehghankhalili M, Fallahi S, Mahmudi F, Ghaffarpassand F, Shahrzad ME, Taghavi M, et al. Epidemiology, regional characteristics, knowledge, and attitude toward female genital mutilation/cutting in Southern Iran. *Journal of Sexual Medicine*. 2015;12(7):1577-83. doi: 10.1111/jsm.12938. PubMed PMID: 2015-33398-004.
96. Makinde ON, Elusiyan JB, Adeyemi AB, Taiwo OT. FEMALE GENITAL MUTILATION: ARE WE WINNING? *East African medical journal*. 2012;89(6):193-8.
97. Lawani LO, Onyebuchi AK, Iyoke CA, Okeke NE. Female genital mutilation and efforts to achieve Millennium Development Goals 3, 4, and 5 in southeast Nigeria. *International Journal of Gynaecology & Obstetrics*. 2014;125(2):125-8. PubMed PMID: 24602774.
98. Minsart AF, N'Guyen T S, Ali Hadji R, Caillet M. Maternal infibulation and obstetrical outcome in Djibouti. *Journal of Maternal-Fetal & Neonatal Medicine*. 2015;28(14):1741-6. PubMed PMID: 25234101.
99. Birge O, Arslan D, Ozbey EG, Adiyeye M, Kayar I, Erkan MM, et al. Which type of circumcision is more harmful to female sexual functions? *Clinical and Experimental Obstetrics and Gynecology*. 2017;44(5):691-4. doi: 10.12891/ceog3464.2017.
100. Gudu W, Abdulahi M. Labor, Delivery and Postpartum Complications in Nulliparous Women with Female Genital Mutilation Admitted to Karamara Hospital. *Ethiopian Medical Journal*. 2017;55(1):11-7. PubMed PMID: 29148634.
101. Sharfi AR, Elmegeboul MA, Abdella AA. The continuing challenge of female genital mutilation in Sudan. *African Journal of Urology*. 2013;19(3):136-40. doi: 10.1016/j.afju.2013.06.002.
102. Birge O, Serin AN, Bakir MS. Female genital mutilation/cutting in Sudan and subsequent pelvic floor dysfunction. *BMC Womens Health*. 2021;21(1):8. doi: 10.1186/s12905-021-01576-y. PubMed PMID: WOS:000734775000006.
103. Ashimi AO, Amole TG, Iiyasu Z. Prevalence and predictors of female genital mutilation among infants in a semi urban community in northern Nigeria. *Sexual and Reproductive Healthcare*. 2015;6(4):243-8. doi: 10.1016/j.srhc.2015.05.005.
104. Korfker DG, Reis R, Rijnders ME, Meijer-van Asperen S, Read L, Sanjuan M, et al. The lower prevalence of female genital mutilation in the Netherlands: a nationwide study in Dutch midwifery practices. *International Journal of Public Health*. 2012;57(2):413-20. PubMed PMID: 22314540.
105. Wahlberg A, Johnsdotter S, Selling KE, Kallestal C, Essen B. Baseline data from a planned RCT on attitudes to female genital cutting after migration: when are interventions justified? *BMJ Open*. 2017;7(8):e017506. PubMed PMID: 28801440.
106. Davis G, Jellins J. Female genital mutilation: Obstetric outcomes in metropolitan Sydney. *Australian & New Zealand Journal of Obstetrics & Gynaecology*. 2019;59(2):312-6. PubMed PMID: 30734267.
107. Johnson-Agbakwu CE, Fox KA, Banke-Thomas A, Michlig GJ. Influence of Female Genital Mutilation/Cutting on Health Morbidity, Health Service Utilization and Satisfaction with Care among Somali Women and Teenage Girls in the United States. *J Racial Ethn Health Disparities*. 2022;9. doi: 10.1007/s40615-022-01266-x. PubMed PMID: WOS:000766061800001.
108. Michlig G, Warren N, Berhe M, Johnson-Agbakwu C. Female Genital Mutilation/Cutting among Somali Women in the US State of Arizona: Evidence of Treatment Access, Health Service Use and Care Experiences. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*. 2021;18(7):15. doi: 10.3390/ijerph18073733. PubMed PMID: WOS:000638497400001.
109. Padovese V, Egidi AM, Melillo Fenech T, Podda Connor M, Didero D, Costanzo G, et al. Migration and determinants of health: clinical epidemiological characteristics of migrants in Malta (2010-11). *Journal of Public Health*. 2014;36(3):368-74. PubMed PMID: 24277779.
110. Wahlberg A, Johnsdotter S, Ekholm Selling K, Essen B. Shifting perceptions of female genital cutting in a Swedish migration context. *PLoS ONE [Electronic Resource]*. 2019;14(12):e0225629. PubMed PMID: 31800614.
111. Cottler-Casanova S, Horowicz M, Gayet-Ageron A, Abdulcadir J. Female genital mutilation/cutting (FGM/C) coding capacities in Swiss university hospitals using the International

