Gender-based violence

Defining and identifying femicide: a literature review

Acknowledgements

This report is part of the work of the European Institute for Gender Equality (EIGE) on the collection of administrative data on violence against women.

In order to expand the data collection on femicide, EIGE commissioned GOPA Luxembourg SARL to produce three reports. The aim of this literature review is to analyse the elements and factors that are required to identify the gender dimensions of femicide cases in order to shed light on how to better measure the extent of gender-related killings. The main author of the report is Prof. Dr. Birgit Sauer (University of Vienna). This report is part of a wider project, which benefited from contributions from a large panel of experts, including Myrna Dawson (University of Guelph), Anna Wiecek-Duranska (Maria Grzegorzewska University), Ecaterina Baltica (Institute of Sociology, Romanian Academy) and Barbara Spinelli.

The project was managed by EIGE's gender-based violence team: Cristina Fabre Rosell, Eleonora Esposito, Jurgita Pečiūrienė and Sophia Lane.

EIGE would like to thank all the contributors and the external peer reviewers for their valuable input. Special thanks go to Professor Sandra Walklate (University of Liverpool and Monash University) for insights and expertise that greatly informed the research.

This report is part of a broader EIGE study aimed at supporting EU Member States in their efforts to collect administrative data on intimate partner violence and gender-related killings of women and girls (femicide). It is accompanied by further publications on data collection on violence against women. These resources can be found on EIGE's website (https://eige.europa.eu/gender-based-violence).

European Institute for Gender Equality

The European Institute for Gender Equality (EIGE) is an autonomous body of the European Union established to strengthen gender equality across the EU. Equality between women and men is a fundamental value of the EU and EIGE's task is to make this a reality in Europe and beyond. This includes becoming a European knowledge centre on gender equality issues, supporting gender mainstreaming in all EU and Member State policies, and fighting discrimination based on sex.

European Institute for Gender Equality, EIGE
Gedimino pr. 16
LT-01103 Vilnius
LITHUANIA

Tel. +370 52157444

Email: eige.sec@eige.europa.eu

http://www.eige.europa.eu

http://twitter.com/eurogender

http://www.facebook.com/eige.europa.eu

http://www.youtube.com/eurogender

http://eurogender.eige.europa.eu

https://www.linkedin.com/company/eige/

Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union, 2021

Print	ISBN 978-92-9482-925-2	doi:10.2839/861004	MH-09-21-293-EN-C
PDF	ISBN 978-92-9482-926-9	doi:10.2839/718210	MH-09-21-293-EN-N

Defining and identifying femicide: a literature review

Contents

1. Introduction

The scientific literature on definitions of femicide and variables and factors for identifying femicide is rather scarce, as is the availability of data on femicide (Corradi and Stöckl, 2014). The European Cooperation in Science and Technology (COST) Action on femicide summarised this issue, noting that only some countries have databases on femicide (e.g. Italy, Serbia, Spain and the United Kingdom) (Schröttle and Meshkova, 2018); thus, there remains a gap in comparability across Europe – and globally ([1]). The Global Centre of Excellence on Gender Statistics (CEGS) of the United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women (UN Women) states that 'valuable information on femicide/feminicide is frequently lost within the general data on homicides' and a 'global conceptualisation as well as an operationalisation' of the concept of femicide is needed (CEGS, 2020, pp. 5, 11). Different disciplines offer different understandings of femicide and, as a result, provide different inputs as to its nature and extent (Dawson and Carrigan, 2020). However, Corradi and Stöckl complain that intimate partner homicide is 'mostly understood as an extension of IPV [intimate partner violence], rather than as part of the more general phenomenon of homicide' (2014, p. 615). Their country-comparative research established a link between policy provisions on gender-based violence 'and the availability of routine statistics on both male and female IPH [intimate partner homicide]'. Countries that had implemented policy provisions early tended to have 'routine collection and reporting by police and justice system in place', with good data availability (Corradi and Stöckl, 2014, p. 613).

