Title: The prevalence of female genital mutilation: a systematic review and meta-analysis of national, regional, facility and school-based studies.

Short title: Prevalence of female genital mutilation

Authors: Leen Farouki BA[1], Zeinab El Dirani MSc[1], Sawsan Abdulrahim PhD[2], Christelle Akl MS[1], Chaza Akik DrPH[1], Stephen J McCall DPhil[1]

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

2. Department of Health Promotion and Community Health, Faculty of Health Sciences, American University of Beirut, Lebanon. sawsana@aub.edu.lb

Corresponding Author: Stephen J McCall

Email: sm227@aub.edu.lb

Telephone: +961 1 350 000 ext. 4563

Abstract

Background: Female Genital Mutilation/Cutting (FGM/C) is a non-medical procedure entailing the modification of the external female genitalia. The Sustainable Development Goals aim to end FGM/C by 2030. This systematic review aimed to examine FGM/C prevalence and types, by World Health Organization (WHO) region and country.

Methods and Findings: A systematic search using MeSH headings and keywords from inception to March 2, 2020 was undertaken in MEDLINE, PsycINFO, Web of Science, and Embase to identify studies presenting FGM/C prevalence. Abstract and full-text screening, quality assessment, and data extraction were undertaken by two reviewers. Only nationally representative studies were included in the meta-analysis. Pooled FGM/C prevalence was estimated by meta-analysis using random effects models. FGM/C prevalence and types were presented separately by women aged 15-49 and girls aged 0-14. 3,205 articles were identified. 135 met the inclusion criteria and 28 were included in the meta-analysis. Across 27 countries, the pooled prevalence estimate of FGM/C in women aged 15-49 was 40% (95% CI: 26-55%; I^2 =100%), and 15% (95% CI: 10-21%; I^2 =100%) in girls aged 0-14 across 34 countries. The country with the highest FGM/C prevalence in women was Guinea (97%) and the lowest, Uganda (0·3%). The highest prevalence in girls was in Mali (77%), and the lowest in Ghana (0%). The most common category of FGM/C was “flesh removed” at 69% (women) and 70% (girls). Limitations include that studies had heterogeneous terminology and relied on recall.

Conclusions: There is large variation in FGM/C prevalence, and the lower prevalence in the current generation of girls is encouraging. However, considerable policy and community-level interventions are required to meet the SDG. Future research should consider collecting data on the 15-19 age group in order to accurately assess generational differences in FGM prevalence. The study protocol is available: https://osf.io/ema9j/**.**

Funding: None

Introduction

Female Genital Mutilation/Cutting (FGM/C), also referred to as female circumcision or female genital cutting (FGC), is a non-medical procedure that entails the total or partial removal of external female genitalia and other injuries to the female genital organs.[1] The United Nations Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) target 5.3 on gender equality refers to FGM/C as a harmful traditional practice and calls for ending it by the year 2030.[2]

While the true global prevalence of FGM/C is unknown, an estimate by UNICEF sets the number at 200 million women and girls across thirty countries in Africa, Asia, the Middle East, and migrants in Europe and North and South America.[3] In African countries, over three million girls are at risk of FGM/C yearly.[4] FGM/C persists due to religious, social, and cultural factors. It is commonly believed to create better marriage prospects because it associates with morality, hygiene, and aesthetics; FGM/C is also believed to curb sexual urges and maintain virginity.[5] However, the procedure has no health benefits; it may result in negative health outcomes, including menstrual difficulties, infertility, urinary problems, mental health problems, pregnancy and labor complications,[6] severe pain, risk of contracting infections, septicemia, and even death.[1,7]

FGM/C is most often performed on girls between infancy and adolescence, and has been classified into four types.[8] Type I (clitoridectomy), involves the partial or total removal of the prepuce and/or the clitoral gland. Type II involves the partial or total removal of the labia minora and clitoral glans without the excision of the labia majora. Type III (infibulation), involves narrowing the vaginal canal by modifying the labia majora and minora, and may also include the removal of the clitoral glands. Type IV involves any other non-medical, harmful procedure, such as cauterization, pricking, and scraping.[9]

An important aspect of the SDGs is to track progress on ending harmful traditional practices, such as FGM/C. However, to our knowledge, there is no comprehensive review in the literature that provides estimates of FGM/C globally, by geographic regions, or specific countries, which can be used to track improvements in reaching the FGM/C component of SDG 5.3 by providing a baseline to which future estimates can be contrasted. A review of the prevalence of FGM/C will support efforts to understand the global burden of FGM/C and inform adequate prevention and intervention efforts and local and international policies. A review of the types of FGM will contribute similarly by tracking the prevalence of the severity of the procedure. This systematic review and meta-analysis aimed to examine (1) the prevalence of FGM/C and (2) the proportion of the different types of FGM/C, in girls aged 0-14 and women aged 15-49 years old by country.

Methods

Search Strategy and study selection

In this systematic review and meta-analysis of FGM/C prevalence, separate searches were conducted using Ovid MEDLINE(R), PsycINFO, Web of Science, and Embase. The last search on all databases was conducted on March 2, 2020. Hand searches of the grey literature were conducted through searches of reports from international non-governmental organizations, including UNFPA and UNICEF amongst others, and other Google searches. Hand searches of the bibliographies of relevant systematic reviews were also conducted. Together, these databases provide international and interdisciplinary publications. The search strategy (S1 Appendix) was adapted to the format of each database. To present up-to-date data that can be used as a baseline to monitor progress on SDG 5.3 over the last decade, the search was limited to include publications from 2009 until 2020. The MeSH term for FGM/C was used when possible; otherwise, keywords were used, including "Female Genital Mutilation," "Female Genital Alteration," "Female Circumcision," and "Female Genital Cutting". No language restrictions were imposed. The references were imported from each database into EndNote where duplicates were removed, then into the systematic review software DistillerSR.[10]

Inclusion and exclusion criteria. This systematic review and meta-analysis are part of a larger project on FGM/C prevalence and determinants worldwide.[11] Cohort or cross-sectional studies that reported on FGM/C prevalence at the national level, using representative samples or population-based methods, were included in the systematic review and meta-analysis. Sub-regional, facility and, school-based studies and studies that used non-population-based methods or unrepresentative samples, including case-series, cross-sectional, case-control or cohort designs, were included in the systematic review but not in the meta-analysis.

Studies were excluded if they (i) only reported on health outcomes of FGM/C, the attitudes and knowledge of healthcare providers, economic effects, or perceptions of FGM/C, (ii) only used qualitative methods, (iii) were systematic reviews (except for referencing), or (iv) were policy reports, conference proceedings or letters to the editor. If numerous journal articles used the same data source, e.g. secondary data analysis of international surveys, only the original report was included. If the same data source completed multiple studies in a given country, then the most recent was included. The supplementary material contains further details on the included and excluded studies (S2 Appendix).

Study Screening. Titles and abstracts were screened independently by two reviewers. Articles selected for full-text review were also screened by two reviewers, independently and in duplicates. The reasons for exclusion at both the abstract and full-text stages were recorded. Disagreements between the two reviewers were resolved by discussion and consulting a third reviewer who verified the eligibility of all included studies. The supplementary material contains further details on the screening process (S3 Appendix).

Data extraction and quality assessment. Data were extracted from included articles using a structured data extraction form, uploaded into DistillerSR. Summary estimates were independently extracted from published reports by two reviewers and reviewed by a third reviewer. Items extracted from studies included study characteristics, sampling methods, design, host country and country of origin, ethnicity, age, age at FGM/C, location of procedure, performer of FGM/C, FGM/C prevalence, and proportion of the different FGM/C types if available. The FGM/C prevalence in each included study was extracted as a proportion or calculated from the numbers presented. Studies were assessed for risk of bias independently by two reviewers using an adapted tool by Hoy and colleagues (S4 Appendix), which is specific to prevalence studies.[12] This tool includes nine items that collectively assess the selection bias, representativeness of the sample, validity of the tool, and appropriateness of the estimate. Each item was scored as low or high risk of bias, and each paper was given an overall score rated as low, moderate, or high risk of bias. The reporting of this study was based on the Preferred Reporting items for Systematic Review (PRISMA) guidelines.[13,14] The study protocol is available at: https://osf.io/ema9j/[11] and is registered with PROSPERO, number CRD42020186937. The protocol was amended to include studies in any language and to specify the disaggregation by age group; available at: https://osf.io/xehpa/.

Data Analysis

Because the literature fell into certain categories, namely nationally representative, sub-regional, and non-population based, data in the present study were grouped similarly. Prevalence estimates from the different studies were grouped by country, study design, and type of FGM/C. Pooled estimates of FGM/C prevalence were only presented from studies with representative samples or population-based methods at a national level. The prevalence estimates were presented separately for women aged 15-49 years old and girls aged 0-14 years old as most studies collected data for women and girls separately as defined by these age groups and it was considered inappropriate to pool these groups together due to a cohort effect.[15,16] The denominator of FGM/C type was the total number of women and girls with FGM/C, respectively. All statistical analyses were conducted using R version 3.6.2. For the meta-analysis, heterogeneity between studies was assessed using the I^2 statistic, and low, moderate, and high heterogeneity was assessed using I^2 results of 25, 50, and 75%, respectively.[17] A random-effects meta-analysis was conducted due to high heterogeneity between studies. The pooled prevalence estimates were transformed using the Freeman-Tukey double arcsine method and presented as a pooled prevalence with 95% CIs[18] using the 'metaprop' command within the Meta package, version 4.15-1.[19] Funnel plots were constructed to inspect visual asymmetry using the funnelR package, version 0.1.0 (S6 Appendix).[20]

Role of the funding source

There was no funding source for this study. The corresponding author had full access to all the data in the study and had final responsibility for the decision to submit for publication.

Results

Out of 3205 records retrieved from database and hand searches, 318 publications were assessed under full-text review. Of these, a total of 135 were included in the systematic review: 28 nationally representative studies that were included in meta-analysis of the prevalence of FGM/C; 28 sub-regional studies with population-based methods; and 78 non-population-based studies including 27 on migrant populations (S6 Appendix S1 figure). Only one nationally representative study – the Indonesia RISKESDAS[21] – was not included in the meta-analysis because it did not provide the number of FGM/C cases or sample size.

