

1
2

Tools for measuring sexual and reproductive health and rights (SRHR) indicators in humanitarian settings

Céline M. Goulart, Amanda Giancola, Humaira Nakhuda, Anita Ampadu, Amber Purewal, Jean-Luc Kortenaar & Diego G. Bassani

The Hospital for Sick Children
686 Bay St, Toronto, ON. M5G 0A4
Corresponding Author: Céline M Goulart
Corresponding Author Email: celine.goulart@mail.utoronto.ca

1 **Abstract**

2 **Background:** Effective measurement of all health indicators and especially SRHR is difficult in
3 humanitarian settings. Displacement and insecurity due to conflict, natural disasters, and epidemics
4 place women and girls at higher risk of SRHR-related morbidity and mortality and reduce the coverage
5 of essential SRHR services. This scoping review describes the measurement tools, methods, and
6 indicators used to measure SRHR coverage and outcome indicators in humanitarian settings in the past
7 15 years and presents an accessible dashboard that can be used by governments, researchers and
8 implementing organizations to identify available SRHR measurement tools.

9 **Methods:** Scientific articles published between January 2004 and May 2019 were identified using
10 Embase, Medline, PsycInfo, CINAHL, Scopus, PAIS index as well as relevant non-peer-reviewed literature
11 available through websites of humanitarian organizations. Publications including data from low- or
12 middle-income countries (LMICs), focused on women and/or girls living in areas impacted by a
13 humanitarian crisis, where data was collected within five years of the crisis were included. Indicators
14 extracted from these publications were categorized according to validated SRHR indicators
15 recommended by the World Health Organization (WHO). Measurement tools, sampling and data
16 collection methods, gap areas (geographical, topical and contextual), and indicators were catalogued for
17 easy access in an interactive Tableau dashboard.

18 **Results:** Our search yielded 42,081 peer-reviewed publications and 2,569 non-peer-reviewed reports.
19 After initial title and abstract screening, 385 publications met the inclusion criteria. SRHR indicators
20 were categorized into nine domains: abortion, antenatal care, family planning, gender-based violence,
21 HIV and sexually transmitted infections, maternal health, maternal mortality, menstrual and
22 gynecological health, and obstetric care (delivery). A total of 65 tools and questionnaires measuring
23 SRHR were identified, of which 25 were designed specifically for humanitarian settings.

1 **Discussion:** Although SRHR was measured in humanitarian settings, several gaps in measurement were
2 identified. Abortion and gynaecological health were not consistently measured across included studies
3 or validated WHO indicators. Toolkits and indicators identified in this review may be used to inform
4 future SRHR data collection in humanitarian settings. However, identifying and/or developing innovative
5 data collection methodologies should be a research priority, especially in light of the recent COVID-19
6 pandemic.

7 **Keywords:** Girls and women, Humanitarian, Measurement methods, Sexual health, Reproductive health

8 **1. Background**

9 Sexual and reproductive health and rights (SRHR) are essential for the health and development of all
10 people, as outlined by target 3.7 of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs)(1) and the Minimum
11 Initial Service Package (MISP) (2). Women and girls are significantly impacted by humanitarian crises and
12 face SRHR challenges in these contexts. We used the definition of humanitarian crisis defined as “a
13 *serious disruption of the functioning of a community or a society causing widespread human, material,*
14 *economic or environmental losses which exceed the ability of the affected community or society to cope*
15 *using its own resources, necessitating a request to national or international level for external assistance.*
16 *The disaster situation may either be manmade (e.g. armed conflict) or a natural phenomenon (e.g.*
17 *drought)” (3). In 2018, the United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA) estimated that 136 million people*
18 *had been affected by conflict, hazards, pandemics and displacement, and were in need of humanitarian*
19 *assistance. Of those, an estimated 34 million were women and girls aged 15-49 years and five million*
20 *were pregnant (4).*

21 **1.1 Summary of existing literature**

1 While access to healthcare is generally challenging in humanitarian settings, access to SRHR poses its
2 own unique set of barriers, including poor sanitation, inadequate living conditions and stigma
3 surrounding SRHR services (5, 6). Displacement can negatively impact the power and agency of girls and
4 women to make decisions surrounding sexual activity (7). Good quality SRHR services are not
5 consistently available across a diversity of humanitarian settings (8, 9). Low quality or inaccessible SRHR
6 services can lead to a greater risk of unplanned pregnancy, HIV & sexually transmitted infections (STIs),
7 and greater maternal morbidity and mortality (10).

8 Effective measurement of SRHR-related indicators in low- and middle-income countries (LMICs) is
9 difficult, and even more so in humanitarian settings. According to the Interagency Field Manual on
10 Reproductive Health in Humanitarian Settings (IAFM), access to some or all of the affected populations
11 may be complicated due to ongoing security issues. Further, where routine data collection strategies are
12 disrupted, and in the few instances where data can still be collected or continue to be produced, data
13 quality is likely compromised and the severity of the quality implications are usually unknown (11). In
14 addition to these factors, the costs of implementing programs in conflict settings are much higher than
15 in non-conflict settings, and the ethical implications are far more complex (12). Many conflict-affected
16 countries are politically fragile and may lack the capacity to provide research practice guidelines and
17 monitor research ethics. This means that researchers could circumvent their own national ethical
18 standards for the use of poorly enforced guidelines. Additionally, humanitarian organizations may face
19 political barriers to the dissemination of sensitive research findings (13).

20 **1.2 Objective**

21 In order to streamline data collection and measurement of indicators relevant to the planning, delivery,
22 uptake and outcomes of developmental assistance in such settings, there is a need to understand the
23 coverage of services and SRHR-related morbidity and mortality among women and girls (11). This

1 scoping review describes the measurement tools, methods and indicators used to measure SRHR
2 coverage and outcome indicators in humanitarian settings and identifies gaps in measurement across
3 the domains of SRHR in these contexts. This scoping review also presents an interactive online
4 dashboard with our findings. However, our study does not explore the technical, logistical or financial
5 aspects of conducting research or evaluations in humanitarian settings, which is aptly explored in the
6 IAFM (12).

7 **2. Methods**

8 A scoping review provides a broad synthesis of the literature available on a topic of interest, and
9 therefore was our method of choice for exploring the measurement of SRHR in humanitarian settings
10 (14). The research question was defined by inclusion and exclusion criteria and a search of both the
11 peer-reviewed and non-peer-reviewed literature was conducted. This was followed by title abstract
12 screening, full text screening and extraction, each of which were conducted in duplicate, as explained in
13 the sections below (14). This scoping review was conducted in accordance with the Preferred Reporting
14 Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) statement (15).

15 **2.1. Definitions and Inclusion Criteria**

16 The World Health Organization (WHO)'s definition of SRHR was used in this review, which includes the
17 domains of abortion, antenatal care (ANC), family planning (FP), gender-based violence (GBV), HIV and
18 sexually transmitted infections (STIs), maternal health, maternal mortality, menstruation and
19 gynecological health, and obstetric care (delivery) (16). The search strategy was based on the domains
20 listed above and related terms relevant to SRHR coverage and morbidity/mortality. See Additional file 1
21 for full search strategy.

1 To be included in this review, the humanitarian event had to result in over 1,000 human casualties. The
2 event had to be distinct from latent civil unrest, or long-standing epidemics, such as HIV. This definition
3 was also used to build our second scoping review on gender equality and women’s empowerment
4 (GEWE) (17). Together these papers form a set of scoping reviews on the status of women across
5 humanitarian settings in LMICs.

6 For a publication to meet the inclusion criteria, it had to:

- 7 · Include women and/or girls that had been impacted by a humanitarian crisis in a LMIC. Data
8 must have been collected either during the time of conflict or no more than five years post-
9 event. This included populations living in LMICs who had fled a country with ongoing
10 humanitarian event. Refugee populations living in high-income countries were excluded, as
11 their access to resources and housing may be privileged. This also excluded populations
12 living in LMICs that were not impacted by a humanitarian event.
- 13 · Measure quantitative SRHR outcomes.
- 14 · Be an interventional or observational study on an SRHR-related topic.
- 15 · Be published after January 1st, 2004 to May 2019. Publications before the year 2004 were
16 excluded on the basis of relevance and feasibility.
- 17 · Be in the English language or have an English translation available online, as this project did
18 not have the capacity for translation.