- Classification of Diseases (ICD). *Bmc Public Health*. 2021;21(1):11. doi: 10.1186/s12889-021-11160-6. PubMed PMID: WOS:000664845500001.
112. Taraldsen S, Owe KM, Bodtker AS, Bjorntvedt IW, Midhaugeide B, Sandberg M, et al. Female genital cutting in women living in Norway - consequences and treatment. *Tidsskrift for Den Norske Laegeforening*. 2021;141(15):1438-44. PubMed PMID: WOS:000714665500010.
113. Kawous R, van den Muijsenbergh M, Geraci D, Hendriks KRM, Ortensi LE, Hilverda F, et al. Estimates of female genital mutilation/cutting in the Netherlands: a comparison between a nationwide survey in midwifery practices and extrapolation-model. *Bmc Public Health*. 2020;20(1):6. doi: 10.1186/s12889-020-09151-0. PubMed PMID: WOS:000548954800016.
114. Shukralla HK, McGurgan P. Maternity care of women affected by female genital mutilation/cutting: An audit of two Australian hospitals. *Women and Birth*. 2020;33(4):E326-E31. doi: 10.1016/j.wombi.2019.07.008. PubMed PMID: WOS:000541401900003.
115. Ukoha DE. *Female genital mutilation/circumcision: Culture and women sexual health in Igbo women residing in Dallas-Fort Worth, Texas*: ProQuest Information & Learning; 2016.
116. Wikholm K, Mishori R, Ottenheimer D, Korostyshevskiy V, Reingold R, Wikholm C, et al. Female Genital Mutilation/Cutting as Grounds for Asylum Requests in the US: An Analysis of More than 100 Cases. *Journal of Immigrant and Minority Health*. 2020;22(4):675-81. doi: 10.1007/s10903-020-00994-8. PubMed PMID: WOS:000520809300001.
117. Vrachnis N, Salakos N, Iavazzo C, Bakalianou K, Kouiroukidou P, Iliodromiti Z, et al. Female genital mutilation: A new reality for Greek healthcare providers. *European Journal of Contraception and Reproductive Health Care*. 2012;17:S129. doi: 10.3109/13625187.2012.673963.
118. Zinka B, Ackermann I, Bormann C, Graw M. [Female genital mutilation in refugees]. *MMW Fortschritte der Medizin*. 2018;160(3):56-9. PubMed PMID: 29464617.
119. Hänselmann K, Börsch C, Ikenberg H, Strehlau J, Klug SJ. Female genital mutilation in Germany. *Geburtshilfe und Frauenheilkunde*. 2011;71(3):205-8. doi: 10.1055/s-0030-1270887.
120. Kartal YA, Yazici S. Female genital mutilation: Experiences, attitudes and perceptions of Somali female students living in Turkey. *Perspect Psychiatr Care*. 2021;57(4):1937-43. doi: 10.1111/ppc.12769. PubMed PMID: WOS:000631095500001.
121. Frick A, Azuaga A, Abdulcadir J. Cervical dysplasia among migrant women with female genital mutilation/cutting type III: A cross-sectional study. *Int J Gynecol Obstet*. 2021;7. doi: 10.1002/ijgo.13921. PubMed PMID: WOS:000705333500001.
122. Division of Sexual R, Child and Youth Health; Division of Health Statistics and Monitoring; Shared Services Ministry of Health (SPMS). *Mutilação Genital Feminina Análise dos casos registados na PDS/RSE- PP 2014 - 2017*. Government of Portugal, 2018.
123. Rouzi AA, Berg RC, Sahly N, Alkafy S, Alzaban F, Abduljabbar H. Effects of female genital mutilation/cutting on the sexual function of Sudanese women: a cross-sectional study. *American Journal of Obstetrics and Gynecology*. 2017;217(1). doi: 10.1016/j.ajog.2017.02.044. PubMed PMID: WOS:000405276800015.
124. Al Awar S, Al-Jefout M, Osman N, Balayah Z, Al Kindi N, Ucenic T. Prevalence, knowledge, attitude and practices of female genital mutilation and cutting (FGM/C) among United Arab Emirates population. *BMC Womens Health*. 2020;20(1):12. doi: 10.1186/s12905-020-00949-z. PubMed PMID: WOS:000529898100003.
125. Zurynski Y, Phu A, Sureshkumar P, Cherian S, Deverell M, Elliott EJ, et al. Female genital mutilation in children presenting to Australian paediatricians. *Archives of Disease in Childhood*. 2017;102(6):509-15. PubMed PMID: 28082321.
126. Varol N, Dawson A, Turkmani S, Hall JJ, Nanayakkara S, Jenkins G, et al. Obstetric outcomes for women with female genital mutilation at an Australian hospital, 2006-2012: a descriptive study. *BMC Pregnancy & Childbirth*. 2016;16(1):328. PubMed PMID: 27793119.
127. Geynisman-Tan J, Milewski A, Dahl C, Collins S, Mueller M, Kenton K, et al. Lower Urinary Tract Symptoms in Women With Female Genital Mutilation. *Female Pelvic Medicine & Reconstructive Surgery*. 2019;25(2):157-60. PubMed PMID: 30807420.