Nationally representative studies

Of the 28 nationally representative studies, 13 used data from Demographic and Health Surveys (DHS), 13 use data from Multiple Indicator Cluster Surveys (MICS), and two used other population-based surveys. Study characteristics of these studies are presented in Table 1: 23 represent the African Region (AFR),[22-44] four represent the Eastern Mediterranean Region (EMR)[45-48], one represents the South-East Asian Region (SEAR)[21,49]. All national studies reported FGM/C prevalence among both women and girls, except those from Liberia,[34] Niger,[38] and Tanzania[41] which reported only on women, and the Pew Research Center survey[44] which reported only on girls. All studies, apart from that of the Pew Research Center, had a low risk of bias and used a cross-sectional design with multi-stage cluster sampling. The Pew Research Center survey had a moderate risk of bias, a cross-sectional design, and used stratified random sampling.[44]

The 28 nationally representative studies included in the meta-analysis provided data on women in 27 countries and data on girls in 34 countries. Out of a total of 387,902 women aged 15-49 in 27 countries, 156,269 women had FGM/C representing a pooled prevalence of 40% [95% CI: 26%-55%; I^2:100%]) (Table 2 & Figure 2). Prevalence estimates varied considerably by country and ranged from 96.8% in Guinea[50] to 0·3% in Uganda[43]. Out of a total of 384,740 girls aged 0-14 in 34 countries, 105,937 girls had FGM/C and this gave a pooled prevalence of 15% (0.15 [95% CI: 10% - 21%; I^2: 100%]); The country level prevalence ranged between 77% in Mali[35] and 0% in Ghana[30] (Table 2, Figure 3). FGM/C prevalence was lower in girls than in women.

Twenty-two of the 28 national reports recorded FGM/C type (Table 3). In MICS and DHS Type I and II were described as “cut with flesh removed”, Type III was described as “sown closed” and Type IV was described as “nicked” or “cut”. The pooled proportion of women with FGM/C that were “nicked” was 8% (95%CI: 4-13%) (Figure 4a), had “flesh removed” was 69% (95% CI: 59-79%) (Figure 4b), or had their genital area sown closed was 11% (95% CI: 4-20%) (Figure 4c).

In girls with FGM, the pooled proportion of girls with ‘nicking’ was 5% (95% CI: 2-10%) (Figure 5a), with ‘flesh removed’ was 70% (95% CI: 55-84%) (Figure 5b), or had their genital area sown closed was 9% (95% CI: 6-12%) (Figure 5c). Alternatively, the proportion of girls with FGM that had their genital area not sewn closed was 90% (95% CI: 85-95%)

(Figure 5d). Surveys using this term did not indicate whether 'not sown closed' indicated nicking or the removal of flesh.

In all countries, for the majority of women and girls, FGM/C was performed by traditional circumcisers, whilst a lower proportion was performed by medical professionals. The exception was girls in Egypt, where the proportion of FGM/C performed by medical professionals was 81·9% (Table 4).[45] For women, in all countries where age of FGM/C was reported, FGM/C was most commonly performed at early ages (0-5 years) except for Kenya and Egypt where the procedure was most commonly done at 9-14 years. For girls, the highest proportion of FGM/C was performed at the lowest age category: under 1 year of age. Exceptions include Burkina Faso and Tanzania where the category 0-4 years had higher proportions, and Kenya and Egypt, where the procedure was most commonly done at 5-9 and 11-12 years respectively (Table 4).

Among 28 sub-regional studies including women, the highest FGM/C prevalence was in Somaliland, Somalia (99·1%)[59]and the lowest was on migrant populations based in Lothian, Scotland (0·24%),[60] followed by women in KwaZulu-Natal (3%), South Africa.[61] Regarding the 13 sub-regional studies including girls, the highest FGM/C prevalence was in Kersa, Ethiopia (88·1%)[62] and the lowest was in Axum Town, Ethiopia (0%)[63] (S6 Appendix, S5 Table). Six out of the 28 sub-regional studies reported on FGM/C type. Type II was the most common in three studies[64-66] and "sewn closed" was the most common in two sub-regional DHS reports on Somaliland[59] and the Northeast Zone of Somalia[67] (S6 Appendix, S6 Table). In 11 studies, the most common performers of FGM/C were traditional circumcisers.[62,64-66,68-76] In three studies, in Egypt[77,78] and Saudi Arabia[79] medical professionals were more common (S6 Appendix, S7 Table).

Prevalence and type in non-population based studies

Within 78 non-population-based studies, studies were from 15 countries, with 31 from AFR, two from SEAR, and 18 from EMR (S6 Appendix 6, S8 Table). 34 were hospital/clinic-based, 10 school-based, and 7 community-based studies. School and university-based studies reported a prevalence ranging from 9·4[80]-83·3%[81]; hospital or clinic-based studies reported a prevalence from 13%[82] to 100%[75], and community-based studies reported a prevalence from 10·4%[83] to 71·6%[84] (S6 Appendix, S9 Table). Four studies were case series, three were case control studies, and 44 were cross-sectional. Twenty-six out of the 78 non-population-based studies reported on FGM/C types. In nine studies each, Type I[82,85-92] and Type II[86,93-99] were the most common and in two studies each, Type III[64,100] and IV[76,101] were the most common (S6 Appendix, S10 Table).

Within non-population-based studies, 27 studies on migrant populations with FGM/C were identified. Only a few countries per region had FGM/C cases. The included studies were from the Region of the Americas (AMR) (6 studies), European Region (EUR) (15 studies), Western Pacific Region (WPR) (3 studies), and EMR (3 studies) (S6 Appendix 6, S12 Table). Participants within these studies were categorized as migrants, refugees, or asylum seekers. Prevalence within these migrant populations ranged from 0·32% (of a sample of 145,492)[102]

to 99% (of a sample of 191)[103] (S6 Appendix, S13 Table). Type I[104-108] and Type II[104,109-112] were most common in five studies each, followed by Type III (four studies),[102,103,113,114] and Type IV (three studies)[115-117] (S6 Appendix, S14 Table).

Discussion

Main findings

To our knowledge, this is the first systematic review and meta-analysis considering the prevalence of FGM/C, FGM/C types, age at FGM, and FGM performers using all available published literature on FGM. In this research, data from 28 nationally representative studies published between 2009 and 2020 were compiled and represented over 772,642 respondents across 37 countries in three WHO regions. Results indicated that the practice remains widespread in countries where it is reported, however, it appears to be lower in the younger generation. Across nationally representative studies in 27 countries, 156,269 out of 387,902 women aged 15-49 had FGM/C, giving a prevalence of 40%. Whilst across 34 countries, 105,937 out of 384,740 girls aged 0-14 had FGM/C, yielding a pooled prevalence of 15%. There was a high variation in prevalence between countries, ranging between 96.8% in Guinea[50] to 0.3% in Uganda[43] for women, and, between 73% in Mali[35] to 0·2% in Benin[44] for girls. For both women and girls who had FGM, over two-thirds had flesh removed and approximately a tenth had their genital area sown closed, which highlights no considerable difference in severity of FGM type between women and girls. In most countries, FGM/C commonly occurred in early childhood and was performed by traditional circumcisers. FGM/C practices appear to continue in those who migrate from countries where FGM/C is prevalent. However, the prevalence in these communities is variable and localized to a few countries per region.

Results in context

The possible generational reduction in FGM/C shown by a cautious comparison between girls and women corresponds with previous research, which showed an absolute decline in the prevalence of FGM/C in girls aged 0-14 by 51·8%; from 67.6% in 1990-1996 to 15·8% in 2015-2017.[16] Results were consistent with previous research regarding large variations in prevalence between countries and regions.[16, 15, 118]

Structural level changes including legislative bans and policy changes are likely to play a role in the possible generational change. FGM/C is banned by law in 25 African countries (enacted between 1965 in Guinea and 2020 in Sudan), and in 19 other countries worldwide (enacted between 1985 in the UK and 2012 in Ireland).[1] In Egypt, the lower prevalence for girls may relate to the legal ban implemented in 2008.[45] The efficacy of laws against FGM/C depend on enforcement and the specificities of the law. For example, in Liberia and Mauritania laws only protect girls below the age of 18[119] and in Indonesia, FGM/C was legalized in a medical setting in 2010, however, the repeal of that law in 2014 left no explicit ban or consequences.[120] In countries where FGM/C remains legal, such as Mali, Sierra Leone, Somalia, and Chad[1], prevalence varies. For example, it remains high in Mali, at 88·6% of women and 73% of girls.[55] However, in Sierra Leone and Chad, data indicates a lower prevalence in girls compared to women (44.2% of women and 12.1% of girls in Chad[25], and 86·1% of women and 13·3% of girls in Sierra Leone[39]). This indicates that other mechanisms have contributed to a generational reduction in FGM/C, such as education,

literacy or change in social norms, which have been implicated in both countries.[121,122] To end the propagation of the procedure, structural, community and family level interventions are required.

Consistent with other studies, the most common FGM/C type in women and girls was 'cut with flesh removed', equivalent to Type I or II.[123,15] Similar to our findings, Koski and colleagues reported no generational differences regarding type.[15] Moreover, UNICEF reported that traditional circumcisers perform most procedures. Yet, the opposite occurs in Egypt where medicalization of FGM/C was high despite its ban.[45] Similar to other findings, this review found that FGM/C most often occurs in early childhood.[123]

Studies of different regions or facilities in the same countries had different prevalence reports, a phenomenon also reported by UNICEF[123], likely owing to regional or community risk factors. For example, the national prevalence in Ethiopian women was 65·2%,[27] while in one region, the East Gojjam Zone, it was 96%.[72] Studies based on migrant populations have widely varying prevalence estimates. They demonstrate that FGM/C is present countries where it is not traditionally practiced, however, larger scale studies are needed to understand FGM/C in these countries, and to inform policies, interventions, and relevant healthcare services.