19 Qualitative studies, and those without any measurement methods were excluded. Outcomes that were
20 based on non-empirical data, including models or simulations were excluded. Indicators that included
21 only counts (number of individuals or events) without a clear denominator were also excluded.
22 Indicators measuring intimate partner violence (IPV) and non-partner sexual violence (NPSV) prevalence
23 were excluded from our standard indicator count if they did not capture the experience of violence that

1 occurred in the 12 months preceding measurement, as defined in the WHO standard indicators (16, 18).
2 However, they were counted towards the sexual violence and intimate partner violence indicator type
3 count. See Additional file 2 for detailed inclusion and exclusion criteria.

4 **2.2. Search**

5 Scientific articles published between January 2004 and May 2019 were identified using Embase,
6 Medline, PsycInfo, CINAHL, Scopus and PAIS index. The websites and databases of UNFPA, United
7 Nations High Commission for Refugees (UNHCR), Oxfam, Care International, WHO, International Rescue
8 Committee (IRC), International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC), World Vision, Médecins Sans
9 Frontières (MSF) Field Research, Active Learning Network for Accountability and Performance (ALNAP),
10 Save the Children International (SCI), Sexual Violence Research Initiatives (SVRI), IAWG, Women’s
11 Refugee Commission, Humanitarian Response, Relief Web and Plan International were searched for
12 relevant non-peer-reviewed literature. The first 200 citations were screened from each source and then
13 the full-text documents were screened for eligibility.

14 **2.3 Screening Process**

15 The results of the index literature search were uploaded to a screening software that allowed reviewers
16 to work in duplicate. This review used Rayyan – an abstract screening interface as well as a title and
17 abstract prediction classifier based on a machine learning algorithm (19). Details of this tool used for
18 title and abstract screening can be seen in Additional file 3.

19 Following the title and abstract screening process, conducted in duplicate in Rayyan, the full-texts of
20 publications were also screened in duplicate and assessed for eligibility; an exclusion reason was
21 assigned for publications that did not meet the study criteria.

1 Relevant systematic reviews identified through the database and non-peer-reviewed searches were
2 manually screened for relevant citations. Ten additional studies were included through this process. The
3 GEWE review also yielded relevant papers that were not retrieved through the SRHR search,
4 contributing 53 additional studies.

5 **2.4 Data Extraction and Analysis**

6 Information of interest from the included publications was extracted into a Microsoft Excel spreadsheet.
7 A narrative synthesis was conducted to group indicators thematically into nine different domains of
8 SRHR (20). Within these domains of SRHR, indicators were further sorted into types and subtypes.
9 Extracted and sorted data were then descriptively analyzed using STATA 16, to tabulate frequencies
10 (21). Demographics, measurement methods and tools, and indicators were counted once per study.
11 These counts were then used to describe gaps in measurement across domains.

12 Indicators extracted from the selected papers were compared to standard SRHR indicators and their
13 corresponding data collection methods from the WHO Core Indicators and the WHO Reproductive
14 Health Indicators (16, 18). If extracted indicators met the WHO recommended definition and study
15 population, they were classified as standard indicators. Indicators that used recommended probability-
16 based sampling methods were noted (16). Indicators from the standard WHO Core and SRHR lists were
17 excluded if the population of interest was men (outside of our study population) or were specific to
18 nationwide rates (e.g. fertility rate), rather than conflict or humanitarian settings. Data collection
19 toolkits and surveys from our included studies are collated in Additional file 4. Toolkits and surveys are
20 mapped to WHO standard indicators in Additional file 5.

21 Measurement tools, methods, gaps and indicators identified in this analysis were then used to create
22 interactive Tableau dashboards. They are now accessible online, along with the results from our gender

1 equality and women’s empowerment review (22). A link to the online dashboards can be found in

2 Additional file 6.

3 **3. Results**

4 The search yielded 42,081 scientific publications and 2,569 reports. After removing duplicates,

5 title/abstract and full text screening, 385 publications met the inclusion criteria and were included in

6 this review. Of these studies, 22% (n=86) were coverage studies, 40% (n=155) were morbidity/mortality

7 studies and 37% (n=144) covered both topics. Additional file 7 includes the full list of studies.

8 [Insert Figure 1 PRISMA chart]

9 **3.1. Study Characteristics**

10 Most of the studies included in this review (86%) were conducted with populations affected by conflict

11 within the past five years. Nine percent of studies (n=36) were conducted in disaster and post-disaster

12 settings, and 7% (n=26) in epidemic and post-epidemic settings. Women of reproductive age (WRA),

13 pregnant and postpartum women, and adolescents/adolescent girls were the most represented study

14 populations. Only 1% of studies (n=5) were conducted among children/girls. A total of 32% (n=123) were

15 conducted with refugee populations, 29% (n=111) with populations of internally displaced persons

16 (IDPs), and 37% (n=142) did not report the displacement status of their study population. Over a third of

17 the studies 38% (n=147) collected data on populations living in refugee camps and informal settlements.

18 Population dwelling was not reported for 41% of studies (n=158). Figure 2 includes the study

19 characteristics, stratified by studies on coverage, morbidity/mortality and both.

20 [Insert Figure 2: Study Characteristics]

1 The studies identified covered 66 countries. Uganda (n=64), the Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC)
2 (n=45), Lebanon (n=19), Liberia (n=18), and Jordan (n=18) were the most common conflict-affected
3 population sites for data collection. China (n=6), Nepal (n=6), and Pakistan(n=6) were the most
4 frequently studied disaster settings and Sierra Leone (n=4), Liberia (n=5), and Brazil (n=6) were the most
5 common epidemic settings. Figure 3 illustrates all included countries by type of humanitarian setting.
6 Refugee populations originated from 29 countries, the most common being Syria, Myanmar, DRC,
7 Palestine and Somalia. Figure 3 illustrates all the countries of origin of refugee populations in this
8 review.

9 [Insert Figure 3: Geographical location and number of studies by type of humanitarian setting]

10 [Insert Figure 4: Geographical location and number of studies by country of origin of refugee
11 populations]

12 **3.2. Measurement Methods Used**

13 Ninety-five percent (n=367) of the studies in this review were observational, and nearly three quarters
14 of these studies (70%) were cross-sectional (n=269). One hundred and fifty-six studies (41%) were
15 facility level studies, while 214 (56%) were conducted at the population level. Thirteen studies (3%) did
16 not report the data level, and two used both population and facility data (0.5%). Figure 5 illustrates the
17 distribution of the data collection methods, by data level. Only 17 interventional studies (4%), including
18 11 randomized controlled trials (RCTs) (3%), met the inclusion criteria for our review paper.

19 [Insert Figure 5: Distribution of the data collection methods]

20 A total of 166 studies (43%) used probability sampling methods, including cluster sampling (37%, n=62)
21 and simple, stratified and systematic random sampling (54%, n=89). Additionally, 29% (n=110) of the

1 studies employed non-probability sampling, of which convenience (45%, n=50), purposive (26%, n=29)
2 and quota sampling (8%, n=9) were the most common. Sampling methods were not reported for 27%
3 (n=105) of publications.

4 Approximately 75% of all publications reported used interviewer-administered questionnaires for data
5 collection, 15 % (n=58) of all studies relied on administrative data, 3% (n=13) relied on laboratory tests
6 and self-administered questionnaires, and 3% (n=11) used audio computer-assisted self-interviews
7 (ACASI).