128. Chu T, Akinsulure-Smith AM. Health outcomes and attitudes toward female genital cutting in a community-based sample of West African immigrant women from high-prevalence countries in New York City. *Journal of Aggression, Maltreatment & Trauma*. 2016;25(1):63-83. doi: 10.1080/10926771.2015.1081663. PubMed PMID: 2016-08151-006.
129. Castagna P, Ricciardelli R, Piazza F, Mattutino G, Pattarino B, Canavese A, et al. Violence against African migrant women living in Turin: clinical and forensic evaluation. *International Journal of Legal Medicine*. 2018;132(4):197-204. PubMed PMID: 29308532.
130. Ali S, Patel R, Armitage AJ, Learner HI, Creighton SM, Hodes D. Female genital mutilation (FGM) in UK children: a review of a dedicated paediatric service for FGM. *Archives of Disease in Childhood*. 2020;105(11):1075-8. doi: 10.1136/archdischild-2019-318336. PubMed PMID: WOS:000585987800012.
131. Rouzi AA, Berg RC, Alamoudi R, Alzaban F, Sehlo M. Survey on female genital mutilation/cutting in Jeddah, Saudi Arabia. *BMJ Open*. 2019;9(5):e024684. PubMed PMID: 31154295.
132. Creighton SM, Dear J, de Campos C, Williams L, Hodes D. Multidisciplinary approach to the management of children with female genital mutilation (FGM) or suspected FGM: service description and case series. *BMJ Open*. 2016;6(2):e010311. PubMed PMID: 26928027.
133. Hodes D, Armitage A, Robinson K, Creighton SM. Female genital mutilation in children presenting to a London safeguarding clinic: a case series. *Archives of Disease in Childhood*. 2016;101(3):212-6. PubMed PMID: 26216833.
134. Yoder PS, Wang S. Female genital cutting: the interpretation of recent DHS data Calverton, Maryland, USA: ICF International; 2013. Available from: <http://dhsprogram.com/pubs/pdf/CR33/CR33.pdf>.
135. UNFPA. Female genital mutilation (FGM) frequently asked questions 2019. Available from: <https://www.unfpa.org/resources/female-genital-mutilation-fgm-frequently-asked-questions> Date Accessed: 22-04-2022.
136. World Bank. Compendium of international and national legal frameworks on female genital mutilation 2021. Available from: <https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/bitstream/handle/10986/35112/Compendium-of-International-and-National-Legal-Frameworks-on-Female-Genital-Mutilation-Fifth-Edition.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y> Date Accessed: 22-04-2022.
137. FGM And The Law Around The World: Equality Now; 2019. Available from: [https://www.equalitynow.org/the\\_law\\_and\\_fgm](https://www.equalitynow.org/the_law_and_fgm) Date Accessed: 22-04-2022.
138. Akinsulure-Smith AM, Sicalides EI. Female genital cutting in the United States: Implications for mental health professionals. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice*. 2016;47(5):356-62. doi: 10.1037/pro0000079. PubMed PMID: 2016-39047-001.
139. Ameyaw EK, Tetteh JK, Armah-Ansah EK, Aduo-Adjei K, Sena-Iddrisu A. Female genital mutilation/cutting in Sierra Leone: are educated women intending to circumcise their daughters? *BMC international health and human rights*. 2020;20(1):1-19. doi: 10.1186/s12914-020-00240-0.
140. Ahinkorah BO. Factors associated with female genital mutilation among women of reproductive age and girls aged 0-14 in Chad: a mixed-effects multilevel analysis of the 2014-2015 Chad demographic and health survey data. *BMC public health*. 2021;21(1):286-. doi: 10.1186/s12889-021-10293-y.
141. Female Genital Mutilation/Cutting: A statistical overview and exploration of the dynamics of change 2013 [updated 23/12/2020]. Available from: <https://data.unicef.org/resources/fgm-statistical-overview-and-dynamics-of-change/> Date Accessed: 02-05-2022.
142. WHO. Female Genital Mutilation 2021. Available from: <https://www.who.int/en/news-room/factsheets/detail/female-genital-mutilation> Date Accessed 27-04-22.
143. UNICEF. Calling for the end of the medicalization of female genital mutilation. 2018. Available from: <https://www.unicef.org/sites/default/files/2019-02/Factsheet%20FGM-Medicalization-2018-06-15.pdf> Date Accessed 27-04-22.



144. Leye E, Van Eekert N, Shamu S, Esho T, Barrett H, Anser. Debating medicalization of Female Genital Mutilation/Cutting (FGM/C): learning from (policy) experiences across countries. *Reproductive Health*. 2019;16(1). doi: 10.1186/s12978-019-0817-3. PubMed PMID: WOS:000494464200002.
145. Van Eekert N, Buffel V, De Bruyn S, Van de Velde S. The medicalisation of female genital cutting: Harm reduction or social norm? *Sociology of health & illness*. 2021;43(2):263-80. doi: 10.1111/1467-9566.13153.
146. Elmusharaf S, Elhadi N, Almroth L. Reliability of self reported form of female genital mutilation and WHO classification: cross sectional study. *BMJ*. 2006;333(7559):124-7. Epub International edition. doi: 10.1136/bmj.38873.649074.55.
147. Egger M, Smith GD, Schneider M, Minder C. Bias in meta-analysis detected by a simple, graphical test. *BMJ*. 1997;315(7109):629-34. doi: 10.1136/bmj.315.7109.629.
148. Cappa C, Van Baelen L, Leye E. The practice of female genital mutilation across the world: Data availability and approaches to measurement. *Global Public Health*. 2019;14(8):1139-52. doi: 10.1080/17441692.2019.1571091.
149. Tantet C, Aupiais C, Bourdon M, Sorge F, Pages A, Levy D, et al. Female genital mutilation: an evaluation of the knowledge of French general and specialized travel medicine practitioners. *Journal of Travel Medicine*. 2018;25(1):01. PubMed PMID: 29394392.

Table 1. Prevalence of Female Genital Mutilation/Cutting (FGM/C) in Women and Girls in Nationally Representative Studies

WHO Region	Country, Survey <sup>§</sup>	Year <sup>§§</sup>	Women 15-49 years			Girls 0-14 years <sup>¶</sup>		
			FGM/C, %	Total number with FGM/C	Sample Size	FGM/C, %	Total number with FGM/C	Sample Size
AFR	Benin, MICS [34]	2014	9.2	1,457	15,815	0.2	20	9,902
	Botswana, Pew study <sup>†*</sup> [31]	2010				5	20	399
	Burkina Faso, DHS [35]	2010	75.8	12,949	17,087	13.3	2,319*	17,434
	Cameroon, Pew study <sup>†*</sup> [31]	2010				1	8	755
	Central African Republic, MICS[36]	2018-2019	21.6	1,983	9,202	1.4	139	9,704
	Chad, MICS [37]	2019	34.1	7,698	22,561	7	1,838	26,303
	Chad, Pew study <sup>†*</sup> [31]	2010				39	304	779
	Cote D'Ivoire, MICS [38]	2016	36.7	4,329	11,780	10.9	972	8,909
	Democratic Republic of Congo, Pew study <sup>†*</sup> [31]	2010				9	70	773
	Eritrea, Population and Health Survey <sup>†*</sup> [32]	2010	82.9	8,495	10,238	44.1	2,409	5,461
	Ethiopia, DHS [39]	2016	65.2	5,101	7,822	15.7	1,147	7,306
	Ethiopia, Pew study <sup>†*</sup> [31]	2010				33	204	618
	Gambia, DHS[40]	2021	72.6	4,490	6,186	45.9	2,343	5,105
	Ghana, MICS [41]	2018	2.4	341	14,374	0.1	15	12,015
	Ghana, Pew study <sup>†*</sup> [31]	2010				9	63	699 <sup>†</sup>
	Guinea, DHS[42]	2018	94.5	10,276	10,874	39.1	3,563	9,122
	Guinea Bissau, MICS [43]	2020	52.1	5,703	10,945	29.7	2,558	8,625
	Guinea-Bissau, Pew study <sup>†*</sup> [31]	2010				33	178	539
	Kenya, DHS[44]	2014	21	3,066	14,625	2.8	352	12,388
	Kenya, Pew study <sup>†*</sup> [31]	2010				10	76	762
	Liberia, DHS [45] <sup>#</sup>	2021	38.2	2,568	6,716			
	Liberia, Pew study <sup>†*</sup> [31]	2010				21	182	866
	Mali, DHS [46]	2018	88.6	4,699	5,302	72.7	4,314	5,939
	Mali, Pew study <sup>†*</sup> [31]	2010				77	447	581
	Mauritania, MICS [47]	2015	66.6	9,555	14,342	53.2	6,936	13,048
	Mozambique, Pew study <sup>†*</sup> [31]	2010				12	76	631
	Niger, DHS[49]	2012	2	219	11,160			
	Nigeria, DHS [48]	2018	19.5	5,202	26,705	19.2	4,640	24,143
	Nigeria, Pew study <sup>†*</sup> [31]	2010				13	106	813
	Rwanda, Pew study <sup>†*</sup> [31]	2010				3	15	499
	Senegal, DHS[50]	2019	25.2	2,181	8,649	16.1	1,176	7,288
Senegal, Pew study <sup>†*</sup> [31]	2010				4	21	537	
Sierra Leone, DHS[51]	2019	83	12,932	15,574	7.9	946	12,037	