The strengths of the study ensure a thorough and accurate examination of the research question. The review had broad inclusion criteria to provide a comprehensive review of all FGM/C studies. The study used robust methods to identify studies, extract data, and present findings. To guarantee the relevance of included data, retrieved studies had to be published in the past ten years. The broadest possible scope of research was scanned with no restrictions on language or study type. A hand search of grey literature was conducted to be as comprehensive as possible. Moreover, DHS and MICS data, which is collected via representative sampling methodology with high response rates and a low risk of bias, ensured the quality of the meta-analyses.

This study had several limitations. There were two missing country reports unavailable for analysis (S2 Appendix). This study is only as complete as the literature base on FGM/C; there are regional and tribal reports of FGM/C in numerous countries that were not in the scope of the present literature search, including: Colombia, Georgia, Russia, Iran, Oman, Kuwait, UAE, Singapore, Thailand, the Philippines, India, Pakistan, Ecuador, Peru, the State of Palestine and Sri Lanka.[124] It is imperative that future DHS and MICS studies in these countries include questions on FGM/C. Moreover, in many studies, FGM/C was self-reported, thus the prevalence estimates may be underreported due to legal ramifications or social desirability. Women and girls may not be able to accurately recall the type of procedure performed on them, or there may be confusion due to multiple ways of describing each type. Furthermore, recollection of who performed the procedure may be inaccurate.

The prevalence in the 0-14 age group may be underreported as these girls are still at risk of FGM/C at the time of survey. Future research should adjust prevalence for girls by age at FGM/C procedure or conduct analyses based on age cohorts to be inclusive of those still at

risk of FGM/C. Gathering data on five-year age cohorts including a 15-19 age group as those individuals either have or are no longer at risk of FGM/C will allow the systematic analysis of generational change.[123] Most studies collected data based on the 0-14 and 15-49 age groups, which limited the granularity of this study. This study also shows the need for consistency in future research regarding the terminology used to describe each type of FGM.

Conclusion

Based on current findings, although FGM/C prevalence in girls appears to be lower than in women, individual countries vary greatly in their progress regarding FGM/C to meet SDG 5.3 for ending all harmful practices by 2030. Current findings may be used as a baseline in future attempts to track progress to meeting SDG 5.3.A decline to end FGM/C across generations could be possible in the near future in low-prevalence countries such as Niger, Uganda, and Ghana. However, the decline in FGM/C must be greater in other countries where FGM/C is close to universal such as Egypt, Guinea, and Mali underlining the need for immediate interventions to meet the SDG. Moreover, outside of endemic countries, awareness of FGM/C is required to aid migrant communities.

Declaration of interests

We declare no competing interests.

Data sharing statement

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

Contributors

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

References

1. UNFPA. Female genital mutilation (FGM) frequently asked questions. 2019. https://www.unfpa.org/resources/female-genital-mutilation-fgm-frequently-asked-questions (accessed March 2020.
2. United Nations. Transforming Our World: The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development: United Nations, 2015.
3. UNICEF. Female Genital Mutilation/Cutting: A Global Concern. (2016). Female Genital Mutilation/Cutting: A Global Concern. In: UNICEF, editor.; 2016.
4. Serour GI. Medicalization of female genital mutilation/cutting. *African Journal of Urology* 2013; **19**(3): 145-9.
5. Programme WHOHR. Female genital mutilation and other harmful practices. https://www.who.int/reproductivehealth/topics/fgm/fgm-sexuality/en/ (accessed 12/03/2020.
6. Creighton DRaSM. Long term health consequences of Female Genital Mutilation (FGM). *Maturitas* 2015; **80**(1): 48-51.
7. Sarayloo K RR, Elhadi A. Health Consequences of the Female Genital Mutilation: A Systematic Review. *Galen Medical Journal* 2018; **8**.
8. Odukogbe ATA, Afolabi BB, Bello OO, Adeyanju AS. Female genital mutilation/cutting in Africa. *Translational Andrology and Urology* 2017; **6**(2): 138-48.
9. Care of women and girls living with female genital mutilation: a clinical handbook: World Health Organization, 2018.
10. DistillerSR, Evidence Partners.
11. 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.
12. Hoy D BP, Woolf A, Blyth F, March L, Bain C. Assessing risk of bias in prevalence studies: modification of an existing tool and evidence of interrater agreement. *J Clin Epidemiol; 65:934-9* 2012.
13. Moher D. LA, Tetzlaff J., Altman D.G. Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses: the PRISMA statement. . *Annals of internal medicine 2009;1514 264-9*.
14. Page MJ, McKenzie JE, Bossuyt PM, et al. The PRISMA 2020 statement: An updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. *Journal of clinical epidemiology* 2021.
15. 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.
16. 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.
17. Higgins JP TS, Deeks JJ, Altman DG. Measuring inconsistency in metaanalyses. *BMJ* 2003.
18. Barendregt J.J. DSA, Lee Y.Y., Norman R.E., Vos T. . Meta-analysis of prevalence. *Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health 2013;6711 974-8*.
19. 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.
20. Kumar M. funnelR: Funnel Plots for Proportion Data. 2018.
21. GI. S. Medicalization of female genital mutilation/cutting. . *African Journal of Urology* 2013; **19**: 145–9.
22. Enquête par grappes à indicateurs multiples 2014, Rapport final. Cotonou, Bénin: Institut national de la statistique et de l'analyse économique (INSAE), 2015.
23. Burkina Faso Enquete Demographique et de Sante et ‡ Indicateurs Multiples (EDSBF-MICS IV) 2010. Calverton, Maryland, USA: Institut National de la Statistique et de la Demographie, Burkina Faso, I. C. F. International, 2012.
24. Enquête par grappes à indicateurs multiples MICS, RCA 2010 Rapport final. Bangui, RCA: ICASEES, 2010.

25. Enquête par grappes à indicateurs multiples Tchad 2010. Tchad: Ministère du Plan, de l'Economie et de la Coopération Internationale, Institut National de la Statistique, des Études Économiques et Démographiques (INSEED), 2010.
26. Enquête par grappes à indicateurs multiples - Côte d'Ivoire 2016. Cote D'Ivoire: Ministere Du Plan Et Du Development, L'Institute National de la Statistique, 2017.
27. Ethiopia Demographic and Health Survey 2016. Addis Ababa, Ethiopia: Central Statistical Agency, Ethiopia and ICF, 2017.
28. Eritrea Population and Health Survey 2010. Asmara, Eritrea: National Statistics Office, Fafo Institute For Applied International Studies, 2013.
29. The Gambia Multiple Indicator Cluster Survey 2018 Survey Findings Report. Banjul, The Gambia: The Gambia Bureau of Statistics, 2019.
30. Multiple Indicator Cluster Survey (MICS2017/18), Survey Findings Report. Accra, Ghana: Ghana Statistical Service, 2018.
31. Enquête par grappes à indicateurs multiples (MICS, 2016) Rapport final. Conakry, Guinée.: Institut National de la Statistique, 2017.
32. Inquérito aos Indicadores Múltiplos (MICS6) 2018-2019, Relatório Final. 2020.
33. Kenya Demographic and Health Survey 2014. Rockville, MD, USA: National Bureau of Statistics, Ministry of Health, National Aids Control Council, Medical Research Institute, National Council for Population Development (Kenya), 2015.
34. Liberia Demographic and Health Survey 2019-20 - Key Indicators Report. Monrovia, Liberia: Liberia Institute of Statistics and Geo-Information Services (LISGIS), Ministry of Health and Social Welfare, Monrovia, Liberia, and The DHS Program, ICF, Rockville, Maryland, USA, 2020.
35. Mali Demographic and Health Survey 2018. Bamako, Mali: Institut National de la Statistique, Cellule de Planification et de Statistique Secteur, Sante-Developpement, ICF, 2019.
36. Enquête par Grappes à Indicateurs Multiples, 2015, Résultats clés. Nouakchott, Mauritanie: L'Office National de la Statistique, 2016.
37. Nigeria Demographic and Health Survey 2018 - Final Report. Abuja, Nigeria: National Population Commission, ICF, 2019.
38. Niger Enquete Demographique et de Sante et ‡ Indicateurs Multiples (EDSN-MICS IV) 2012. Calverton, Maryland, USA: Institut National de la Statistique, I. N. S. Niger, I. C. F. International, 2013.
39. Sierra Leone Multiple Indicator Cluster Survey 2017, Survey Findings Report. Freetown, Sierra Leone: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2018.
40. Senegal: Enquete Demoggraphique et de Sante Continue (EDS-Continue) 2017. Dakar, Senegal: Agence Nationale de la Statistique et de la Demographie, ICF, 2018.
41. Tanzania Demographic and Health Survey and Malaria Indicator Survey 2015-2016. Dar es Salaam, Tanzania: Ministry of Health, Community Development Gender Elderly Children, Ministry of Health, National Bureau of Statistics, 2016.
42. Togo - Enquête à Indicateurs Multiples 2017, Rapport final. Lomé, Togo: Institut National de la Statistique et des Etudes Economiques et Démographiques, 2018.
43. Uganda Demographic and Health Survey 2016. Kampala, Uganda: Uganda Bureau of Statistics (UBoS) and ICF, 2018.
44. Tolerance and Tension: Islam and Christianity in Sub-Saharan Africa. *Pew Research Center* 2010; **Pew Forum on Religion & Public Life**.
45. Egypt Demographic and Health Survey 2014. Cairo, Egypt: Ministry of Health and Population and ICF International, 2015.
46. Iraq Multiple Indicator Cluster Survey 2018 Survey Findings Report. Iraq: Central Statistical Organization (CSO), Kurdistan Region Statistical Office (KRSO), 2019.
47. Multiple Indicator Cluster Survey 2014 of Sudan, Final Report. . Khartoum, Sudan: Central Bureau of Statistics (CBS), UNICEF Sudan, 2016.