As suggested by Dawson and Carrigan (2020), the terminology on femicide is contested and varies between disciplines and scientific traditions. Even within these traditions different emphases can be found. For example, some criminologists refer to intimate partner homicide or intimate partner femicide, reducing femicide to one specific – albeit most common – type, while the gender-sensitive literature uses the concept of femicide or feminicide (Corradi and Stöckl, 2014, p. 603). Others, following the seminal work of Kelly (1988), consider the phenomenon of femicide more broadly, placing it on the continuum of violence(s) present in women's lives. However, it is generally accepted that the literature on femicide starts with Caputi and Russell, who define femicide as the killing of women by men 'motivated by hatred, contempt, pleasure, or a sense of ownership of women' (1990, p. 34; Russell and Harmes, 2001). This work emphasises femicide as the misogynistic killing of women by men (Radford and Russell, 1992), that is, the killing of a woman because she is a woman. In this vein, feminicide was introduced into the debate on the killings of women in the Latin American context to stress the complicity of Latin American states in the killing of women through their roles in neglecting such killings and failing to take them seriously. Thus, the states both implicitly and explicitly support such gender-related killing.

This literature review contributes to a comparative analysis of definitions of, types of, indicators of and data collection systems on femicide in the EU Member States and the United Kingdom, and at international level. It is based on a comprehensive and in-depth search for studies published in respected peer-reviewed journals and in books. The aim is to give an overview of the existing multidisciplinary literature on variables and factors used to identify femicide and gender-related motives of female homicides. It provides a structured outline of the state of play on defining and creating typologies of femicide. The literature review relies on a broad definition of femicide as 'structural violence', while acknowledging that femicide is an individual act with a specific motivation. It also reviews methodologies of gathering data on femicide, together with current challenges, and identifies

([1]) For a description of the COST Action monitor European Observatory on Femicide (EOF), see EIGE (2021c).

adequate variables to identify femicide and gender-related motives of homicide. Only some of the literature described can contribute to developing an indicator of femicide or statistical measurement ([2]).

This literature review aims to do four things:

1. it presents the method used to gather the material on which it is based;
2. it offers an overview of the themes and challenges raised in the literature;
3. it presents definitions of femicide, defines different types of femicide and reports variables used to identify femicide;
4. and, finally, it suggests administrative data that, if collected, might be used to establish a measurement framework for femicide.

([2]) This literature review detects descriptive variables or factors in a murder case to assess the demographic characteristics of the victim and perpetrators, the crime scene and the motivation for the killing. Unlike the term 'variable', the term 'indicator' refers to aggregate numbers of femicides in a country, which helps to analyse changes over time or differences between regions (Walby et al., 2017).

2. Methodology and limitations of the study

This literature review presents an overview of peer-reviewed articles and publications on femicide from 2015 to 2020 ([3]). Only some earlier articles and books are included, often quoted within more recent work. The systematic search was mainly restricted to English-language publications.

The method for identifying literature on variables and factors of femicide was based on several steps (Whittemore and Knafl, 2005). The first step was a Google and Google Scholar search for the terms 'femicide', 'feminicide', 'interpersonal partner homicide/femicide' and 'uxoricide'. The second step was a systematic review of the most highly regarded journals in the fields of gender-based violence, women's health, criminology and homicide studies, and forensic and medical studies, using the same search terms. An automated computer search scanned these journals for articles that included these search terms, as well as the phrases 'data collection/gathering', 'femicide statistics' and 'difference between femicide and other forms of homicide'. The third step applied a snowball system, starting with the articles found in the first two steps and tracing the references cited in those articles. In a fourth step, all articles were browsed for definitions of femicide, variables to identify femicide and risk factors for femicide and intimate partner homicide. This included any discussions of availability, data gathering, comparability and limitations of data sets and forms of documentation of (data on) femicide, police, forensic and medical investigations and reporting of femicide. Attention was also paid to general discussions of the practice of counting femicide cases, as well as to recommendations and suggestions on how to identify femicide. The journal articles were also browsed for publications other than journal articles considered relevant for this review.

Publications that did not discuss any of the aforementioned aspects were excluded, including forensic science articles that discussed specific cases of femicide without a systematic approach. The literature review focuses on male perpetrators only, excluding female perpetrators. Finally, reports on femicide by international or national organisations were excluded (with the exception of UNODC (2018) and CEGS (2020)), as their analyses are part of a comparative study by the European Institute for Gender Equality (EIGE) of definitions, types and indicators of femicide and data collection systems on femicide in EU Member States and at international level (EIGE, 2021c) ([4]).

