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Reviewer's report:

Thank you for the opportunity to review this important manuscript. This is a well-designed study of an under-researched aspect of FGC. While there are important limitations (pricking being illegal in Sweden being chief of these), the study will be an important addition to the literature.

Some methodological questions (not all of which need to be revised/addressed in the manuscript necessarily):

While I understand that snowball sampling was likely necessary from a pragmatic standpoint, the potential drawback is, of course, of a skewed sample. That is, participants may help to recruit their contacts that perhaps share the same views. This limitation should be discussed in the manuscript.

Including the questionnaire in an appendix would be helpful to the reviewer and reader. My supposition is that some of the 49 items were validated, but not all. However, better delineating this would be useful. Furthermore, given the use of 6 collectors of both sexes, it would be useful to describe the training, any concordance with data collection issues, and inferences of impact of data collector sex on truthfulness in the respondent's answers.

Given the power analysis was calculated based on a test sample and design effect, it would be useful to mention whether there are other studies that have assessed support for continuation of FGC. At the least, mentioning ongoing incidence of FGC in Somali natives/immigrants (which is much higher than 24%), would lead to a different power calculation/sample size needed and should be mentioned.

Would the results be different if backward stepwise regression was used? It seems that Allen-Cady modified backward elimination may be better suited here.

Overall, I believe the authors are careful at not drawing too many inferences from their data. Adding a qualitative component would have been helpful in terms of providing richer data. However, this is an excellent first step at understanding a potentially changing view of pricking.
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