48. Yemen National Health and Demographic Survey 2013. Rockville, Maryland, USA: Ministry of Public Health and Population, Central Statistical Organization, Pan Arab Program for Family Health (Yemen), ICF, 2015.
49. Maldives Demographic and Health Survey 2016-17. Male, Maldives: Ministry of Health Maldives and ICF, 2018.
50. Enquête par grappes à indicateurs multiples (MICS, 2016) Rapport final. Conakry, Guinée.: Institut National de la Statistique, 2017.
51. Enquête par grappes à indicateurs multiples 2014, Rapport final. Cotonou, Bénin: Institut national de la statistique et de l'analyse économique (INSAE), 2015.
52. Burkina Faso EnquÍte Démographique et de Santé et Indicateurs Multiples (EDSBF-MICS IV) 2010. Calverton, Maryland, USA: Institut National de la Statistique et de la DÈmographie - INSD/Burkina Faso and ICF International, 2012.
53. Enquête par grappes à indicateurs multiples MICS, RCA 2010 Rapport final. . Bangui, Central African Republic: Central African Institute of Statistics, 2010.
54. UNICEF. Niger Statistical Profile on Female Genital Mutilation 2020.
55. Institut National de la Statistique I, Cellule de Planification et de Statistique Secteur S-D, Icf. Mali Demographic and Health Survey 2018. Bamako, Mali: INSTAT/CPS/SS-DS-PF and ICF, 2019.
56. Niger Enquete Dèmographique et de Santé et ‡ Indicateurs Multiples (EDSN-MICS IV) 2012. Calverton, Maryland, USA: Institut National de la Statistique, I. N. S. Niger, I. C. F. International, 2013.
57. Sierra Leone Multiple Indicator Cluster Survey 2017, Survey Findings Report. Freetown, Sierra Leone: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2018.
58. Riset Kesehatan Dasar (RISKESDAS) 2013. Indonesia: Badan Penelitian dan Pengembangan Kesehatan, 2013.
59. Phadungkiatwattana P, Rujivejpongsathron J, Tunsatit T, Yanase Y. Analyzing pregnancy outcomes in women of extremely advanced maternal age (> or = 45 years). *Journal of the Medical Association of Thailand* 2014; **97**(1): 1-6.
60. Ford CM, Darlow K, Massie A, Gorman DR. Using electronic maternity records to estimate female genital mutilation in Lothian from 2010 to 2013. *European Journal of Public Health* 2018; **28**(4): 657-61.
61. Scorgie F, Beksinska M, Chersich M, Kunene B, Hilber AM, Smit J. "Cutting for love": Genital incisions to enhance sexual desirability and commitment in KwaZulu-Natal, South Africa. *Reproductive Health Matters* 2010; **18**(35): 64-73.
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.
63. 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.
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.
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.
67. Mehta S, Tran K, Stewart L, Soutter E, Nauta M, Yoong W. Pregnancy outcomes in women greater than 45 years: a cohort control study in a multi-ethnic inner city population. *Archives of Gynecology & Obstetrics* 2014; **289**(5): 1125-8.
68. 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.

69. 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.
70. 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.
71. Tamire M, Molla M. Prevalence and belief in the continuation of female genital cutting among high school girls: a cross - sectional study in Hadiya zone, Southern Ethiopia. *BMC Public Health* 2013; **13**: 1120.
72. Andualem M. Determinants of female genital mutilation practices in East Gojjam Zone, Western Amhara, Ethiopia. *Ethiopian medical journal* 2016; **54**(3): 109-16.
73. Mudege NN, Egondi T, Beguy D, Zulu EM. The determinants of female circumcision among adolescents from communities that practice female circumcision in two Nairobi informal settlements. *Health Sociology Review* 2012; **21**(2): 242-50.
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. 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.
76. Rashid AK, Patil S, Valimalar AS. The Practice Of Female Genital Mutilation Among The Rural Malays In North Malaysia. *The internet journal of the third world medicine* 2009; **9**.
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.
78. Zayed AA, Ali AA. Abusing female children by circumcision is continued in Egypt. *Journal of Forensic & Legal Medicine* 2012; **19**(4): 196-200.
79. Milaat WA, Ibrahim NK, Albar HM. Reproductive health profile and circumcision of females in the Hali semi-urban region, Saudi Arabia: A community-based crosssectional survey. *Annals of Saudi Medicine* 2018; **38**(2): 81-9.
80. Abolfotouh SM, Ebrahim AZ, Abolfotouh MA. Awareness and predictors of female genital mutilation/cutting among young health advocates. *International Journal of Women's Health* 2015; **7**: 259-69.
81. 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.
82. 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.
83. Ivanova O, Rai M, Mlahagwa W, et al. A cross-sectional mixed-methods study of sexual and reproductive health knowledge, experiences and access to services among refugee adolescent girls in the Nakivale refugee settlement, Uganda. *Reproductive Health* 2019; **16**(1): 35.
84. Hassanin IM, Shaaban OM. Impact of the complete ban on female genital cutting on the attitude of educated women from Upper Egypt toward the practice. *International Journal of Gynaecology & Obstetrics* 2013; **120**(3): 275-8.
85. Njoku CO, Emechebe CI, Njoku AN, Efiok EE, Iklaki CU. Obstetric outcomes of parturients with female genital mutilation in a tertiary hospital in Nigeria. *Research Journal of Obstetrics and Gynecology* 2020; **13**(1): 8-13.
86. Ndlaye P, Diongue M, Faye A, Ouedraogo D, Dia AT. Female genital mutilation and complications in childbirth in the province of Gourma (Burkina Faso). *Sante Publique* 2010; **22**(5): 563-70.

87. 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.
88. A. Mitwaly 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 2017DO - 1018203/2320-1770ijrcog20174398* 2017.
89. 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.
90. 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.
91. Dehghankhalili M, Fallahi S, Mahmudi F, 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.
92. Adigüzel C, Baş Y, Erhan MD, Gelle MA. The Female Genital Mutilation/Cutting Experience in Somali Women: Their Wishes, Knowledge and Attitude. *Gynecologic and Obstetric Investigation* 2019; **84**(2): 118-27.
93. Anikwe CC, Ejikeme BN, Obiechina NJ, et al. Female genital mutilation and obstetric outcome: A cross-sectional comparative study in a tertiary hospital in Abakaliki South East Nigeria. *European Journal of Obstetrics and Gynecology and Reproductive Biology: X* 2019; **1**.
94. Makinde ON, Elusiyan JB, Adeyemi AB, Taiwo OT. Female Genital Mutilation: Are We Winning? *East African Medical Journal* 2012; **89**(6): 193-8.
95. 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.
96. Bjalkander O, Grant DS, Berggren V, Bathija H, Almroth L. Female genital mutilation in sierra leone: forms, reliability of reported status, and accuracy of related demographic and health survey questions. *Obstetrics & Gynecology International* 2013; **2013**: 680926.
97. Plo K, Asse K, Sei D, Yenan J. Female genital mutilation in infants and young girls: report of sixty cases observed at the general hospital of abobo (abidjan, cote d'ivoire, west Africa). *International Journal of Pediatrics* 2014; **2014**: 837471.
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.
99. Birge O, Arslan D, Ozbey EG, et al. Which type of circumcision is more harmful to female sexual functions? *Clinical and Experimental Obstetrics and Gynecology* 2017; **44**(5): 691-4.
100. Birge Ö, Akbaş M, Özbey EG, Adıyeke M. Clitoral keloids after female genital mutilation/cutting. *Turk Jinekoloji ve Obstetrik Dernegi Dergisi* 2016; **13**(3): 154-7.
101. Ashimi AO, Amole TG, Iliyasu 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.
102. Korfker DG, Reis R, Rijnders MEB, 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.
103. 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.
104. Varol N, Dawson A, Turkmani S, et al. Obstetric outcomes for women with female genital mutilation at an Australian hospital, 2006-2012: A descriptive study. *BMC Pregnancy and Childbirth* 2016; **16**(1).

105. Zurynski Y, Phu A, Sureshkumar P, Cherian S, Deverell M, Elliott EJ. Female genital mutilation in children presenting to Australian paediatricians. *Archives of Disease in Childhood* 2017; **102**(6): 509-15.
106. Geynisman-Tan J, Milewski A, Dahl C, Kenton K, Lewicky-Gaupp C. Lower urinary tract symptoms are common in women with female genital mutilation. *Female Pelvic Medicine and Reconstructive Surgery* 2018; **24**(5): S128.
107. 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.
108. Castagna P, Ricciardelli R, Piazza F, et al. Violence against African migrant women living in Turin: clinical and forensic evaluation. *International journal of legal medicine* 2018; **132**(4): 1197-204.
109. Zinka B, Bormann C, Graw M, Ackermann I. Anatomical findings after female genital mutilation: Investigations of African asylum-seeking women and young girls. *Rechtsmedizin* 2018; **28**(4): 264-71.
110. Hänselmann K, Börsch C, Ikenberg H, Strehlau J, Klug SJ. Female genital mutilation in Germany. *Geburtshilfe und Frauenheilkunde* 2011; **71**(3): 205-8.
111. Vrachnis N, Salakos N, Iavazzo C, et al. Female genital mutilation: A new reality for Greek healthcare providers. *European Journal of Contraception and Reproductive Health Care* 2012; **17**: S129.
112. Ukoha DE. Female genital mutilation/circumcision: Culture and women sexual health in lgbo women residing in Dallas-Fort Worth, Texas: ProQuest Information & Learning; 2016.
113. Wahlberg A, Johnsdotter S, Ekholm Selling K, Kallestal C, Essen B. Factors associated with the support of pricking (female genital cutting type IV) among Somali immigrants - a cross-sectional study in Sweden. *Reproductive Health* 2017; **14**(1): 92.
114. Padovese V, Egidi AM, Melillo Fenech T, 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.
115. 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.
116. Creighton S, Dear J, De Campos C, Williams L, Hodes D. A multidisciplinary approach to the management of children with female genital mutilation (FGM) or suspected FGM: Service description and case series. *BJOG: An International Journal of Obstetrics and Gynaecology* 2016; **123**: 25-6.
117. 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.
118. Yoder PS, Wang S. Female genital cutting: the interpretation of recent DHS data. Calverton, Maryland, USA: ICF International, 2013.
119. FGM And The Law Around The World. 2019. https://www.equalitynow.org/the_law_and_fgm (accessed 23/12/2020.
120. Indonesia Seeks End to Female Genital Mutilation. 2016. https://www.hrw.org/news/2016/09/26/indonesia-seeks-end-female-genital-mutilation (accessed 23/12/2020.
121. 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): 19.
122. 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.
123. Female Genital Mutilation/Cutting: A statistical overview and exploration of the dynamics of change, 2013.
124. 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.