	South Africa, Pew study <sup>††</sup> [31]	2010				4	33	819
	Tanzania, DHS [52]	2016	10	1,329	13,266	0.4	47	11,795
	Tanzania, Pew study <sup>††</sup> [31]	2010				6	64	1,074
	Togo, MICS [53]	2017	3.1	225	7,326	0.3	17	6,077
	Uganda, DHS[54]	2016	0.3	56	18,506			
	Uganda, Pew study <sup>††</sup> [31]	2010				13	89	682
	Zambia, Pew study <sup>††</sup> [31]	2010				3	13	443
<b>EMR</b>	Djibouti, Pew study <sup>††</sup> [31]	2010				58	469	808
	Egypt, DHS <sup>††</sup> [55]	2014	92.3	20,086*	21,762	21.4	4,941*	23,090
	Iraq, MICS [56]	2018	7.4	2,270	30,660	0.5	128	24,438
	Somalia, DHS[58]	2020	99.2	14,651	14,771	33.3 <sup>#</sup>	2,492 <sup>#</sup>	7,482 <sup>#</sup>
	Sudan, MICS [57]	2014	86.6	15,853	18,302	31.5	5,570	17,661
	Yemen, DHS <sup>††</sup> [33]	2013	18.5	4,705	25,434	15.9 <sup>†</sup>	1,909	12,005
<b>SEAR</b>	Maldives, DHS [59]	2016-2017	12.9	996	7,699	1.1	40*	3,626
	Indonesia, RISKESDAS <sup>††</sup> [30]	2013				51.2	NA	NA
<b>Pooled prevalence <sup>‡</sup></b>	<b>Women 15-49 years</b>					<b>Girls 0-14 years<sup>††</sup></b>		
		<b>Pooled prevalence, % (95% CI)</b>	<b>Estimated total number with FGM/C (95% CI)</b>	<b>Total population <sup>†</sup></b>		<b>Pooled prevalence, % (95% CI)</b>	<b>Estimated total number with FGM/C (95% CI)</b>	<b>Total population <sup>†</sup></b>
	<b>Global</b>	38.31 (20.8-59.5)	86,080,915 (46,736,701 - 133,693,929)	224,695,680	7.25 (3.1-16.0)	11,982,031 (5,123,351 - 26,476,156)	165,269,394	
	<b>AFR</b>	32.01 (16.2-53.5)	53,533,504 (28,096,309 - 89,406,470)	167,239,938	7.14 (2.7-17.8)	9,193,035 (3,424,856 - 22,905,335)	128,753,992	
<b>EMR</b>	73.68 (21.0-96.7)	42,249,544 (12,041,808 - 56,034,547)	57,341,944	12.02 (2.1-46.7)	4,382,987 (762,100 - 17,014,158)	36,464,121		

Abbreviations: AFR: African Region; DHS: Demographic and Health Survey; EMR: Eastern Mediterranean Region; MICS: Multiple Indicator Cluster Surveys; NA: Not available; SEAR: South-East Asia Region; WHO: World Health Organization.

<sup>§</sup>The Pew study corresponds to the Islam & Christianity in Sub-Saharan Africa Survey, Pew Research Centre.

<sup>§§</sup>Year of data collection

<sup>¶</sup>For girls, studies are either reporting (1) the percentage/total number of girls with FGM/C or (2) the percentage/total number of women with at least one daughter with FGM/C.

<sup>¶¶</sup>In the Egypt DHS 2014 report, the age category of girls is 0 to 19 years.

\* The total number with FGM/C was computed using data available in the study/report.

<sup>†</sup> Excluded from the meta-analyses of girls (0-14 years) as results represent the percentage of women with at least one daughter with FGM/C [31-33]

<sup>††</sup> Excluded from the meta-analyses of girls (0-14 years) due to insufficient data.

<sup>‡</sup> No pooled prevalence was calculated for SEAR as data were only available from one country.

<sup>†</sup> Population estimates were taken from the United Nations 2019 Revision of World Population Prospects total population estimates for 2020 [29].

<sup>#</sup>This computed using the dataset as no denominator was provided in the report. <sup>#</sup>Liberia: among women who have heard of FGM/C.