8 This review identified 65 toolkits and questionnaires measuring SRHR in humanitarian settings, of which
9 25 were designed specifically for humanitarian settings. The most frequently used toolkits in this review
10 were: the CDC Reproductive Health Assessment Toolkit for Conflict-Affected Women (7% of all studies,
11 n=26), the Demographic and Health Survey (DHS) (6 % of all studies, n=22), and the WHO Multi-Country
12 Study on Women's Health and Domestic Violence Against Women (5% of all studies, n=18). The CDC
13 Reproductive Health Assessment Toolkit for Conflict-Affected Women used 20 standard indicators, and
14 the Demographic and Health Survey used 21 standard indicators. See Additional file 4 for the full list of
15 toolkits and surveys. The full list of standard indicators can be found in Figure 7.

16 **3.3. Domains of SRHR**

17 [Insert Figure 6: Number of studies by SRHR domain]

18 Figure 6 illustrates the representation of SRHR domains by study count. Indicators of SRHR were
19 categorized into nine domains: abortion, ANC, FP, GBV, HIV and STIs, maternal health, maternal
20 mortality, menstruation and gynecological health, and obstetric care (delivery). The abortion and
21 maternal mortality domains were the least common in our review, found in only n=30 (8%) and n=19
22 studies (5%), respectively. Menstruation and gynecological health were represented in 44 studies (11%).

1 GBV had the highest representation of studies, with 178 papers (48%) including at least one GBV
2 indicator. Obstetric care (delivery), HIV and STIs, and FP were found in a similar number of studies in our
3 review (n=99, 26%; n=97, 25%; and n=93, 24% respectively).

4 **3.4. Gaps in Measurement**

5 [Insert Figure 7: Frequency of studies including standardized indicators by domain]

6 Figure 7 includes all the WHO standard indicators found in this study, by study count, probability
7 methods, toolkit count, and country count. Figure 8 illustrates the various types of gaps within our
8 scoping review. Domains of SRHR were organized into indicator types and then subtypes, which can be
9 found in additional file 8. Indicator types/subtypes that have few, or no check marks represent gaps.
10 Indicator types/subtypes that were present in 15 or more of the 385 papers included in this scoping
11 review are *considered common across studies*. *Standardization exists* for indicator types/subtypes that
12 are validated by a WHO standard indicator. Indicators types/subtypes used in five or more countries are
13 *considered common across countries*. Indicator types/subtypes are *considered common in the toolkits* if
14 they were present in three or more toolkits retrieved from this review. Finally, an indicator type/subtype
15 is *measured in detail* when it is measured by the same indicator in three or more studies, or three or
16 more different indicators within one study.

17 [Insert Figure 8: Measurement gap areas]

18 From our gap mapping exercise, it became clear that some types and subtypes of SRHR were more
19 adequately and frequently measured than others.

20 **a. The Pregnancy Continuum**

1 Indicators and tools related to stages of the pregnancy continuum were represented across studies,
2 across countries and across toolkits. ANC and obstetric care were well measured, including the standard
3 indicators ANC coverage (n=46), ANC (four or more visits) (n=15), proportion of births delivered by a
4 skilled birth attendant (n=18), proportion of births delivered in a health facility (n=28), perinatal
5 mortality rate (n=29), stillbirth rate (n=20) and C-section rate (n=28). Contraceptive prevalence was
6 measured in 72 studies, 69% of which used probability methods, and in a total of 40 countries. It also
7 was represented in 22 of the toolkits found in this review, making contraceptive prevalence the most
8 frequent standard indicator measured. However, two indicators related to syphilis (positive status
9 during pregnancy and screening and positive status) were only measured once and thrice respectively.
10 Additionally, the standard indicator *postnatal care (PNC) for women* was only found in two studies, only
11 one of which used a probability sampling method. Maternal mortality rate (MMR) was only measured in
12 5 studies, in 14 different countries. Cause of maternal death was measured in 8 studies.

13 **b. Gender-Based Violence**

14 In the GBV domain, nine different tools to measure IPV and five tools to measure NPSV prevalence were
15 found in 24 and 15 studies, respectively. The indicator types sexual violence and intimate partner
16 violence were found in 110 and 61 studies respectively. However, indicators measuring female genital
17 mutilation/cutting (FGM/C) were poorly represented. Prevalence of female genital cutting was only
18 measured in three instances in three different countries.

19 **c. Abortion**

20 Abortion as a domain was not common in the literature, indicating that there is a lack of measurement
21 of both safe and unsafe abortion in humanitarian settings. Post abortion care (n=5, 1%), self-induced
22 abortion (n=1, 0.3%), and location of abortion (n=4, 1%) were reported in a few studies throughout this

1 review. Abortion complications, unsafe abortion, availability/accessibility of safe abortion were not
2 explicitly measured.

3 **d. Menstruation & Sexual Health**

4 Menstruation as an SRHR domain was also not common in this review. Menstrual hygiene management
5 (MHM) and menstrual irregularities were measured in ten studies. There were no WHO standard
6 indicators related to menstruation.

7 HIV prevalence rate was the most commonly measured standard indicator in the HIV/STI domain, having
8 been represented in 39 studies. Cervical cancer screening was extremely underrepresented in our study
9 (n=1), yet it is classified as a WHO Core Indicator. Cervical cancer screening and sexual and reproductive
10 health (SRH) knowledge were solely measured in one study and one country; they were not well
11 represented in the toolkits.

12 **4.0. Discussion**

13 **4.1. Discussion of Measurement Methods Used**

14 The lack of interventional research in this review may be in part due to the scope of our study, however
15 it could also underscore the difficulty of conducting interventional research among displaced
16 populations; it is challenging to distinguish a control group in conflict settings, and in the absence of this
17 group, the study results are less comparable (23). While the majority of studies in this review employed
18 a cross-sectional study design, a variety of sampling methods were used. Random sampling is the
19 optimal sampling approach for cross-sectional surveys as it reduces the possibility of selection bias and
20 allows results to be more generalizable. It is recommended (along with clustered sampling) to be
21 employed when measuring the WHO Reproductive Health Indicators (16). However, there may be

1 constraints to employing this method in humanitarian settings due to the displacement of study
2 populations (24). Sampling can be challenging in insecure and violent circumstances (25). Lack of
3 resources and infrastructure can limit access to populations and can limit the ability to conduct
4 research, thus compromising the quality and scientific validity of the results (13).

5 Although a cross-sectional design limits the ability to make causal statements about findings, it was the
6 most common design used in unstable environments (26-28). Non-probability methods are more
7 feasible while conducting research with some marginalized populations, especially in situations with
8 limited resources and research capacity. However, non-probability sampling results in findings that are
9 less representative of the population and less generalizable across settings (29, 30). Additionally, some
10 of the non-random samples within our review were very small, further reducing their generalizability
11 (31). Non-probability sampling methods are also prone to selection bias. For example, employing
12 purposive or convenience sampling in a facility-based study will limit the study population to women
13 who seek care, excluding women for whom care is unavailable or inaccessible (24, 25, 32).

14 Questionnaires providing self-reported data were the most commonly used measurement instrument.
15 However, these instruments have a number of limitations, in humanitarian settings and in other
16 contexts. Underreporting can occur, especially when the subject matter is sensitive in nature (33, 34).
17 Participants may omit information due to a lack of privacy, especially when data collection takes place in
18 a crowded environment, or near other household members (35). Social desirability bias may occur, as
19 participants may under- or over-report experiences based on the perceived expectations of the
20 researcher (31, 36, 37). Self-reported and interview-administered questionnaires are also prone to recall
21 bias due to the retrospective nature of the questionnaires (25, 31, 38-40). There are limitations to using
22 retrospective administrative data as well, as patient data may not be verifiable (41).

23 **4.2. The Pregnancy Continuum**

1 ANC (four or more visits), ANC coverage, proportion of births delivered in a health facility, proportion of
2 births attended by a skilled birth attendant, C-section rate, perinatal mortality rate, and stillbirth rate
3 are well recognized indicators of SRHR. These are well established and validated indicators found
4 throughout the literature, using probability sampling methods (16, 18). From our review, it is evident
5 that antenatal care, family planning, and obstetric care (delivery) are priority areas for non-
6 governmental organizations (NGOs) and governments when responding to humanitarian crises. It is
7 important to note that though the WHO now recommends eight ANC visits, four visits or more was
8 chosen as the indicator as it was used in most ANC studies included in this review (42).