Table 1. Characteristics of National Population-Based Studies

WHO Region	Survey	Author	Pub.	Date of Data collection	Population description	Age	Total Number FGM Women	Total Number non-FGM Women	Total Number FGM Girls	Total Number non-FGM Girls	Type
AFR	**Benin MICS[118]**	Institut National de la Statistique et de l'Analyse Économique	2015	2014	Women of reproductive age and their daughters.	0-14, 15-49	1457	14358	20	9882	Flesh removed, Nicked, Sewn closed
	Burkina Faso DHS[119]	National Institute of Statistics and Demography (INSD) and ICF International	2012	2010	Women of reproductive age and their daughters.	0-14, 15-49	12949	4138	2319	15115	Flesh removed, Nicked, Sewn closed
	Central African Republic MICS[120]	Institut Centrafricain des Statistiques et des Études Économiques et Sociales (ICASEES)	2012	2010	Women of reproductive age and their daughters. Ethnicity: Haoussa (4.7%), Sara (6%), Mboum (6.3%), Gbaya (29%), Mandja (8.3%), Banda (21.3%), Ngbaka-Bantou (8%),Yakoma-Sango (6.8%), Zandé/Nzakara (2.7%), other ethnic groups (3.7%) Non-Central African ethnic groups (2.9%)	0-14, 15-49	2785	8725	139	17302	Flesh removed, Nicked, Sewn closed
	Chad MICS[25]	République du Tchad Ministère du Plan, de l'Economie et de la Coopération Internationale.	2011	2010	Women of reproductive age and their daughters.	0-14, 15-49	7043	8893	1928	14008	Cut, flesh removed; Cut, no flesh removed, Sewn closed
	Cote D'Ivoire MICS[26]	Ministère Du Plan Et Du Développement	2017	2016	Women of reproductive age and their daughters. Ethnicities: Akan, Krou, South Mandé, North Mandé, Gur, Other Ivorian, non-Ivorian.	0-14, 15-49	4329	7451	972	7937	Cut, Cut with flesh removed, Sewn closed

	Ethiopia DHS[27]	Central Statistical Agency	2017	2016	Women of reproductive age and their daughters.	0-14, 15-49	5101	2721	1147	6159	Cut, flesh removed, Cut, no flesh removed, Sewn closed
	Eritrea Population and Health Survey [28]	National Statistics Office	2013	2010	Women of reproductive age and their daughters.	0-14, 15-49	8495	1743	3363	8872	NA
	Gambia MICS[29]	Gambia Bureau of Statistics	2019	2018	Women of reproductive age and their daughters.	0-14, 15-49	10328	3312	5928	11718	Flesh removed, Nicked, Sewn closed
	Ghana MICS[30]	Ghana Statistical Service	2018	2017, 2018	Women of reproductive age and their daughters.	0-14, 15-49	341	14032	15	12000	Flesh removed, Nicked, Sewn closed
	Guinea MICS[50]	Institut National de la Statistique	2017	2016	Women of reproductive age and their daughters.	0-14, 15-49	9351	312	4000	4832	Cut, Cut with flesh removed, Sewn closed
	Guinea Bissau MICS[32]	Ministério da Economia, do Plano e Integração Regional	2020	2018, 2019	Women of reproductive age and their daughters.	0-14, 15-49	5703	5242	2558	6067	Mutilaram (tiraram) alguma parte na zona genital, Parte genital cortada apenas sem que a carne fosse removida, Zona da vagina fecharam com uma costura

	Kenya DHS[33]	Kenya National Bureau of Statistics	2015	2014	Women of reproductive age and their daughters. Ethnicity: Embu, Kalenjin, Kamba, Kikuyu, Kisii, Luhya, Luo,Maasi, Mru, Swahii, Somali, Taveta, Turkana, Samburu, other.	0-14, 15-49	3066	11559	347	12041	Sewn closed, Not sewn closed
	Liberia DHS[121]	Liberia Institute of Statistics	2020	2019	Women of reproductive age.	15-49	2566	4150			NA
	Mali DHS[35]	Institut National de la Statistique	2019	2018	Women of reproductive age and their daughters.	0-14, 15-49	4699	603	4335	1604	Cut, Cut with flesh removed, Sewn closed
	Mauritania MICS[36]	Mauritania National Statistics Office	2016	2015	Women of reproductive age and their daughters.	0-14, 15-49	9555	4787	6936	6112	Cut, Cut with flesh removed, Sewn closed
	Nigeria DHS[37]	National Population Commission	2019	2018	Women of reproductive age and their daughters. Ethnicity: Hausa , Igbo, Yoruba, Fulani, Ibibio, Igala, Ijaw/Izon, Kanuri/Beriberi, Tiv, Ekoi, Other	0-14, 15-49	5,202	21503	19503	24143	Sewn closed, Not sewn closed, Angurya, Gishiri, Use of corrosive substances
	Niger DHS[38]	Institut National de la Statistique (INS) et ICF International	2013	2012	Women of reproductive age.	15-49	219	10941			Flesh removed, Nicked, Sewn closed
	Senegal DHS[40]	Agence Nationale de la Statistique et de la Démographie (ANSD)	2020	2018	Women of reproductive age and their daughters. Ethnicities: Wolof, Serer, Mandingue / Socé , Soninké and Poular, Diola.	0-14, 15-49	2196	7218	1071	6527	Cut, Cut with flesh removed, Sewn closed
	Sierra Leone MICS[122]	Statistics Sierra Leone (Stats SL)	2018	2017	Women of reproductive age and their daughters.	0-14, 15-49	15,394	2479	11884	12,972	Flesh removed,

											Nicked, Sewn closed
	Tanzania DHS[41]	Ministry of Health, Community Development, Gender, Elderly and Children (MoHCDGEC) [Tanzania Mainland], Ministry of Health (MoH) [Zanzibar]	2016	2015, 2016	Women of reproductive age.	0-14, 15-49	1329	11937	47	11,748	Cut, flesh removed; Cut, no flesh removed, Sewn closed
	Togo MICS[42]	Institut National de la Statistique et des Etudes Economiques et Démographiques (INSEED)	2018	2017	Women of reproductive age and their daughters. Ethnicity: Adja-Ewe (42.4%); Kabye-Tem (22.7%); Akposso/Akébou (3.2%); Ana-Ife (3.1%); Paragourma Autres togolais (19.6%); Other Togolese (3.4%); other nationalities (5.6%)	0-14, 15-49	225	7101	17	6060	Cut, Cut with flesh removed, Sewn closed
	Uganda DHS[43]	Uganda Bureau of Statistics (UBOS), ICF	2018	2016	Women of reproductive age.	15-49	56	18450			NA
	Tolerance and Tension: Islam and Christianity in Sub-Saharan Africa [44]	Pew Research Center	2010	2008, 2009	Daughters	NA	NA	NA	Botswana (20), Cameroon (8), Chad (304), Democratic Republic of Congo (70), Djibouti (469), Ethiopia (204), Ghana (63), Guinea Bissau (178), Kenya (76), Liberia (182), Mali (447), Mozambique (76), Nigeria (106),	Botswana (379), Cameroon (747), Chad (475), Democratic Republic of Congo (703), Djibouti (339), Ethiopia (414), Ghana (636), Guinea Bissau (361), Kenya (686), Liberia (684), Mali (134), Mozambique (555), Nigeria (707), Rwanda (454), Senegal (516), South Africa (780), Tanzania (1010), Uganda	NA

									Rwanda (15), Senegal (21), South Africa (33), Tanzania (64), Uganda (89), and Zambia (13).	(593), and Zambia (430).	
EMR	**Egypt DHS[45]**	Ministry of Health and Population	2015	2014	Women of reproductive age and their daughters.	0-19, 15-49	20086	21762	4941	23090	NA
	Iraq MICS[46]	Central Statistical Organization	2019	2018	Women of reproductive age and their daughters.	0-14, 15-48	2,270	28390	24310	24438	Flesh removed, Nicked, Sewn closed
	Sudan MICS[47]	Central Bureau of Statistics	2016	2014	Women of reproductive age and their daughters.	0-14, 15-48	15853	2449	5770	11891	Flesh removed, Nicked, Sewn closed
	Yemen DHS[48]	Ministry of Public Health and Population (MOPHP)	2015	2013	Women of reproductive age and their daughters.	0-14, 15-49	4705	20729	1909	10096	Cut, flesh removed; Cut, no flesh removed, Sewn closed
SEAR	**Indonesia RISKESDAS[123]***	Health Research and Development Agency	2013	2013	Girls	0-11	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	Maldives DHS[49]	National Bureau of Statistics	2018	2016, 2017	Women of reproductive age and their daughters.	0-14, 15-49	966	6733	40	3586	NA

*Not included in meta-analysis.