Table 2. Repeated nationally representative cross-sectional studies reporting the prevalence of Female Genital Mutilation/Cutting (FGM/C) by country

Region	Country	Date of survey	% FGM/C amongst women	Total sample size of women	% FGM/C amongst girls	Total sample size of girls	Survey source
AFR	Benin	2001*	<b>17.0</b>	6,219			DHS
		2006*	<b>12.9</b>	17,793			
		2011-2012	<b>7.3</b>	16,599	<b>0.3</b>	10,671	
		2014	<b>9.2</b>	15,815	<b>0.2</b>	9,902	
	Botswana	2010*			<b>5.0</b>	399	Pew Res Center
	Burkina Faso	1998-1999**	<b>71.6</b>	6,445	<b>45.5</b>	3,499	DHS
		2003*	<b>76.6</b>	12,477	<b>31.6</b>	7,540	MICS
		2006*	<b>72.5</b>	7,316	<b>24.7</b>	4,548	
		2010	<b>75.8</b>	17,087	<b>13.3</b>	17,434	
	Cameroon	2004*	<b>1.4</b>	5,391	<b>0.7</b>	2,975	DHS
		2010*			<b>1.0</b>	755	Pew Res Center
	Central African Republic	1994-95	<b>43.4</b>	5,884			DHS
		2000	<b>35.9</b>	16,941			MICS
		2006*	<b>25.7</b>	11,592	<b>6.6</b>	6,778	
		2010	<b>24.2</b>	11,510	<b>0.8</b>	17,441	
	2018-2019	<b>21.6</b>	9,202	<b>1.4</b>	9,704		
	Chad	2004*	<b>44.9</b>	6,085	<b>20.7</b>	3,893	DHS
		2010	<b>44.2</b>	15,936	<b>12.1</b>	15,936	MICS
		2010*			<b>39.0</b>	779	Pew Res Center
		2014-2015	<b>38.4</b>	11,534	<b>9.9</b>	14,310	DHS
	Côte D'Ivoire	2019	<b>34.1</b>	22,561	<b>7.0</b>	26,303	MICS
		1998-99**	<b>44.5</b>	3,040	<b>25.8</b>	1,595	DHS
		2005	<b>41.7</b>	5,183			AIS
		2006	<b>36.0</b>	12,888	<b>9.5</b>		MICS
	Democratic Republic of Congo	2011-2012	<b>38.2</b>	10,060	<b>10.5</b>	8,110	DHS
		2016	<b>36.7</b>	11,780	<b>10.9</b>	8,090	MICS
		2010*			<b>9.0</b>	773	Pew Res Center
		2010*					
	Eritrea	1995**	<b>94.5</b>	5,054	<b>71.4</b>		DHS
	Ethiopia	2002*	<b>88.7</b>	8,754	<b>62.5</b>	4,604	
		2000*	<b>79.9</b>	15,367	<b>51.9</b>	7,659	DHS
	Ethiopia	2005*	<b>74.3</b>	14,070	<b>37.7</b>	7,920	DHS
		2010*			<b>33.0</b>	618	Pew Res Center
		2016	<b>65.2</b>	7,822	<b>15.7</b>	7,306	DHS
	Gambia	2005-2006*	<b>78.3</b>	9,982	<b>64.3</b>	5,337	MICS
		2010	<b>76.3</b>	14,685	<b>42.4</b>	16,635	
		2013	<b>74.9</b>	10,233			DHS
		2018	<b>75.7</b>	13,64	<b>50.6</b>	11,718	MICS
	Ghana	2019-2020	<b>72.6</b>	6,186	<b>45.9</b>	5,105	DHS
		2006	<b>3.8</b>	5,890			MICS
2010*				<b>9.0</b>	699	Pew Res Center	
Ghana	2011	<b>3.8</b>	10,627	<b>0.4</b>	8,276		
	2017-2018	<b>2.4</b>	14,374	<b>0.1</b>	12,015	MICS	
	2010*						
Guinea	1999*	<b>98.6</b>	6,753	<b>54.4</b>	4,240		
	2005*	<b>95.6</b>	7,954	<b>56.8</b>	4,972	DHS	
	2012	<b>96.9</b>	9,142	<b>45.5</b>	8,497		
	2016	<b>96.8</b>	9,663	<b>45.3</b>	8,832	MICS	
Guinea Bissau	2018	<b>94.5</b>	10,874	<b>39.1</b>	9,122	DHS	
	2006*	<b>44.5</b>	8,010	<b>34.7</b>	4,575	MICS	
	2010*	<b>49.8</b>	18,734	<b>38.7</b>	10,563		
	2010*			<b>33.0</b>	539	Pew Res Center	
Guinea Bissau	2014	<b>44.9</b>		<b>29.6</b>		MICS	
	2018-2019	<b>52.1</b>	10,945	<b>29.7</b>	8,625		
	2010*						
Kenya	1998**	<b>37.6</b>	7,881	<b>24.1</b>	1,590	DHS	