9 However, post-natal care (PNC) for mothers is insufficiently captured by the data on SRHR in LMICs in
10 crisis, especially compared to other time periods along the pregnancy continuum. The available data on
11 PNC included in this scoping review focuses predominantly on attendance and procedures, and to a
12 lesser extent postpartum depression and other postpartum complications. Much of PNC focuses on
13 newborn rather than maternal health (43), which explains the dearth of data on PNC in our scoping
14 review, since our population of interest is women of reproductive age. In spite of this, *PNC coverage for*
15 *women* is a standard WHO indicator, demonstrating its significance as a measure of SRHR (16).

16 The domain of maternal mortality as a whole and mortality rates, including AIDS-related mortality rate
17 and MMR, were not commonly found in the literature. Maternal mortality is difficult to estimate in
18 humanitarian settings. A review on the measurement of maternal mortality in humanitarian settings
19 found that there was selection bias in how maternal deaths were measured (40). Few studies confirmed
20 deaths with verbal autopsy or medical records. Studies conducted at the household level relied on recall
21 from family members. More representative samples are needed, and deaths need to be reconfirmed to
22 increase the reliability of the data (44). However, it is also possible that our study criteria excluded some
23 maternal mortality studies that relied on statistical modelling to estimate MMR at the national level.

1 **4.3. Gender-Based Violence (GBV)**

2 While GBV was the most frequently measured domain in this review, FGM/C was poorly represented.

3 FGM/C is defined as the partial or total removal of external female genitalia for non-medical reasons.

4 There are no health benefits to FGM/C for women and girls, and FGM/C is known to lead to a number of

5 health problems, including severe bleeding, problems urinating, cysts, infections, complications with

6 childbirth and in some cases, death (45). FGM/C is contextual, and its frequency depends on the cultural

7 norms of the population. In some emergency settings, there are too few individuals in the community

8 who practice FGM to make tracking a priority for resource allocation (46). FGM/C can be challenging to

9 define based on severity, practice, cultural beliefs and stigma, rendering it difficult to measure

10 quantitatively at the population level (46, 47). Family separation, social disruption, health issues, and

11 poverty caused by crises make access to FGM/C prevention interventions and programs difficult; FGM/C

12 responses tend to be secondary in emergency settings where basic provisions of food, water, and

13 healthcare are a priority (46). One study excluded FGM/C from their GBV screening tool because it was

14 expected that much of the adult female population would have experienced this practice, and the

15 consequent number of referrals would overwhelm the health system (48, 49).

16 In addition to FGM/C, economic violence was not commonly found in the GBV domain. Economic

17 violence can negatively impact the sexual and reproductive health of women in crisis. However, because

18 economic violence is not a measurement of SRH, it is better-suited (much like other GBV subtypes) to

19 the GEWE scoping review; economic violence is a direct indication of inequality and/or

20 disempowerment (17).

21 **4.4. Abortion**

1 Despite increased funding and capacity to deliver SRH interventions by NGOs, comprehensive abortion
2 care remains as a significant gap in adolescent sexual and reproductive health services in humanitarian
3 settings (12). Abortion is complicated to measure globally, as it is stigmatized and therefore can be
4 underreported (50).

5 Barriers to accessing abortion in humanitarian settings result in challenges to measuring safe abortion.
6 In order for abortion to be considered safe, it must be conducted by a trained health professional using
7 a recommended method. If neither or only one of these criteria is met, the abortion is considered
8 unsafe ((50, 51). At the participant level, barriers to accessing abortion services include stigma,
9 confidentiality (52), availability, shortage in trained workers and equipment, and religious barriers (51).

10 There are also barriers to abortion and abortion measurement at the organization/facility level.
11 Abortion services may be perceived as too complicated to provide in the humanitarian space, despite
12 being safe and well-established medical procedures (53). Further, many researchers have shown that
13 post-abortion care services can be offered in politically unstable and culturally conservative settings
14 where abortion is stigmatized (54, 55). Another potential barrier to the provision and measurement of
15 abortion is that some donors do not fund abortion services (53). Additionally, abortion is illegal in some
16 settings, although 190 out of 196 countries globally do permit abortion, some under limited
17 circumstances (53); for example, in the DRC, abortion is legal if two physicians agree that it is necessary
18 to save the life of the mother (56).

19 Though abortion is supported by international treaties and laws, there is still a need for
20 decriminalization, particularly in conflict-settings where there are high levels of pregnancy as a result of
21 sexual violence (57, 58). The legalization of abortion will also promote a higher standard for these
22 services and reduce instances where untrained providers offer these procedures illegally (52).

1 Abortion is represented by just one standard indicator in this review: obstetric and gynecological
2 admissions owing to abortion (16). This indicator does not sufficiently capture the true prevalence of
3 abortions in humanitarian settings or if unsafe abortions are prevalent within the community.
4 Measuring the proportion of admissions owing to abortion will underestimate the actual abortion rate in
5 the region (53). In 2019, 92% of women of reproductive age in Sub-Saharan Africa lived in countries
6 with restrictive laws surrounding abortion. From 2010-2014, 77% of abortions were unsafe, compared
7 to 45% globally (50). In settings where abortion services are illegal or inaccessible, the magnitude of
8 unsafe abortions and associated maternal mortality should be measured. Further, there should be
9 additional standard indicators to capture the stigma and laws that surround abortion. Not only does
10 abortion need to be funded and accessible, it also needs to be measured using validated methods that
11 are comprehensive.

12 **4.5. Menstruation & Gynecological Health**

13 Very few papers contained within our scoping review focused on MHM and other topics external to the
14 pregnancy continuum, such as unspecified gynecological illnesses and related complications. These gaps
15 could be attributed to a variety of factors: the inherent nature of humanitarian responses (prioritizing
16 life-saving measures for the most vulnerable at the outset), the preference for qualitative methods to
17 assess certain topics, or in some cases, the lack of standard indicators. Even where standardization
18 exists, indicators may be overlooked; this may be because they pertain to non-communicable diseases,
19 they are not immediately life-threatening or they do not affect a large number of people. This was the
20 case for cervical cancer screening measurement in humanitarian settings.

21 Within the domain of menstruation and gynecological health, indicators were extracted for MHM
22 including knowledge, satisfaction and type of menstrual product used, menstrual irregularities, and SRH
23 symptoms, such as anemia, and reproductive/gynecological complaints and infections. Noticeably

1 absent from our findings was an association between any of the extracted SRH symptoms and
2 menstruation. For example, anemia was not connected to menstruation, despite its association with
3 menarche. Despite the guidance given by the IAFM (12), and the MISP Distance Learning Module on
4 Menstrual-related Responses (2), menstrual-related indicators in this scoping review do not reflect or
5 measure the complexity/granularity that is outlined by these responses.

6 The Sphere Handbook recommends that adolescent girls and women are consulted about their needs
7 and preferences with regards to MHM, yet it does not contain standards for these consultations (59).
8 There are also no standard indicators for menstruation or MHM in either of the WHO Core Indicators or
9 the WHO Reproductive Health Indicators (16, 18), which reflects the lack of consensus on the optimal
10 way to monitor and evaluate these interventions (60). There is, however, a minimum standard for
11 responding to the MHM needs of adolescent girls, which includes the supply of sanitary materials, and in
12 more comprehensive responses, the delivery of puberty education to 10-14 year olds (61). Nevertheless,
13 in the absence of standards, both for the recommended consultations with adolescent girls and women
14 and for the indicators used to monitor and evaluate menstruation and MHM, data may be poorly
15 collected, or missing entirely. Notable organizations and resources in this arena clearly define *what*
16 should be implemented in these situations with regards to MHM, but not *how* they should be
17 implemented or maintained, or whether any novel menstrual products should be introduced in these
18 settings (60).

19 **4.6 Sexual Health**

20 Cervical cancer ranks as the leading cause of cancer death in 42 countries, predominantly in Sub-
21 Saharan Africa and Southeast Asia. However, many of these countries were not represented within our
22 scoping review, as they were not humanitarian settings (62). While the WHO recommends that
23 unvaccinated women (between the ages of 30-49) are screened for cervical cancer, this may not be

1 prioritized in countries where the prevalence is low, resources are constrained (62), or where there may
2 be high vaccination rates in childhood.