Table 2. Prevalence of FGM in Women and Girls in National Population-Based Studies

			Women			Girls		
WHO Region	Survey	Year	FGM %	Total FGM	Sample Size	FGM %	Total FGM	Sample Size
AFR	Benin MICS[118]	2014	9.2%	1457	15815	0.2%	20	9902
	Botswana*[44]	2010				5%	20†	399†
	Burkina Faso DHS[119]	2010	75.8%	12949	17087			
	Cameroon*[44]	2010				1%	8†	755†
	Central African Republic MICS[120]	2010	24.2%	2785	11510	0.8%	139	17441
	Chad MICS[25]	2014/15	44.2%	7043	15936	12.1%	1928	15936
	Chad*[44]	2010				39%	304†	779†
	Cote D'Ivoire MICS[119]	2016	36.7%	4329	11780	10.9%	972	8909
	Democratic Republic of Congo*[44]	2010				9%	70†	773†
	Eritrea Population and Health Survey[28]	2010	82.9%	8495	10238	44.1%	2409†	5461†
	Ethiopia DHS[27]	2016	65.2%	5,101	7,822	15.7%	1,147	7,306
	Ethiopia*[44]	2010				58%	204†	808†
	Gambia MICS[29]	2018	75.7%	10,328	13,640	50.6%	5,928	11,718
	Ghana MICS[30]	2017/18	2.4%	341	14374	0.1%	15	12015
	Ghana*[44]	2010				9%	63†	699†
	Guinea MICS[50]	2016	96.8%	9351	9663	45.3%	4000	8832
	Guinea Bissau MICS[32]	2018-19	44.5%	5703	10945	29.7%	2558	8625
	Guinea Bissau*[44]	2010				33%	178†	539†
	Kenya DHS[33]	2014	21%	3,066	14,625	2.8%	352	12,388
	Kenya*[44]	2010				10%	76**	762**
	Liberia DHS[121]	2019/20	38.2%	2566	6,716			
	Liberia*[44]	2010				21%	182†	866†
	Mali DHS[113]	2018	88.6%	4,699	5302	73%	4335	5939
	Mali* [44]	2010				77%	447†	581†
	Mauritania MICS[36]	2015	66.6%	9555	14342	53.2%	6936	13048
	Mozambique*[44]	2010				12%	76†	631†
	Niger DHS[124]	2012	2%	219	11160			
	Nigeria DHS[37]	2018	20%	5,202	26,705	19.2%	4640	24,143

	Nigeria*[44]	2010				13%	106†	813†
	Rwanda*[44]	2010				3%	15†	499†
	Senegal DHS[40]	2018	23.2%	2196	9,414	14.1%	1071	7598
	Senegal*[44]	2010				4%	21†	537†
	Sierra Leone MICS[122]	2017	86.1%	15394	17873	13.3%	2319	17434
	South Africa*[44]	2010				4%	33†	819†
	Tanzania DHS[41]	2015/16	10%	1,329	13,266	0.4%	47	11,795
	Tanzania*[44]	2010				6%	64†	1074†
	Togo MICS[42]	2017	3.1%	225	7326	0.3%	17	6077
	Uganda DHS[43]	2016	0.3%	56	18506			
	Uganda*[44]	2010				13%	89†	682†
	Zambia*[44]	2010				3%	13†	443†
EMR	Djibouti*[44]	2010				58%	469†	808†
	Egypt DHS[45]	2015	92.3%	20086	21,762	21.4%	4941	23,090
	Iraq MICS[46]	2018	7.4%	2,270	30,660	0.5%	128	24,438
	Sudan MICS[47]	2014	86.6%	15,853	18,302	31.5%	5,570	17,661
	Yemen DHS[48]	2015	18.5%	4705	25434	8.4%	1088	12972
SEAR	Maldives DHS[49]‡	2016/17	12.9%	996	7,699	1.1%	40	3,626
	Indonesia RISKESDAS[123]§	2013				51.2%	NA	NA

*Islam & Christianity in Sub-Saharan Africa Survey, Pew Research Center.

† At least 1 daughter.

§ Excluded from all meta-analyses.

‡ Excluded from regional meta-analysis.

Table 3. Types of FGM in National Population-Based Studies

			Women						Girls						
WHO Region	**Host Country**	**Year**	**FGM (%)**	**Total FGM**	**Nicked (%)**	**Flesh removed (%)**	**Sewn closed (%)**	**Don't Know/ Missing Type (%)**	**FGM (%)**	**Total FGM**	**Nicked (%)**	**Not Sewn Closed (%)**	**Flesh removed (%)**	**Sewn closed (%)**	**Don't Know/ Missing Type (%)**
EMR	Iraq MICS[46]	2018	7%	2270	6%	84.3%	1.3%	8.4%	1%	128	9.1%		88.9%	1%	1.1%
	Sudan MICS[47]	2014	87%	15,853	2.2%	16.3%	77%	4.5%	32%	5570					
	Yemen DHS[48]	2013	18.5%	4705	7%	89.7%		3.3%	15.9%*	1909	10.7%	88.3%			1%
AFR	Benin MICS[118]	2014	9.2%	1457	14.5%	72.1%	10.1%	3.4%	0.2%	20					
	Burkina Faso DHS[119]	2010	76%	12,949	16.6%	76.8%	1.2%	5.4%	13%	2319					
	Central African Republic MICS § [120]	2010	24.2%	2785	4.8%	17%†	1.7%	0.8%	0.8%	139	0.2%		0.5%	0.1%	0.1%
	Chad MICS ¶ [25]	2010	44.2%	7043	4.2%	35.5%	3.2%	1.3%	12.1%	1928	1.1%		9.8%		88.1%
	Cote D'Ivoire MICS[26]	2016	36.7%	4329	6.8%	63.3%	9.4%	20.5%	10.9%	972	6.3%		78.4%	10.4%	4.9%
	Ethiopia DHS[27]	2016	65%	5101	2.6%	73%	6.5%	17.9%	16%	1147		90.1%		9.3%	0.6%
	Gambia MICS[29]	2018	76%	10328	1.2%	80.6%	14.6%	3.6%	51%	5928	0.9%		84.3%	14%	0.7%
	Ghana MICS[30]	2017-18	2.4%	341	4.6%	63.6%	15.9%	15.9%	0.1%	15			75.4%	20.2%	5.2%
	Guinea MICS[50]	2016	96.8%	9351	15.1%	63.6%	10.5%	10.7%	45.3%	4000	17.3%		60.8%	12.2%	9.8%
	Guinea Bissau MICS[32]	2018-19	44.5%	5703	1.1%	73.8%	18.5%	6.5%	29.7%	2558	1.5%		84.1%	13.4%	3.6%
	Kenya DHS[33]	2014	21%	3066	1.6%	87.2%	9.3%	1.9%	3%	352		86.3%		7.8%	5.9%
	Mali DHS[113]	2018	88.6%	4699	25.4%	40.7%	8.2%	25.8%	73%	4335		88.6%		11.4%	
	Mauritania MICS[36]	2015	66.6%	9555	1.2%	64.9%	4.5%	29.4%	53.2%	6936	1%		75.2%	4.2%	19.6%
	Niger DHS[124]	2012	2%	219	7.2%	78.4%	6.3%	8.1%							
	Nigeria DHS [37]	2018	20%	5,202	63% ‡	40.7%	5.6%	44.1%	19%	4640		96.5%		3.5%	
	Senegal MICS[40]	2018	23.3%	2196	8.5%	58.3%	6.9%	26.4%	14.1%	1071					

	Sierra Leone MICS[122]	2017	86.1%	15,394	0.4%	92.1%	5.8%	1.8%	8.4%	1088	0.2%		89.3%	9.1%	1.3%
	Tanzania DHS[41]	2015-16	10%	1329	3.2%	81.1%	6.6%	9.1%							
	Togo MICS[42]	2017	3.1%	225	6.3%	54%	36.2%	3.5%							

*At least 1 daughter

†70% comprised of clitoral ablation

‡ In Nigeria, “Nicked” included a form of cut known as “Angurya” (40.4%), and “Gishiri” (13%). Another form in Nigeria was the use of corrosive substances (6.6%).

§ Percentages of types from women and girls are calculated from the total sample.

¶ Percentages of types for women are calculated from the total sample.

Table 4. Characteristics of FGM Procedure in National Population-Based Studies

			Women		Girls	
WHO Region	**Country**	**Year**	**Age at FGM**	**Performer of FGM**	**Age at FGM**	**Performer of FGM**
AFR	Burkina Faso DHS[119]	2010	< 5 (60.4%), 5-9 (28.2%), 10-14 (8.9%), 15+ (2%), missing (0.5%)	Traditional (97.2%), Medically (0.2%)	<1 (2.8%), 1-4 (7.3%), 5-9 (3.1%), 10-14 (0.2%), missing (0.1%)).	Traditional (98.3%), Medical (0.2%)
	Eritrea Population and Health Survey[28]	2010	<1 (47.4%), 1-3 (4.7%)	Traditional (84.4%), Medical (0.3%), Other (15.4%)	<1 (65.7%) 1-4 (20.9%), 5-6 (8.1%), 7-8 (4.3%), 9-10 (0.4%); 11-12 (0.1%) , 13+ (0.1%), do not know (0.4%)	Traditional (98.3%), medical professional (0.09%), do not know (1.6%)
	Ethiopia DHS[27]	2016	< 5 (49%); 5-9 (22%); 10-14 (18%), age 15+ (6%); don't know (6%)	Traditional (90.1%), Medical (1%), Other: (8.9%) don't know/missing	< 1 (7.2%), 1-4 (3.4%), 5-9 (3.7%), 10-14 (1.0%)	Traditional (97.6%); Medical (1.9%), do not know (0.5%)
	Kenya DHS[33]	2014	<5 years (2.3%), 5-9 years (26.6%), 10-14 (42.6%), 15+ years (26.9%), missing (1.7%)	Traditional (83.3%), Medical (14.8%), Other (1.9%)	<1 (0.0%), 1-4 (0.2%), 5-9 (2.1%), 10-14 (0.5%)	Traditional (74.9%), Medical (19.7%), missing/do not know (5.4%).
	Mali DHS[113]	2018	<5 (75.5%), 5–9 (16.1%), 10–14 (4.4%). 15+ (0.3%), do not know/ missing (3.6%)	Traditional (91.5%), Medical (0.7%), do not know/missing (8.2%)	<1 (34.2%), 1-4 (31.9%), 5-9 (5.2%), 10-14 (0.4%), do not know/missing (0.9%)	Traditional (98.6%), Medical (2.8%)
	Nigeria DHS[37]	2018	< 5 years (86%), 5-9 (4.2%), 10-14 (3.9%), 15+ (5%)	Traditional (85.4%), Medical (8.6%), Other (6%)	<1 (17.2%), 1-4 (1.1%), 5-9 (0.7%), 10-14 (0.0%), do not know / missing (0.1%)	Traditional (92.8%) Medical (7%)
	Niger DHS[124]	2012	<5 (75.7%), 5-9 (7.3%), 10-14 (7.9%), 15+ (1.4%), do not know/ missing (7.8%)	Traditional (95.8%), Other (0.2%), do not know/missing (4%)		
	Senegal DHS[40]	2017	<5 (79.6%), 5-9 (12.1%), 10-14 (4.3%), 15+ (0.7%), do not know/ missing (3.2%)		<1 (7.5%), 1-4 (5.6%), 5-9 (0.7%), 10-14 (0.1%), do not know / missing (0.1%)	
	Tanzania DHS[41]	2015-16	<1 (35.4%), 1-4 (2.3%), 5-6 (5.2%), 7-8 (7.5%), 9-10 (10.9%), 11-12 (9.3%), 13+ (27.6%), Do not know/missing (1.8%)	Traditional (86%), Medical (14.8%), Do not know/missing (1.9%)	<1 (0.1%), 1-4 (0.2%), 5-9 (0.1%), 10-14 (0.1%)	Traditional (74.9%), Medical (19.7%), Do not know/missing (5.4%)
	Yemen DHS[48]	2013	First week after birth (83.3%); After first week but before first year (10.5%); 1 year + (1.2%), do not know / missing (4.5%)	Women - Traditional (92.8%), Medical (2.9%), Other (4.3%)	First week after birth (84.9%), After 1st week but before 1 year (14.3%), 1 year or older (0.6%), Do not know/missing (0.2%)	Traditional (84.7%), Medical (12.8%), Other (2.5%)