	2003**	32.2	8,195	21.0	1,577	
	2008-2009	27.1	8,444			
	2010*			10.0	762	Pew Res Center
	2014	21.0	14,625	2.8	12,388	DHS
Liberia	2010*			21.0	866	Pew Res Center
	2019-2020 <sup>†</sup>	38.2	6,716			
Mali	1995-1996**	93.7	9,704	73.6	6,399	DHS
	2001	91.6	12,849	73.0	8,223	
	2006*	85.2	14,583	68.7	9,105	
	2009-2010*	88.5	26,751	74.6		MICS
	2010*			77.0	581	Pew Res Center
	2012-2013	91.4	10,424	69.2	11,857	DHS
	2015	82.7		76.4		MICS
	2018	88.6	5,302	72.7	5,939	DHS
Mauritania	2000-2001*	71.3	7,728	66.2	3,887	DHS
	2007*	72.2	12,549	65.8	6,454	MICS
	2011	69.4	12,754	54.8	10,992	
	2015	66.6	14,342	53.2	13,048	
Mozambique	2010*			12.0	631	Pew Res Center
Nigeria	1999**	25.1	8,206	20.2	4,503	DHS
	2003*	19.0	7,620	9.9	4,129	
	2007*	26.0	24,565	13.3	13,124	MICS
	2008*	29.6	33,385	29.9	11,563	DHS
	2010*			13.0	813	Pew Res Center
	2011	27.0	30,772	19.2	16,874	MICS
	2013	24.8	38,948	16.9	36,308	DHS
	2016-2017	18.4	34,376	25.3	17,529	MICS
	2018	19.5	26,705	19.2	24,143	DHS
Niger	1998*	4.5	7,577	2.5		DHS
	2006*	2.2	9,223	0.9	6,173	DHS
	2012	2.0	11,160			
Rwanda	2010*			3.0	499	Pew Res Center
Senegal	2005*	28.2	14,602	19.5	7,419	
	2010*			4.0	537	DHS
	2010-2011	25.7	15,688	12.9	8,983	Pew Res Center
	2012-2013			17.5	7,172	DHS
	2014	24.7	8,488	12.9	7,186	
	2015	24.2	8,851	14.6	7,529	
	2016	22.7	8,865	13.6	7,390	
	2017	24.0	16,787	14.0	14,008	
	2018	23.3	9,414	14.1	7,598	
	2019	25.2	8,649	16.1	7,288	
Sierra Leone	2008*	91.3	7,374	32.5	4,590	DHS
	2010	88.3	13,359	10.2	14,703	MICS
	2013	89.6	16,658			DHS
	2017	86.1	17,873	8.4	12,972	MICS
	2019	83.0	15,574	7.9	12,037	DHS
South Africa	2010*			4.0	819	Pew Res Center
United Republic of Tanzania	1996**	17.9	8,120	6.7	4,753	DHS
	2003-2004	17.7	6,863			
	2004-2005*	14.6	10,329	4.2	6,095	
	2010*	14.6	10,139	3.4	6,075	
	2010*			6.0	1074	Pew Res Center
	2015-2016	10.0	13,266	0.4	11,795	DHS
Togo	2006*	5.8	6,211	1.0	3,431	MICS

		2010	<b>3.9</b>	6,379	<b>0.4</b>	4,679	
		2013-2014	<b>4.7</b>	9,480	<b>0.3</b>		DHS
		2017	<b>3.1</b>	7,326	<b>0.3</b>	6,077	MICS
	Uganda	2006	<b>0.6</b>	8,531			DHS
		2010*			<b>13.0</b>	682	Pew Res Center
		2011	<b>1.4</b>	8,674			DHS
		2016	<b>0.3</b>	18,506			
	Zambia	2010*			<b>3.0</b>	443	Pew Res Center
EMR	Egypt	1995*	<b>97.0</b>	14,779	<b>49.7</b>	10,847	DHS
		2000*	<b>97.3</b>		<b>49.5</b>	11,540	
		2003*	<b>97.0</b>	9159	<b>47.3</b>	6,587	
		2005	<b>95.8</b>	19,474	<b>27.7</b>	20,628	
		2008	<b>91.1</b>		<b>24.1</b>	16,475	
		2014	<b>92.3</b>	21,762	<b>21.4</b>	23,090	
		2015	<b>87.2</b>	7,906	<b>14.1</b>	5,280	
	Djibouti	2006*	<b>93.1</b>	6,020	<b>48.5</b>	1,923	MICS
		2010*			<b>58.0</b>	808	Pew Res Center
	Iraq	2011	<b>8.1</b>	55,194	<b>20.6</b>	8,759	MICS
		2018	<b>7.4</b>	30,660	<b>0.5</b>	24,438	
	Somalia	2006*	<b>97.9</b>	6,764	<b>46.0</b>	3,716	MICS
		2020	<b>99.2</b>	14,771	<b>33.3<sup>#</sup></b>	7,482 <sup>#</sup>	DHS
	Sudan	1989-1990	<b>89.2</b>	5,860			DHS
		2010	<b>88.2<sup>¶</sup></b>	16,716	<b>37.0</b>	19,084	MICS
		2014	<b>86.6</b>	18,302	<b>31.5</b>	17,661	
	Yemen	1997*	<b>22.6</b>	10,414	<b>19.7</b>	7,854	DHS
		2013*	<b>18.5</b>	25,434	<b>15.9</b>	12,005	
SEAR	Indonesia	2013			<b>51.2</b>		RISKESDAS
	Maldives	2016-2017	<b>12.9</b>	7,699	<b>1.1</b>	3,626	DHS

Abbreviations: AFR: African Region; DHS: Demographic and Health Survey; EMR: Eastern Mediterranean Region; MICS: Multiple Indicator Cluster Surveys; Empty cell: Not available in report; SEAR: South-East Asia Region.

\*Women with at least one living daughter with FGM/C. \*\*Women reporting whether their eldest daughter had FGM/C. <sup>¶</sup>Age range for women 18-49 years old. <sup>†</sup>Among women who have heard of FGM/C <sup>#</sup>This was computed using the dataset as no denominator was provided in the report. For most countries girls was defined as 0-14 years old; Indonesia (2013) 0-11 years old; Senegal (2010-11) 0-9 years; Egypt (2015) age 1-14 years old; Egypt (2014) 0-19 years old; Egypt (2008 & 2005) 0-17 years old.