3 STI testing also represented a notable gap in our scoping review. Overall, HIV-related indicators are
4 measured more often than other STI-related indicators. HIV may be measured more commonly than
5 other STIs, in conflict-settings because there is a body of literature that shows how conflict and the
6 associated impacts of conflict, such as weak social and physical infrastructure, poor health, and
7 untreated STIs, increase the risk of HIV transmission (63). This heightened risk results from increased
8 vulnerability (due to sexual violence, poverty, and breakdown of public health education) and increased
9 exposure opportunity (through casual or transactional sex and interactions with individuals who partake
10 in high-risk behaviors) (63).

11 Overall, our scoping review yielded more tools focusing on reproductive and maternal health than
12 sexual health-related topics (such as STIs). More emphasis must be placed on the diverse needs
13 between groups (including, but not limited to, young girls, lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, queer,
14 intersex and asexual youth, and those with disabilities) and on understanding the perceptions of and
15 information provided to girls and women through professional and traditional services (12).

16 **4.7. Limitations**

17 This scoping review has a number of limitations. First, studies were only included if they were published
18 or available in English, which reduced the representation of research from non-English researchers and
19 journals. Second, studies were only extracted if they contained indicators with measured outcomes. This
20 prevented some toolkits and checklists from being included in our review if they were found directly in
21 the grey literature. Studies that exclusively used qualitative research methods were also excluded, which
22 may have impacted the level of detail, particularly on lived experiences, contained within the results of

1 our review (32). Third, indicator results reported as crude numbers were not extracted, which excluded
2 a number of facility-based studies. Fourth, this review did not include nationwide data. For example,
3 national maternal mortality and fertility rates were poorly represented or not included, limiting the
4 ability to compare standard indicators across countries. Fifth, we identified 'gaps' using a standardized
5 list of indicators that are used to measure SRHR in non-conflict/non-humanitarian settings, which were
6 not specific to humanitarian settings. As mentioned above, data collection in humanitarian settings is
7 challenging. We wanted to see if it was feasible to measure globally accepted SRHR indicators in this
8 context. Finally, the studies contained within this scoping review were heteronormative and gender
9 binary; GBV indicators contain the latent assumption that the (female) participant was married/in a
10 partnership with a male individual, and all indicators were based on biological sex rather than gender-
11 identity.

12 **5. Conclusions**

13 There was great variation in the quality and range of tools, methods and indicators used to measure
14 SRHR in humanitarian settings. While a wide variety of sampling methods were used in these studies,
15 cross-sectional surveys made up the majority of study designs. GBV and the pregnancy continuum
16 dominated the domains of study. The WHO standard indicators provided a benchmark for measuring
17 SRHR in these settings, however, not all domains of SRHR were well-represented in these standards;
18 measurements of abortion and menstruation were lacking in humanitarian settings and should be
19 captured by standard SRHR indicators.

20

21 The Tableau dashboard created from this scoping review provides an interactive and centralized
22 resource for SRHR measurement, which can be updated as research in humanitarian settings evolves. It
23 is our hope that toolkits and indicators identified in this review will inform future data collection in

1 humanitarian settings. Climate change and the unprecedented COVID-19 pandemic could increase
2 conflict, displacement and access to health services, further jeopardizing the measurement of SRHR in
3 all settings, making the identification and/or development of innovative data collection methodologies a
4 research priority.

5 6 **Supplementary information**

7
8 **Additional file 1:** Search strategy. This file includes the search strategy for all 6 databases. (PDF)
9 **Additional file 2:** Inclusion and exclusion criteria. This files includes the inclusion and exclusion criteria for the
10 review. (PDF)
11 **Additional file 3:** Rayyan screening tool. This file describes the machine learning software used in the title/abstract
12 stage of the review. (PDF)
13 **Additional file 4:** Data collection toolkits and surveys. This is a list of all tools utilized by studies in this review.
14 (PDF)
15 **Additional file 5:** Toolkits, Surveys and Standard Indicators. This file looks at how many standard indicators are
16 included in each tool found. (PDF)
17 **Additional file 6:** Measurement of Sexual and Reproductive Health and Rights, Gender Equality, and Women’s
18 Empowerment in Humanitarian Settings. This link leads to the interactive Tableau dashboard.
19 [https://canwach.ca/initiatives/canadian-collaborative-for-global-health/improving-measurement-sexual-and-](https://canwach.ca/initiatives/canadian-collaborative-for-global-health/improving-measurement-sexual-and-reproductive-health-and-rights-womens-empowerment-and-gender/)
20 [reproductive-health-and-rights-womens-empowerment-and-gender/](https://canwach.ca/initiatives/canadian-collaborative-for-global-health/improving-measurement-sexual-and-reproductive-health-and-rights-womens-empowerment-and-gender/)
21 **Additional file 7:** Study List. Includes list of all included index and grey literature. (PDF)
22 **Additional file 8:** SRHR Domains, Indicator Types, and Indicator Subtypes. This file includes the calculated
23 frequency of each SRHR indicator type and subtype. (PDF)

24 25 **Abbreviations**

26 ACASI: audio computer-assisted self-interviews; ALNAP: Active Learning Network for Accountability and
27 Performance; ANC: Antenatal Care; CanWaCH: Canadian Partnership for Women and Children’s Health; DHS:
28 Demographic and Health Survey; FGM/C: Female Genital Mutilation/Cutting; FP: Family Planning; GBV: Gender-
29 Based Violence; GEWE: Gender Equality and Women’s Empowerment; HIV: Human Immunodeficiency Virus; IAFM:
30 Interagency Field Manual; IAWG: Inter-Agency Working Group; ICRC: International Committee of the Red Cross;
31 IDP: Internally Displaced Persons; IRC: International Rescue Committee; LMICs: Low- and Middle- Income
32 Countries; MHM: Menstrual Hygiene Management; MISP: Minimum Initial Service Package; MMR: Maternal
33 Mortality Rate; MSF: Médecins Sans Frontières; NGOs: Non-Governmental Organizations; PNC: Post-Natal Care;
34 PRISMA: Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews; SCI: Save the Children International; SDGs: Sustainable
35 Development Goals; SRHR: Sexual and Reproductive Health and Rights; STIs: Sexually Transmitted Infections; SVRI:
36 Sexual Violence Research Initiatives; UNFPA: United Nations Population Fund; UNHCR: United Nations High
37 Commission for Refugees; WHO: World Health Organization; WRA: Women of Reproductive Age

38 39 **Declarations**

40 Ethics approval and consent to participate: N/A

- 1 Consent for publication: N/A
- 2 Availability of data and materials: The datasets generated during and/or analyzed during the current study are
3 available from the corresponding author on reasonable request.
- 4 Competing interests: There are no competing interests to report.
- 5 Funding: funded by Global Affairs Canada and the Canadian Partnership for Women and Children’s Health
- 6 Authors' contributions: CG coordinated the study, analyzed the data, planned, wrote and edited the manuscript,
7 directed the team. She also participated in screening, data extraction and cleaning of the study. AG, AA and AP
8 screened, extracted and cleaned the data. They also contributed to manuscript writing and editing. HN created all
9 the Tableau visuals and is responsible for the development of the online Interactive Tableau platform. She also
10 edited and contributed to the writing process. JLK assisted with the machine learning aspect of the project, and
11 wrote the corresponding appendix. DB is the principal investigator and was responsible for the creation of this
12 project in partnership with CanWaCH.
- 13 Acknowledgements: Canadian Partnership for Women and Children’s Health (CanWaCH), Canadian Red Cross, Luay
14 Basil, Katie McLaughlin, Mariella Munyuzangabo, Neil Yang & Malasha D’souza.