EMR	Egypt DHS[45]	2014	<3 years (0.6%); 3-4 (1%), 5-6 (7.4%), 7-8 (13.4%), 9-10 (40.9%) 11-12 (24.6%), 13-14 (5.3%), 15-17 (2.6%), do not know or missing(4.2%)	Traditional (60.5%), Medically (37.9%), Other (1.5%)	<3 years (3.5%); 3-4 (3.4%), 5-6 (10.1%), 7-8 (14.1%), 9-10 (32.8%) 11-12 (28.6%), 13-14 (5.4%), 15-17 (1.3%), do not know or missing (0.7%)	Medical (81.9%), Traditional (18.1%)
SEAR	Indonesia RISKESDAS[123]	2013			1-5 months (72.4%), 1-4 years (13.9%), 5-11 years (3.3%)	
	Maldives DHS[49]	2016-17	< 5 (83%); 5-9 (1.6%); 10-14 (0.4%); 15+ (0.4%); don not know/missing (14.5%)		<1 (0.7%), 1-4 (0.2%), don’t know/ missing (0.1%)	


Records identified through database searching (n =3205) March 2, 2020
Embase: (n=1613)
Ovid MEDLINE: (n=1066)
PSYCINFO: (n=339)
Web of Science: (n=187)
Additional records identified through other sources (n=30)
Records after duplicates removed (n=2230)
Embase: 939
Ovid MEDLINE: 885
PSYCINFO: 241
Web of Science: 135
Grey Literature: 30
Records screened (n =2230)
Records excluded (n=1887)
Full-text articles assessed for eligibility (n = 318)
Full-text articles excluded, with reasons (n =183)
Estimates (n=18)
Cannot be located (n=2)
Repeated survey data / not most recent (n=53)
Duplicates (n=20)
Excluded publication type (n=50)
Outcomes / Perceptions / Risk factors i.e. No Prevalence (n=42)
Studies included (n =135)
Nationally representative included in meta-analysis (n = 28)
Other:
Nationally representative (n = 1)
Regionally representative (n = 28)
Community, Facility, or School based (n =78)
Of which have migrant populations (n=27)


Study
Proportion
95%-CI
Weight
MICS 2016 - Guinea 0.97 [0.96; 0.97] 3.7%
DHS 2015 - Egypt 0.92 [0.92; 0.93] 3.7%
DHS 2018 - Mali 0.89 [0.88; 0.89] 3.7%
MICS 2014 - Sudan 0.87 [0.86; 0.87] 3.7%
MICS 2017 - Sierra Leone 0.86 [0.86; 0.87] 3.7%
Population and Health Survey 2010 - Eritrea 0.83 [0.82; 0.84] 3.7%
MICS 2018 - Gambia 0.76 [0.75; 0.76] 3.7%
DHS 2010 - Burkina Faso 0.76 [0.75; 0.76] 3.7%
MICS 2015 - Mauritania 0.67 [0.66; 0.67] 3.7%
DHS 2016 - Ethiopia 0.65 [0.64; 0.66] 3.7%
MICS 2018-19 - Guinea Bissau 0.52 [0.51; 0.53] 3.7%
MICS 2014-15 - Chad 0.44 [0.43; 0.45] 3.7%
DHS 2019-20 - Liberia 0.38 [0.37; 0.39] 3.7%
MICS 2016 - Cote D'Ivoire 0.37 [0.36; 0.38] 3.7%
MICS 2010 - Central African Republic 0.25 [0.24; 0.26] 3.7%
DHS 2018 - Senegal 0.23 [0.22; 0.24] 3.7%
DHS 2014 - Kenya 0.21 [0.20; 0.22] 3.7%
DHS 2018 - Nigeria 0.19 [0.19; 0.20] 3.7%
DHS 2015 - Yemen 0.18 [0.18; 0.19] 3.7%
DHS 2016-17 - Maldives 0.13 [0.12; 0.14] 3.7%
DHS 2015-16 - Tanzania 0.10 [0.10; 0.11] 3.7%
MICS 2014 - Benin 0.09 [0.09; 0.10] 3.7%
MICS 2018 - Iraq 0.07 [0.07; 0.08] 3.7%
MICS 2017 - Togo 0.03 [0.03; 0.03] 3.7%
MICS 2017-18 - Ghana 0.02 [0.02; 0.03] 3.7%
DHS 2012 - Niger 0.02 [0.02; 0.02] 3.7%
DHS 2016 - Uganda 0.00 [0.00; 0.00] 3.7%
Random effects model 0.40 [0.26; 0.55] 100.0%
Heterogeneity: I^2 = 100%, τ^2 = 0.1676, p = 0
0.2
0.4
0.6
0.8


Study
Proportion
95%-CI
Weight
DHS 2018 - Mali 0.73 [0.72; 0.74] 2.3%
Pew Research Foundation 2010 - Mali 0.77 [0.73; 0.80] 2.3%
MICS 2018 - Gambia 0.51 [0.50; 0.51] 2.3%
MICS 2015 - Mauritania 0.53 [0.52; 0.54] 2.3%
MICS 2016 - Guinea 0.46 [0.45; 0.47] 2.3%
Population and Health Survey 2010 - Eritrea 0.44 [0.43; 0.45] 2.3%
MICS 2014 - Sudan 0.32 [0.31; 0.32] 2.3%
MICS 2018-19 - Guinea Bissau 0.30 [0.29; 0.31] 2.3%
Pew Research Foundation 2010 - Guinea Bissau 0.33 [0.29; 0.37] 2.3%
DHS 2015 - Egypt 0.21 [0.21; 0.22] 2.3%
DHS 2018 - Nigeria 0.19 [0.19; 0.20] 2.3%
Pew Research Foundation 2010 - Nigeria 0.13 [0.11; 0.16] 2.3%
DHS 2012 - Niger 0.19 [0.19; 0.20] 2.3%
DHS 2015 - Yemen 0.16 [0.15; 0.17] 2.3%
DHS 2016 - Ethiopia 0.16 [0.15; 0.17] 2.3%
Pew Research Foundation 2010 - Ethiopia 0.25 [0.22; 0.28] 2.3%
DHS 2018 - Senegal 0.14 [0.13; 0.15] 2.3%
DHS 2010 - Burkina Faso 0.13 [0.13; 0.14] 2.3%
MICS 2014-15 - Chad 0.12 [0.12; 0.13] 2.3%
Pew Research Foundation 2010 - Chad 0.39 [0.36; 0.43] 2.3%
MICS 2016 - Cote D'Ivoire 0.11 [0.10; 0.12] 2.3%
MICS 2017 - Sierra Leone 0.08 [0.08; 0.09] 2.3%
DHS 2014 - Kenya 0.03 [0.03; 0.03] 2.3%
Pew Research Foundation 2010 - Kenya 0.10 [0.08; 0.12] 2.3%
MICS 2010 - Central African Republic 0.01 [0.01; 0.01] 2.3%
DHS 2015-16 - Tanzania 0.00 [0.00; 0.01] 2.3%
Pew Research Foundation 2010 - Tanzania 0.06 [0.05; 0.08] 2.3%
DHS 2016-17 - Maldives 0.01 [0.01; 0.01] 2.3%
MICS 2018 - Iraq 0.01 [0.00; 0.01] 2.3%
MICS 2017 - Togo 0.00 [0.00; 0.00] 2.3%
MICS 2017-18 - Ghana 0.00 [0.00; 0.00] 2.3%
MICS 2014 - Benin 0.00 [0.00; 0.00] 2.3%
Pew Research Foundation 2010 - Ghana 0.09 [0.07; 0.11] 2.3%
Pew Research Foundation 2010 - Liberia 0.21 [0.18; 0.24] 2.3%
Pew Research Foundation 2010 - Uganda 0.13 [0.11; 0.16] 2.3%
Pew Research Foundation 2010 - Djibouti 0.58 [0.55; 0.61] 2.3%
Pew Research Foundation 2010 - Botswana 0.05 [0.03; 0.08] 2.3%
Pew Research Foundation 2010 - Cameroon 0.01 [0.00; 0.02] 2.3%
Pew Research Foundation 2010 - Democratic Republic of Congo 0.09 [0.07; 0.11] 2.3%
Pew Research Foundation 2010 - Mozambique 0.12 [0.10; 0.15] 2.3%
Pew Research Foundation 2010 - South Africa 0.04 [0.03; 0.06] 2.3%
Pew Research Foundation 2010 - Zambia 0.03 [0.02; 0.05] 2.3%
Pew Research Foundation 2010 - Rwanda 0.03 [0.02; 0.05] 2.3%
Random effects model 0.15 [0.10; 0.21] 100.0%
Heterogeneity: I^2 = 100%, τ^2 = 0.0634, p = 0
0.2
0.4
0.6
0.8