Table 3. Types of Female Genital Mutilation/Cutting (FGM/C) in Nationally Representative Studies

WHO Region	Country, Survey	Year <sup>§</sup>	Women 15-49 years					Girls 0-14 years				
			Prevalence FGM/C, n (%)	Type of FGM/C, % <sup>§§</sup>				Prevalence FGM/C, n (%)	Type of FGM/C, % <sup>§§</sup>			
				Nicked	Flesh removed	Sewn closed	Don't Know/ Missing Type		Nicked	Not Sewn Closed	Flesh removed	Sewn closed
AFR	Benin, MICS[34]	2014	1,457 (9.2)	14.5	72.1	10.1	3.4	20 (0.2)				
	Burkina Faso, DHS[35]	2010	12,949 (75.8)	16.6	76.8	1.2	5.4	2,319 (13.3)				
	Central African Republic, MICS[36]	2018-2019	1,983 (21.6)	0.8	47.6	49.6	2	139 (1.4)	0.2	38.6	59.2	2.0
	Chad, MICS[37]	2019	7,698 (34.1)	5.5	71.9	15.8	6.8	1,838 (7.0)	4.4	73.6	18.5	3.5
	Cote D'Ivoire, MICS[38]	2016	4,329 (36.7)	6.8	63.3	9.4	20.5	972 (10.9)	6.3	78.4	10.4	4.9
	Ethiopia, DHS [39]	2016	5,101 (65.2)	2.6	73	6.5	17.9	1,147 (15.7)		90.1	9.3	0.6
	Gambia, DHS[40]	2021	4,490 (72.6)	1.4	73.4	16.6	8.7	2,343 (45.9)		67.8	15.2	17.1
	Ghana, MICS [41]	2018	341 (2.4)	4.6	63.6	15.9	15.9	15 (0.1)		74.5	20.2	5.2
	Guinea, DHS[42]	2018	10,276 (94.5)	11	57.7	9.7	21.6	3,563 (39.1)		84.2	15.8	
	Guinea Bissau, MICS[43]	2020	5,703 (44.5)	1.1	73.8	18.5	6.5	2,558 (29.7)	1.5	84.1	13.4	3.6
	Kenya, DHS[44]	2014	3,066 (21)	1.6	87.2	9.3	1.9	352 (2.8)		86.3	7.8	5.9
	Mali, DHS[46]	2018	4,699 (88.6)	25.4	40.7	8.2	25.8	4,314 (72.7)		88.6	11.4	
	Mauritania, MICS[47]	2015	9,555 (66.6)	1.2	64.9	4.5	29.4	6,936 (53.2)	1.0	75.2	4.2	19.6
	Niger, DHS[49]	2012	219 (2.0)	7.2	78.4	6.3	8.1					
	Nigeria, DHS[48]	2018	5,202 (19.5)	9.6	40.7	5.6	44.1	4,640 (19.2)		96.5	3.5	
	Senegal, DHS[50]	2019	2,181(25.2)	9.2	57.7	9.1	24.0	1,176 (16.1)		84.3	5.1	10.6
	Sierra Leone, DHS[51]	2020	12,932 (83.0)	0.7	84	11.9	3.3	946 (7.9)		83.3	15.9	0.8
	Tanzania, DHS [52]	2016	1,329 (10.0)	3.2	81.1	6.6	9.1					
Togo, MICS[53]	2017	225 (3.1)	6.3	54	36.2	3.5						
EMR	Iraq, MICS[56]	2018	2,270 (7.4)	6	84.3	1.3	8.4	128 (0.5)	9.1	88.8	1.0	1.1
	Somalia, DHS[58]	2020	14,651 (99.2)		33.9 <sup>¶</sup>	64.2 <sup>¶¶</sup>	1.9					
	Sudan, MICS [57]	2014	15,853 (86.6)	2.2	16.3	77	4.5	5,570 (31.5)				
	Yemen, DHS[33]	2013	4,705(18.5)	7	89.7	NA	3.3	1,909 (15.9) <sup>‡</sup>	10.7 <sup>††</sup>	88.3 <sup>††</sup>		1.0 <sup>††</sup>

Abbreviations: AFR: African Region; DHS: Demographic and Health Survey; EMR: Eastern Mediterranean Region; MICS: Multiple Indicator Cluster Surveys; WHO: World Health Organization.

<sup>§</sup>Year of data collection

§§ Percentages of types from women and girls are calculated from the total number of women and girls with FGM/C, respectively

¶ Type I, Sunni= 21.6% and Type II, Intermediate = 12.3%

¶¶ Type III and IV= 64.2%

† Prevalence and total number with FGM/C correspond to those of women with at least one daughter with FGM/C.

†† Percent distribution of most recent daughters who had FGM/C



Table 4. Characteristics of Female Genital Mutilation/Cutting (FGM/C) Procedure in Nationally Representative Studies