1 References


- 2 1. Pillai V, Wang Y-C, Maleku A. Women, war, and reproductive health in developing countries.
3 Social Work in Health Care. 2017;56(1):28-44.
- 4 2. Women's Refugee Commission. Minimum Initial Service Package (MISP) for Reproductive Health
5 in Crisis Situations: A Distance Learning Module. New York, USA: Women's Refugee Commission; 2007.
- 6 3. Blanchet K. An evidence review of research on health interventions in humanitarian crises.
7 London, UK: London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine; 2015 October 2015.
- 8 4. United Nations Population Fund. Humanitarian Action 2019 Overview. New York, USA: UNFPA;
9 2019.
- 10 5. Glasier A, Gulmezoglu AM, Schmid GP, Moreno CG, Van Look PF. Sexual and reproductive
11 health: a matter of life and death. The Lancet. 2006;368(9547):1595-607.
- 12 6. Ivanova O, Rai M, Kemigisha E. A Systematic Review of Sexual and Reproductive Health
13 Knowledge, Experiences and Access to Services among Refugee, Migrant and Displaced Girls and Young
14 Women in Africa. Int J Environ Res Public Health. 2018;15(8).
- 15 7. Tirado V, Chu J, Hanson C, Ekström AM, Kågesten A. Barriers and facilitators for the sexual and
16 reproductive health and rights of young people in refugee contexts globally: A scoping review. PLOS
17 ONE. 2020;15(7):e0236316.
- 18 8. Casey SE, Chynoweth SK, Cornier N, Gallagher MC, Wheeler EE. Progress and gaps in
19 reproductive health services in three humanitarian settings: mixed-methods case studies. Conflict and
20 Health. 2015;9(1):S3.
- 21 9. Casey SE. Evaluations of reproductive health programs in humanitarian settings: a systematic
22 review. Conflict and Health. 2015;9(1):S1.
- 23 10. Austin J, Guy S, Lee-Jones L, McGinn T, Schlecht J. Reproductive health: a right for refugees and
24 internally displaced persons. Reprod Health Matters. 2008;16(31):10-21.
- 25 11. Martineau T, McPake B, Theobald S, Raven J, Ensor T, Fustukian S, et al. Leaving no one behind:
26 lessons on rebuilding health systems in conflict- and crisis-affected states. BMJ Global Health.
27 2017;2(2):e000327.
- 28 12. Inter-agency Working Group on Reproductive Health in Crises. 2018 Inter-Agency Field Manual
29 on Reproductive Health in Humanitarian Settings. New York, USA: IAWG; 2018. Available from:
30 <https://iawg.wpengine.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/07/IAFM-English.pdf>.
- 31 13. Ford N, Mills EJ, Zachariah R, Upshur R. Ethics of conducting research in conflict settings. Confl
32 Health. 2009;3:7.
- 33 14. Peterson J, Pearce PF, Ferguson LA, Langford CA. Understanding scoping reviews: Definition,
34 purpose, and process. Journal of the American Association of Nurse Practitioners. 2017;29(1):12-6.
- 35 15. Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, Altman DG. Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and
36 meta-analyses: the PRISMA statement. BMJ. 2009;339:b2535.
- 37 16. World Health Organization. Reproductive health indicators: Guidelines for their generation,
38 interpretation and analysis for global monitoring. Geneva, Switzerland: WHO; 2006.
- 39 17. Goulart C, Purewal A, Nakhuda H, Ampadu A, Giancola A, Kortenaar J-L, et al. Tools for
40 measuring gender equality and women's empowerment (GEWE) indicators in humanitarian settings.
41 [Journal submission]. In press 2020.
- 42 18. World Health Organization. 2018 Global reference list of 100 core health indicators (plus health-
43 related SDGs). Geneva, Switzerland: WHO; 2018.
- 44 19. Rayyan Prediction Classifier [cited 2020 September 10, 2020]. Available from:
45 <http://support.rayyan.qcri.org/knowledgebase/articles/815361-rayyan-prediction-classifier>.

- 1 20. Popay J, Roberts H, Sowden A, Petticrew M, Arai L, Rodgers M, et al. Guidance on the Conduct of
2 Narrative Synthesis in Systematic Reviews: A Product from the ESRC Methods Programme: ERSC; 2006.
3 Available from: <https://doi.org/10.13140/2.1.1018.4643>.
- 4 21. Mehmetoglu M, Jakobsen TG. Applied Statistics Using Stata: A Guide for the Social Sciences:
5 SAGE Publications; 2016.
- 6 22. Nakhuda H. Measurement of Sexual and Reproductive Health and Rights, Gender Equality, and
7 Women's Empowerment in Humanitarian Settings: The Hospital for Sick Children,
8 ; 2020 [Available from:
9 https://public.tableau.com/profile/humairanakhuda#!/vizhome/SRHRGEWEScopingReviewStory_Final_Nov16/SRHRGEWESStory.
10
- 11 23. Usta J, Farver J. Child sexual abuse in Lebanon during war and peace. *Child Care Health Dev.*
12 2010;36(3):361-8.
- 13 24. Alexander J, Cosgrave J. Representative sampling in humanitarian evaluation, Method Note 1.
14 ALNAP Humanitarian Evaluation Community of Practice; 2014.
- 15 25. de Jong K, van der Kam S, Swarthout T, Ford N, Mills C, Yun O, et al. Exposure to violence and
16 PTSD symptoms among Somali women. *J Trauma Stress.* 2011;24(6):628-34.
- 17 26. Nattabi B, Li J, Thompson SC, Orach CG, Earnest J. Family planning among people living with HIV
18 in post-conflict Northern Uganda: A mixed methods study. *Confl Health.* 2011;5:18.
- 19 27. Patel S, Schechter MT, Sewankambo NK, Atim S, Oboya C, Kiwanuka N, et al. Comparison of HIV-
20 related vulnerabilities between former child soldiers and children never abducted by the LRA in
21 northern Uganda. *Confl Health.* 2013;7(1):17.
- 22 28. Hammoury N, Khawaja M, Mahfoud Z, Afifi RA, Madi H. Domestic violence against women
23 during pregnancy: the case of Palestinian refugees attending an antenatal clinic in Lebanon. *J Womens*
24 *Health (Larchmt).* 2009;18(3):337-45.
- 25 29. Al-Shdayfat N. Physical Abuse among Syrian Refugee Women in Jordan. *Middle East Journal of*
26 *Nursing.* 2017;11(1):3-7.
- 27 30. Dikmen HA, Cankaya S, Dereli Yilmaz S. The attitudes of refugee women in Turkey towards
28 family planning. *Public Health Nurs.* 2019;36(1):45-52.
- 29 31. Anastasi E, Borchert M, Campbell OM, Sondorp E, Kaducu F, Hill O, et al. Losing women along
30 the path to safe motherhood: why is there such a gap between women's use of antenatal care and
31 skilled birth attendance? A mixed methods study in northern Uganda. *BMC Pregnancy Childbirth.*
32 2015;15:287.
- 33 32. Kabakian-Khasholian T, Shayboub R, El-Kak F. Seeking maternal care at times of conflict: the case
34 of Lebanon. *Health Care Women Int.* 2013;34(5):352-62.
- 35 33. Spencer RA, Usta J, Essaid A, Shukri S, El-Gharaibeh Y, Abu-Taleb H, et al. Gender Based Violence
36 Against Women and Girls Displaced by the Syrian Conflict in South Lebanon and North Jordan: Scope of
37 Violence and Health Correlates. *Alianza por la Solidaridad*; 2015.
- 38 34. Hammoury N, Khawaja M. Screening for domestic violence during pregnancy in an antenatal
39 clinic in Lebanon. *Eur J Public Health.* 2007;17(6):605-6.
- 40 35. Torun P, Mucaz Karaaslan M, Sandikli B, Acar C, Shurtleff E, Dhrolia S, et al. Health and health
41 care access for Syrian refugees living in Istanbul. *Int J Public Health.* 2018;63(5):601-8.
- 42 36. Gupta J, Falb KL, Lehmann H, Kpebo D, Xuan Z, Hossain M, et al. Gender norms and economic
43 empowerment intervention to reduce intimate partner violence against women in rural Côte d'Ivoire: a
44 randomized controlled pilot study. *BMC Int Health Hum Rights.* 2013;13(1):46.
- 45 37. Ivanova O, Rai M, Mlahagwa W, Tumuhairwe J, Bakuli A, Nyakato VN, et al. A cross-sectional
46 mixed-methods study of sexual and reproductive health knowledge, experiences and access to services
47 among refugee adolescent girls in the Nakivale refugee settlement, Uganda. *Reprod Health.*
48 2019;16(1):35.