Study
Proportion
95%-CI
Weight
DHS 2018 - Nigeria 0.63 [0.62; 0.64] 4.6%
DHS 2018 - Mali 0.25 [0.24; 0.27] 4.6%
MICS 2010 - Central African Republic 0.20 [0.18; 0.21] 4.6%
DHS 2010 - Burkina Faso 0.17 [0.16; 0.17] 4.6%
MICS 2016 - Guinea 0.15 [0.14; 0.16] 4.6%
MICS 2014 - Benin 0.14 [0.13; 0.16] 4.5%
MICS 2010 - Chad 0.09 [0.09; 0.10] 4.6%
DHS 2018 - Senegal 0.09 [0.07; 0.10] 4.6%
DHS 2012 - Niger 0.07 [0.04; 0.12] 4.4%
DHS 2013 - Yemen 0.07 [0.06; 0.08] 4.6%
MICS 2016 - Cote D'Ivoire 0.07 [0.06; 0.08] 4.6%
MICS 2017 - Togo 0.06 [0.03; 0.10] 4.4%
MICS 2018 - Iraq 0.06 [0.05; 0.07] 4.6%
MICS 2017, 2018 - Ghana 0.05 [0.03; 0.08] 4.5%
DHS 2016 - Ethiopia 0.03 [0.02; 0.03] 4.6%
DHS 2015, 2016 - Tanzania 0.03 [0.02; 0.04] 4.5%
MICS 2014 - Sudan 0.02 [0.02; 0.02] 4.6%
DHS 2014 - Kenya 0.02 [0.01; 0.02] 4.6%
MICS 2015 - Mauritania 0.01 [0.01; 0.01] 4.6%
MICS 2018 - Gambia 0.01 [0.01; 0.01] 4.6%
MICS 2018, 2019 - Guinea Bissau 0.01 [0.01; 0.01] 4.6%
MICS 2017 - Sierra Leone 0.00 [0.00; 0.01] 4.6%
Random effects model 0.08 [0.04; 0.13] 100.0%
Heterogeneity: I^2 = 100%, τ^2 = 0.0413, p = 0
0.1
0.2
0.3
0.4
0.5
0.6


Study
Proportion
95%-CI
Weight
MICS 2017 - Sierra Leone 0.92 [0.92; 0.93] 4.6%
DHS 2013 - Yemen 0.90 [0.89; 0.91] 4.6%
DHS 2014 - Kenya 0.87 [0.86; 0.88] 4.6%
MICS 2018 - Iraq 0.84 [0.83; 0.86] 4.6%
DHS 2015, 2016 - Tanzania 0.81 [0.79; 0.83] 4.5%
MICS 2018 - Gambia 0.81 [0.80; 0.81] 4.6%
MICS 2010 - Chad 0.80 [0.79; 0.81] 4.6%
DHS 2012 - Niger 0.79 [0.73; 0.84] 4.5%
DHS 2010 - Burkina Faso 0.77 [0.76; 0.78] 4.6%
MICS 2018, 2019 - Guinea Bissau 0.74 [0.73; 0.75] 4.6%
DHS 2016 - Ethiopia 0.73 [0.72; 0.74] 4.6%
MICS 2014 - Benin 0.72 [0.70; 0.74] 4.5%
MICS 2010 - Central African Republic 0.70 [0.69; 0.72] 4.6%
MICS 2015 - Mauritania 0.65 [0.64; 0.66] 4.6%
MICS 2017, 2018 - Ghana 0.64 [0.58; 0.69] 4.5%
MICS 2016 - Guinea 0.64 [0.63; 0.65] 4.6%
MICS 2016 - Cote D'Ivoire 0.63 [0.62; 0.65] 4.6%
DHS 2018 - Senegal 0.58 [0.56; 0.60] 4.6%
MICS 2017 - Togo 0.54 [0.47; 0.60] 4.5%
DHS 2018 - Mali 0.41 [0.39; 0.42] 4.6%
DHS 2018 - Nigeria 0.41 [0.39; 0.42] 4.6%
MICS 2014 - Sudan 0.16 [0.16; 0.17] 4.6%
Random effects model 0.69 [0.59; 0.79] 100.0%
Heterogeneity: I^2 = 100%, τ^2 = 0.0732, p = 0
0.2 0.3 0.4 0.5 0.6 0.7 0.8 0.9


Study
Proportion
95%-CI
Weight
MICS 2014 - Sudan 0.77 [0.76; 0.78] 4.8%
MICS 2017 - Togo 0.36 [0.30; 0.43] 4.7%
MICS 2018, 2019 - Guinea Bissau 0.18 [0.17; 0.20] 4.8%
MICS 2017, 2018 - Ghana 0.16 [0.12; 0.20] 4.7%
MICS 2018 - Gambia 0.15 [0.14; 0.15] 4.8%
MICS 2016 - Guinea 0.10 [0.10; 0.11] 4.8%
MICS 2014 - Benin 0.10 [0.09; 0.12] 4.8%
MICS 2016 - Cote D'Ivoire 0.09 [0.09; 0.10] 4.8%
DHS 2014 - Kenya 0.09 [0.08; 0.10] 4.8%
DHS 2018 - Mali 0.08 [0.07; 0.09] 4.8%
DHS 2018 - Senegal 0.07 [0.06; 0.08] 4.8%
DHS 2015, 2016 - Tanzania 0.07 [0.05; 0.08] 4.8%
MICS 2010 - Chad 0.07 [0.07; 0.08] 4.8%
MICS 2010 - Central African Republic 0.07 [0.06; 0.08] 4.8%
DHS 2016 - Ethiopia 0.07 [0.06; 0.07] 4.8%
DHS 2012 - Niger 0.06 [0.04; 0.10] 4.7%
DHS 2018 - Nigeria 0.06 [0.05; 0.06] 4.8%
MICS 2017 - Sierra Leone 0.06 [0.05; 0.06] 4.8%
MICS 2015 - Mauritania 0.04 [0.04; 0.05] 4.8%
DHS 2010 - Burkina Faso 0.01 [0.01; 0.01] 4.8%
MICS 2018 - Iraq 0.01 [0.01; 0.02] 4.8%
Random effects model 0.11 [0.04; 0.20] 100.0%
Heterogeneity: I^2 = 100%, τ^2 = 0.0883, p = 0
0.1 0.2 0.3 0.4 0.5 0.6 0.7


Study
Proportion
95%-CI
Weight
MICS 2010 - Central African Republic 0.25 [0.18; 0.33] 9.4%
MICS 2016 - Guinea 0.17 [0.16; 0.19] 10.2%
DHS 2013 - Yemen 0.11 [0.09; 0.12] 10.2%
MICS 2018 - Iraq 0.09 [0.05; 0.16] 9.3%
MICS 2016 - Cote D'Ivoire 0.06 [0.05; 0.08] 10.1%
MICS 2018, 2019 - Guinea Bissau 0.01 [0.01; 0.02] 10.2%
MICS 2010 - Chad 0.01 [0.01; 0.02] 10.2%
MICS 2015 - Mauritania 0.01 [0.01; 0.01] 10.2%
MICS 2018 - Gambia 0.01 [0.01; 0.01] 10.2%
MICS 2017 - Sierra Leone 0.00 [0.00; 0.01] 10.1%
Random effects model 0.05 [0.02; 0.10] 100.0%
Heterogeneity: I^2 = 99%, τ^2 = 0.0209, p = 0
0.05 0.1 0.15 0.2 0.25 0.3


Study
Proportion
95%-CI
Weight
MICS 2017 - Sierra Leone 0.89 [0.87; 0.91] 10.2%
MICS 2018 - Iraq 0.89 [0.82; 0.94] 10.0%
MICS 2018 - Gambia 0.84 [0.83; 0.85] 10.3%
MICS 2018, 2019 - Guinea Bissau 0.84 [0.83; 0.85] 10.3%
MICS 2016 - Cote D'Ivoire 0.78 [0.76; 0.81] 10.2%
MICS 2015 - Mauritania 0.75 [0.74; 0.76] 10.3%
MICS 2017, 2018 - Ghana 0.73 [0.45; 0.92] 8.3%
MICS 2016 - Guinea 0.61 [0.59; 0.62] 10.3%
MICS 2010 - Central African Republic 0.50 [0.42; 0.59] 10.0%
MICS 2010 - Chad 0.10 [0.09; 0.11] 10.3%
Random effects model 0.70 [0.55; 0.84] 100.0%
Heterogeneity: I^2 = 100%, τ^2 = 0.0661, p = 0
0.2
0.4
0.6
0.8


Study
Proportion
95%-CI
Weight
MICS 2017, 2018 - Ghana 0.20 [0.04; 0.48] 2.7%
MICS 2018 - Gambia 0.14 [0.13; 0.15] 8.5%
MICS 2018, 2019 - Guinea Bissau 0.13 [0.12; 0.15] 8.5%
MICS 2016 - Guinea 0.12 [0.11; 0.13] 8.5%
MICS 2010 - Central African Republic 0.12 [0.07; 0.19] 6.9%
DHS 2018 - Mali 0.11 [0.10; 0.12] 8.5%
MICS 2016 - Cote D'Ivoire 0.10 [0.09; 0.12] 8.3%
DHS 2016 - Ethiopia 0.09 [0.08; 0.11] 8.3%
MICS 2017 - Sierra Leone 0.09 [0.07; 0.11] 8.3%
DHS 2014 - Kenya 0.08 [0.05; 0.11] 7.8%
MICS 2015 - Mauritania 0.04 [0.04; 0.05] 8.5%
DHS 2018 - Nigeria 0.03 [0.03; 0.04] 8.5%
MICS 2018 - Iraq 0.01 [0.00; 0.04] 6.8%
Random effects model 0.09 [0.06; 0.12] 100.0%
Heterogeneity: I^2 = 99%, τ^2 = 0.0072, p < 0.01
0.1
0.2
0.3
0.4


Study
Proportion
95%-CI
Weight
DHS 2018 - Nigeria
0.97
[0.96; 0.97]
20.4%
DHS 2016 - Ethiopia
0.90
[0.88; 0.92]
20.0%
DHS 2018 - Mali
0.89
[0.88; 0.90]
20.4%
DHS 2013 - Yemen
0.88
[0.87; 0.90]
20.2%
DHS 2014 - Kenya
0.86
[0.82; 0.90]
18.9%
Random effects model
0.90
[0.85; 0.95]
100.0%
Heterogeneity: I^2 = 99%, τ^2 = 0.0081, p < 0.01
0.84
0.86
0.88
0.9
0.92
0.94
0.96