WHO Region	Country, Survey	Year <sup>s</sup>	Percent distribution of women 15-49 years by:		Percent distribution of girls 0-14 years by:	
			Age at FGM/C (%)	Performer of FGM (%)	Age at FGM/C (%)	Performer of FGM (%)
AFR	Burkina Faso, DHS[35]	2010	<5y (60.4%), 5-9y (28.2%), 10-14y (8.9%), 15+y (2.0%), Don't know/missing (0.5%)	Traditional (97.2%) Medical (0.2%) Don't know/missing (2.6%)	<1y (2.8%), 1-4y (7.3%), 5-9y (3.1%), 10-14y (0.1%), Don't know/missing (0.1%)	Traditional (98.3%) Medical (0.2%) Don't know/missing (1.5%)
	Eritrea, Population and Health Survey [32]	2010	<1y (47.4%), 1-3y (4.7%)	Traditional (84.4%) Medical (0.3%) Other (15.4%)	<1y (65.7%), 1-4y (20.9%), 5-6y (8.1%), 7-8y (4.3%), 9-10y (0.4%), 11-12y (0.1%) 13+y (0.1%), Don't know/missing (0.4%)	Traditional (98.3%) Medical (0.09%) Don't know/missing (1.6%)
	Ethiopia, DHS [39]	2016	<5y (48.6%), 5-9y (21.7%), 10-14y (18.0%), 15+y (5.9%), Don't know/missing (5.8%)	Traditional (90.1%) Medical (1%) Don't know/missing (8.9%)	<1y (7.2%), 1-4y (3.4%), 5-9y (3.7%), 10-14y (1.0%), Don't know/missing (0.3%)	Traditional (97.6%) Medical (1.9%) Don't know/missing (0.5%)
	Kenya, DHS [44]	2014	<5y (2.3%), 5-9y (26.6%), 10-14y (42.6%), 15+y (26.9%), Don't know /missing (1.7%)	Traditional (83.3%) Medical (14.8%) Don't know/missing (1.9%)	<1y (0.0%), 1-4y (0.2%) 5-9y (2.1%), 10-14y (0.5%)	Traditional (74.9%), Medical (19.7%) Don't know/missing (5.4%).
	Mali, DHS [46]	2018	<5y (75.5%), 5-9y (16.1%), 10-14y (4.4%), 15+y (0.3%), Don't know missing (3.6%)	Traditional (91.5%) Medical (0.3%) Don't know/missing (8.2%)	<1y (34.2%), 1-4y (31.9%), 5-9 (5.2%), 10-14y (0.4%), Don't know/missing (0.9%)	Traditional (98.6%) Medical (1.4%)
	Nigeria, DHS [48]	2018	<5y (85.6%), 5-9y (4.2%), 10-14y (3.9%), 15+y (4.5%), Don't know/missing (1.8%)	Traditional (85.4%) Medical (8.6%) Don't know/missing (6%)	<1y (17.2%), 1-4y (1.1%), 5-9 (0.7%), 10-14y (0.0%), Don't know/missing (0.1%)	Traditional (92.8%) Medical (7%) Don't know/missing (0.1%)
	Niger, DHS[49]	2012	<5y (75.7%), 5-9y (7.3%), 10-14y (7.9%), 15+y (1.4%), Don't know/missing (7.8%)	Traditional (95.8%) Other (0.2%) Don't know/missing (4%)		
	Senegal, DHS [50]	2019	<5y (84.9%), 5-9y (10.4%), 10-14y (2.7%), 15+y (0.4%), Don't know /missing (1.7%)	Traditional (100%)	<1y (9.8%), 1-4y (5.4%), 5-9y (0.8%), 10-14y (0.0%), Don't know/missing (0.1)	Traditional (100%)
	Sierra Leone, DHS [51]	2019	<5y (12.3%), 5-9y (14.1%), 10-14y (44.9%), 15+y (26.1%), Don't know /missing (2.5%)	Traditional (98.4%) Medical (0.4%) Don't know/missing (1.2%)	< 1y (0.0%), 1-4y (0.6%), 5-9y (4.1%), 10-14y (3.1%), Don't know/missing (0.1%)	Traditional (99.4%) Medical (0.6%)
	Guinea, DHS[42]	2018	<5y (22.4%), 5-9y (36.7%), 10-14y (28.4%), 15+y (3.9%), Don't know/missing (8.6%)	Traditional (77.6%) Medical (17.3%) Don't know/missing (5.1%)	<1y (1.5%), 1-4y (11.9%), 5-9y (22.7%), 10-14y (2.3%), Don't know/missing (0.8%)	Traditional (64.8%) Medical (34.9%) Don't know/missing (0.3%)
	Liberia, DHS[45]	2020	<5y (24.6%), 5-9y (16.7%), 10-14y (33%), 15+y (21.6%), Don't know (4.1%)			
	Gambia, DHS[40]	2021	<5y (64.9%), 5-9y (17.7%), 10-14y (6%), 15+y (0.7%), Don't	Traditional (95.1%) Medical (0.4%)	<1y (21.9%), 1-4y (19.4%), 5-9y (3.9%), 10-14y (0.2%), Don't know	Traditional (98.8%) Medical (0.1%),

			know /missing (10.6%)	Don't know/missing (4.5%)	(4.5%)	Don't know/missing (1.1%)
	Tanzania, DHS[52]	2016	<1y (35.4%), 1-4y (2.3%), 5-6y (5.2%), 7-8y (7.5%), 9-10y (10.9%), 11-12y (9.3%), 13+y (27.6%), Don't know/missing (1.8%)	Traditional (86%) Medical (14.8%) Don't know/missing (1.9%)	<1y (0.1%), 1-4y (0.2%), 5-9y (0.1%), 10-14y (0.1%)	Traditional (74.9%) Medical (19.7%) Don't know/missing (5.4%)
EMR	Egypt, DHS[55]	2014	<3y (0.6%), 3-4y (1%), 5-6y (7.4%), 7-8y (13.4%), 9-10y (40.9%) 11-12y (24.6%), 13-14y (5.3%), 15-17y (2.6%), 18-19y (0.1%), Don't know/missing (4.2%)	Traditional (60.5%) Medical (37.9%) Other (0.1%), Don't know/missing (1.5%)	<3 y (3.5%); 3-4y (3.4%), 5-6y (10.1%), 7-8y (14.1%), 9-10y (32.8%) 11-12y (28.6%), 13-14y (5.4%), 15-17y (1.3%), Don't know /missing (0.7%)	Medical (81.9%) Traditional (18.1%) Don't know/missing (0.3%)
	Somalia, DHS [58]	2020	<5y (0.2%), 5-9y (70.9%), 10-14y (27.7%), 15+y (0.7%), Don't know /missing (0.5%)		0-4y (3.3%), 5-9y (29.7%), 10-14y (75.9%)	
	Yemen, DHS [33]	2013	First week after birth (83.8%), after first week but before first year (10.5%), >=1y (1.2%), Don't know /missing (4.5%)	Traditional (92.8%) Medical (2.9%) Don't know/missing (4.3%)	First week after birth (84.9%), after 1st week but before 1 year (14.3%), >=1y (0.6%), Don't know/missing (0.2%)	Traditional (84.7%) Medical (12.8%) Don't know/missing (2.5%)
SEAR	Indonesia, RISKESDAS [30]	2013			1-5 months (72.4%), 1-4y (13.9%), 5-11 y (3.3%)	
	Maldives, DHS[149]	2016-2017	<5y (83.1%), 5-9y (1.6%), 10-14y (0.4%), 15+y (0.4%), Don't know /missing (14.5%)		<1y (0.7%), 1-4y (0.2%), Don't know/missing (0.1%)	

Abbreviations: AFR: African Region; DHS: Demographic and Health Survey; EMR: Eastern Mediterranean Region; MICS: Multiple Indicator Cluster Surveys; WHO: World Health Organization; y: years.

<sup>§</sup>Year of data collection

# PRISMA Flow Diagram