- 1 38. Bartels SA, Scott JA, Mukwege D, Lipton RI, Vanrooyen MJ, Leaning J. Patterns of sexual violence
2 in Eastern Democratic Republic of Congo: reports from survivors presenting to Panzi Hospital in 2006.
3 *Confl Health*. 2010;4:9.
- 4 39. Budhathoki SS, Bhattachan M, Castro-Sanchez E, Sagtani RA, Rayamajhi RB, Rai P, et al.
5 Menstrual hygiene management among women and adolescent girls in the aftermath of the earthquake
6 in Nepal. *BMC Womens Health*. 2018;18(1):33.
- 7 40. Campbell DW, Campbell JC, Yarandi HN, O'Connor AL, Dollar E, Killion C, et al. Violence and
8 abuse of internally displaced women survivors of the 2010 Haiti earthquake. *Int J Public Health*.
9 2016;61(8):981-92.
- 10 41. Duroch F, McRae M, Grais RF. Description and consequences of sexual violence in Ituri province,
11 Democratic Republic of Congo. *BMC Int Health Hum Rights*. 2011;11(1):5.
- 12 42. World Health Organization, USAID. WHO Recommendations on Antenatal Care for a Positive
13 Pregnancy Experience: Summary. 2018.
- 14 43. World Health Organization. WHO recommendations on postnatal care of the mother and
15 newborn. Geneva: World Health Organization; 2014.
- 16 44. Morgan SA, Ali MM. A review of methodology and tools for measuring maternal mortality in
17 humanitarian settings. *Health Policy and Planning*. 2018;33(10):1107-17.
- 18 45. Organization WH. Female Genital Mutilation 2020 [Available from: [https://www.who.int/news-
19 room/fact-sheets/detail/female-genital-mutilation](https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/female-genital-mutilation).
- 20 46. Ryan M, Glennie A, Robertson L, Wilson A-M. The Impact of Emergency Situations on Female
21 Genital Mutilation: 28 Too Many Briefing Paper. 28 Too Many; 2014.
- 22 47. Nelson G. Female genital mutilation/cutting and violence against women and girls:
23 Strengthening the policy linkages between different forms of violence. New York, USA: UN Women;
24 2017.
- 25 48. Wirtz AL, Glass N, Pham K, Perrin N, Rubenstein LS, Singh S, et al. Comprehensive development
26 and testing of the ASIST-GBV, a screening tool for responding to gender-based violence among women
27 in humanitarian settings. *Conflict and Health*. 2016;10(1):7.
- 28 49. Pham K, Wirtz AL, Perrin NA, Glass N, Rubenstein LS, Vu A. Validation of a screening tool to
29 identify survivors of gender-based violence among displaced women in Colombia and Ethiopia. *CTS*.
30 2014;7(3):260-1.
- 31 50. Bankole A, Remez L, Owolabi O, Philbin J, Williams P. From Unsafe to Safe Abortion in Sub-
32 Saharan Africa: Slow but Steady Progress. Guttmacher Institute; 2020.
- 33 51. Ray-Bennett NS, Corssel DMJ, Goswami N, Ghosh A. Understanding reproductive health
34 challenges during a flood: insights from Belkuchi Upazila, Bangladesh. *Gates Open Res*. 2019;3:788.
- 35 52. Kinaro J, Ali TE, Schlangen R, Mack J. Unsafe abortion and abortion care in Khartoum, Sudan.
36 *Reprod Health Matters*. 2009;17(34):71-7.
- 37 53. McGinn T, Casey SE. Why don't humanitarian organizations provide safe abortion services? *Confl
38 Health*. 2016;10:8.
- 39 54. Chukwumalu K, Gallagher MC, Baunach S, Cannon A. Uptake of postabortion care services and
40 acceptance of postabortion contraception in Puntland, Somalia. *Reprod Health Matters*. 2017;25(51):48-
41 57.
- 42 55. Loncar M, Medved V, Jovanovic N, Hotujac L. Psychological consequences of rape on women in
43 1991-1995 war in Croatia and Bosnia and Herzegovina. *Croat Med J*. 2006;47(1):67-75.
- 44 56. Kisindja RM, Kimona C, Etoy M, Dorme F, Benfield N. Family planning knowledge and use among
45 women in camps for internally displaced people in the Democratic Republic of the Congo. *Int J Gynaecol
46 Obstet*. 2017;138(3):256-60.
- 47 57. Radhakrishnan A, Sarver E, Shubin G. Protecting safe abortion in humanitarian settings
48 overcoming legal and policy barriers. *Reproductive Health Matters*. 2017;25(51):40-7.

- 1 58. Loko Roka J, Van den Bergh R, Au S, De Plecker E, Zachariah R, Manzi M, et al. One size fits all?
2 Standardised provision of care for survivors of sexual violence in conflict and post-conflict areas in the
3 Democratic Republic of Congo. PLoS One. 2014;9(10):e111096.
- 4 59. Sphere Association. The Sphere Handbook: Humanitarian Charter and Minimum Standards in
5 Humanitarian Response. Geneva, Switzerland,: Practical Action Publishing; 2018. Available from:
6 www.spherestandards.org/handbook.
- 7 60. VanLeeuwen C, Torondel B. Improving menstrual hygiene management in emergency contexts:
8 literature review of current perspectives. Int J Womens Health. 2018;10:169-86.
- 9 61. Mitchell K. Adolescent Sexual and Reproductive Health Toolkit for Humanitarian Settings: A
10 Companion to the Inter-Agency Field Manual on Reproductive Health in Humanitarian Settings. USA:
11 United Nations Population Fund, Save the Children USA; 2009.
- 12 62. Bray F, Ferlay J, Soerjomataram I, Siegel RL, Torre LA, Jemal A. Global cancer statistics 2018:
13 GLOBOCAN estimates of incidence and mortality worldwide for 36 cancers in 185 countries. CA Cancer J
14 Clin. 2018;68(6):394-424.
- 15 63. Mock NB, Duale S, Brown LF, Mathys E, O'Maonaigh HC, Abul-Husn NK, et al. Conflict and HIV: A
16 framework for risk assessment to prevent HIV in conflict-affected settings in Africa. Emerg Themes
17 Epidemiol. 2004;1:6.


18




Count of Unique Studies

0  208

		Coverage	Morbidity & Mortality	Both
Humanitarian Setting	Conflict	71	134	118
	Conflict & Disaster	0	1	2
	Conflict & Epidemic	1	4	0
	Disaster	7	9	17
	Epidemic	7	7	7
Phase of Crisis	Pre	4	5	6
	During	49	82	75
	Post	33	75	65
	Not Reported	7	11	7
Population Type	Adolescents/Adolescent Girls	12	42	30
	Adults	13	16	17
	Children/Girls	0	5	0
	HIV Positive Individuals	5	0	2
	Pregnant & Post Partum Women	12	23	45
	Survivors of Violence	1	16	3
	Women	6	41	26
	Women of Reproductive Age (WRA)	47	39	46
	Young Women/Young Adults	3	3	4
Displacement Status	Hosts	3	2	14
	IDPs	27	43	42
	Migrants	0	0	2
	Non-Displaced	12	24	16
	Other	0	3	1
	Refugees	28	32	63
	Not Reported	27	71	44
Population Dwelling	Camps & Informal Settlements	34	49	64
	Other	18	35	27
	Not Reported	34	71	53






Count of Unique Studies

0  208

		Facility	Population	Not Reported
Observational or Interventional Study	Interventional	5	12	0
	Observational	152	204	13
	Not Reported	1	0	0
Interventional	Interventional Study	3	3	0
	Randomized Controlled Trial	2	9	0
Type of Observational Study	Cohort	19	3	1
	Cross-Sectional Survey	92	170	9
	Mixed-Methods	8	24	1
	Other Observational	12	6	1
	Secondary Analysis of Health Data	21	1	1
Sampling Method	Probability Sampling Method	22	142	2
	Cluster Sampling	5	56	1
	Random Sampling (Simple, Stratified, Systematic)	16	72	1
	Other Probability Sampling Method	1	14	0
	Non-Probability Sampling Method	63	44	3
	Convenience Sampling	36	12	2
	Purposive Sampling	15	14	0
	Quota Sampling (Proportional)	3	6	0
	Snowball Sampling	3	3	1
	Other Non-Probability Sampling Method	6	9	0
	Mixed (Probability & Non-Probability) Sampling	3	2	0
	Not Reported	70	28	8
	Measurement Method	Administrative/Health Data	54	3
Audio Computer-Assisted Self-Interview		6	5	0
Interviewer-Administered Questionnaire		79	200	9
Laboratory Tests		10	0	3
Participant Observation		3	0	0
Self-Administered Questionnaire		5	8	0
Not Reported		1	0	0



		Count	0  72			
	Standardized Indicator	Indicator Source	# of countries where indicator used	# of toolkits using this indicator	Counted once per study	Indicators measured using probability methods
AB	Obstetric and gynaecological admissions owing to abortion	WRHI	1	0	1	1
	Antenatal care (4+ visits)	WRHI	19	6	15	12
	Antenatal care coverage	WCI, WRHI	28	16	46	33
	Antenatal care: Had blood pressure measured	WCI	2	2	2	2
	Iron supplementation during pregnancy	WCI	7	4	9	5
ANC	Neonatal tetanus protection	WHO	6	3	6	5
	Percentage of ANC clients screened for syphilis	WCI	4	3	3	2
	Pregnant women living with HIV receiving ART	WCI	2	0	2	0
	Prevalence of positive syphilis serology in pregnant women	WRHI	1	2	1	1
	Timing of first ANC visit	WCI	4	2	5	4
FP	Contraceptive prevalence	WCI, WRHI	40	22	32	50
	Intimate partner violence prevalence	WCI	14	17	24	17
GBV	Non-partner sexual violence prevalence	WCI	17	6	15	10
	Prevalence of female genital mutilation/cutting	WRHI	3	2	3	1
	Sexual violence against children	WCI	7	6	7	2
	AIDS-related mortality rate	WCI	10	0	1	0
	ART coverage (%)	WCI	6	0	5	0
	ART retention rate	WCI	5	1	4	0
	HIV incidence rate	WCI	4	0	2	0
Domain HIV/STI	HIV prevalence rate	WCI	14	7	39	26
	HIV viral load suppression	WCI	2	0	2	0
	Knowledge of HIV-related preventive practices	WRHI	2	2	4	1
	Prevalence of HIV infection in pregnant women	WRHI	3	0	3	0
	Prevention of mother-to-child transmission	WCI	2	0	2	0
	Protection against HIV at last high risk contact	WCI	15	3	9	9
	Sexually transmitted infections (STIs) incidence rate	WCI	15	9	29	21
M/GH	Cervical cancer screening	WCI	1	0	1	0
M/GH	Sexual and reproductive health (SRH) knowledge (ages 15-24)	WCI	1	1	1	0
	Intermittent preventative treatment for malaria during pregnancy	WCI	5	4	8	6
	Malaria mortality rate	WRHI	11	0	2	0
MH	Malaria test positivity rate	WCI	6	1	8	5
	Postnatal care coverage- women	WCI	2	0	2	1
	Prevalence of anemia in women 15-49, by age & pregnancy status	WRHI	13	2	15	13
	Use of insecticide treated nets (ITNs)	WCI	4	1	5	3
MM	Maternal mortality rate (MMR)	WRHI	14	0	5	5
	Availability of basic essential obstetric care	WCI, WRHI	3	2	4	0
	C-section rate	WHO	15	6	28	23
	Perinatal mortality rate	WRHI	17	9	29	29
OCD	Proportion of births attended by skilled birth attendant	WRHI	14	6	18	15
	Proportion of births delivered in a health facility	WHO	17	7	28	18
	Severe systemic infection/sepsis in the postnatal period	WCI	3	0	3	2
	Stillbirth rate	WCI	13	4	20	18

AB = Abortion, ANC = Antenatal Care, FP = Family Planning, GBV = Gender-Based Violence, HIV/STI = Human Immuno-deficiency Virus/Sexually Transmitted Infections, M/GH = Menstrual/Gynecological Health, MH = Maternal Health, MM = Maternal Mortality, OCD = Obstetric Care (Delivery), WCI = WHO Core Indicators, WHO = WHO Indicator Website, WRHI = WHO Reproductive Health Indicators

		Representation Across Studies	Standard Indicators Exist	Representation Across Countries	Represented in Toolkits Found	Measured in Detail
Abortion	Abortion complications	✗	✗	✗	✔	✗
	Availability/Accessibility of abortion	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗
	Experienced abortion	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔
	Experienced self-induced abortion/unsafe abortion	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗
	Location of abortion	✗	✗	✗	✔	✗
	Post abortion care	✗	✗	✗	✗	✔
Antenatal Care	Access to ANC	✔	✔	✔	✔	✗
	Attended 4+ visits	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔
	IFA supplementation during pregnancy	✗	✔	✔	✔	✔
	Number of ANC visits attended	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔
	Received other ANC testing/procedure	✔	✗	✔	✔	✗
	Tetanus toxoid during pregnancy	✗	✔	✔	✔	✔
Family Planning	Access to family planning services/contraception	✔	✗	✔	✔	✔
	Knowledge of family planning	✔	✔	✔	✔	✗
	Modern contraceptive use	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔
	Traditional contraceptive use	✔	✗	✔	✔	✗
	Unmet need for family planning	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔
Gender-Based Violence	Emotional/psychological violence	✔	✗	✔	✔	✔
	Experienced domestic violence	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔
	Experienced economic violence	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗
	Experienced female circumcision	✗	✔	✗	✔	✗
	Experienced intimate partner violence (IPV)	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔
	Experienced non-partner violence	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔
	Experienced physical violence	✔	✗	✔	✔	✔
	Experienced physical violence resulting in injury	✔	✗	✔	✔	✔
	Experienced sexual violence	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔
	Morbidity due to sexual violence	✔	✗	✔	✔	✔
Sought care for GBV	✔	✗	✔	✔	✔	
HIV/STI	Access to HIV services	✔	✗	✔	✔	✗
	Access to STI treatment	✔	✗	✔	✔	✗
	HIV knowledge	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔
	HIV prevalence	✔	✔	✗	✔	✔
	Positive HIV status	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔
	STI infection	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔
	STI knowledge	✗	✗	✔	✔	✔
	STI testing	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗
Maternal Health	Anemia during pregnancy	✗	✔	✔	✗	✔
	Experienced post partum complications	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗
	Illness/complications experienced during pregnancy	✔	✗	✔	✔	✔
	Malaria/malaria infection during pregnancy	✔	✔	✗	✗	✔
	Post natal care attendance	✗	✗	✔	✗	✗
	Post natal care procedures	✗	✗	✔	✗	✗
Maternal Mortality	Cause of maternal death	✗	✗	✔	✗	✗
	Maternal mortality rate	✗	✔	✔	✗	✗
Menstruation & Gynecological Health	Anemia	✗	✔	✗	✗	✗
	Gynecological health	✗	✗	✔	✔	✗
	Menstrual hygiene management	✗	✗	✔	✔	✗
Obstetric Care (Delivery)	C-Section delivery	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔
	Delivery by skilled birth attendant	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔
	Experienced miscarriage	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔
	Experienced obstetric complication	✔	✗	✔	✔	✔
	Experienced stillbirth	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔
	Location of delivery (facility, home etc)	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔
	Other delivery procedure	✔	✗	✗	✗	✗