Finally, several handbooks on homicide and gender-based violence with chapters on intimate partner or family homicide, including some methodological considerations, were screened ([5]). The chapters in Dawson (2017) discussing methods of data collection, the challenges it presents and national differences in data collection ([6]) were considered. A comprehensive book by Walby et al. (2017) examines measurements of violence against women, including femicide, and identifies major variables to determine homicide as gendered. Similarly, CEGS (2020) works towards an operationalisation of femicide and standardised measurements.

([3]) Although this limited time frame may mean that some important earlier work might be missed, it was necessary given the contractual scope of the study. The most recent literature was assumed to be the most relevant and to build on key earlier reports (e.g. EIGE, 2021c).

([4]) This report covers a longer period of research on femicide. It also includes suggestions on data collection by international organisations and gives a comprehensive overview of EU Member States' data collection systems.

([5]) For example, Smith and Zahn (1999) and Liem and Pridemore (2012). The latter does not contain the keyword 'femicide', but contains 'intimate partner violence', 'female homicide', 'intimate partner homicide–suicide' and 'familicide'. The article by Pritchard (2012) in the handbook discusses 'family violence' and 'child homicide', using this review's keywords.

([6]) The chapter by Dawson et al. (2017) discusses the differences in data collection, as well as the context of femicide, in low- and middle-income countries compared with high-income countries. Although this is an important differentiation, this literature review is – with some exceptions – restricted to Western and European countries.

The literature search found a total of 97 publications (included in the references section of this report): 79 journal articles (see Appendix 1 for details), 9 book chapters, 6 books and 3 reports. Following the categorisation of approaches as feminist, sociological, criminological or decolonial (Corradi et al., 2016, p. 979), this literature review includes 29 criminological, 17 forensic, 5 healthcare, 18 feminist, 25 sociological and 3 decolonial journal articles (some articles appear in more than one category; see Appendix 2) ([7]). Note that some publications included in the literature review are not listed in Appendix 2 because they were still at the peer review stage at the time of the analysis.

The review found a lively debate on femicide, especially intimate partner homicide/femicide, in academic journals. Although the substantial number of publications promises a rich debate on femicide and definitions of and variables for identifying femicide, this literature review was limited by the fact that research on the measurements of femicide has several restrictions. Two articles discussed the (in)visibility of femicide in research: Weil (2016) cannot prove any of her hypotheses on the lack of research on femicide resulting in invisibility within sociology, but has several suggestions for future visibility, while Bradbury-Jones et al. (2019) noted that their research was hindered by the fact that 'Many titles and abstracts are not explicit about the gendered nature of the research, and researchers need to be more explicit about this in their publications' (p. 479). The challenge in the usage and visibility of the term 'femicide' is evident in Niemi et al. (2020), whose book *International Law and Violence against Women: Europe and the Istanbul Convention* uses the term 'femicide' only twice, both times to criticise the absence of the term in the Istanbul Convention, but without further discussion.

It is important to note, and of relevance to the measurement project with which this literature review is concerned, that the issue of invisibility carries consequences for the question of counting. Not only does invisibility highlight the inherent limits of data sets in themselves (Cullen et al., 2021), but there are also cultural limits to what might be included as countable (Shalhoub-Kervorkian and Daher-Nashif, 2013). Moreover, some acts of femicide are concealed and so fail to be counted (Bitton and Dayan, 2019), some femicides are staged as other crimes (Ferguson, 2015), some femicides do not count because the state treats them with impunity (Godínez Leal, 2008; Livingstone, 2004) and, finally, some femicides are simply 'missing' and fail to count because of the age of the victim (Roberts, 2021).

While some of the literature focuses on the invisibility of femicide in scientific research ([8]), most of the reviewed work highlights the lack of data and of adequate forms of data collection. Limitations of data availability and comparability are frequently mentioned and ascribed to the absence of common definitions, standards and parameters to count and document femicide. A plethora of articles exist on risk assessment of intimate partner homicide, discussing the importance of certain risk factors, yet the debate restricts itself to intimate partner femicide and the articles do not always contribute to identifying variables to define and distinguish different types of femicide. Of all of the articles reviewed for this literature review, only 12 discuss research and/or data collection on femicide. Four of the other publications develop concrete variables to identify femicide, and some others name certain aspects that are missing within current systems. Overall, there are very few concrete recommendations that go beyond a broadly framed request to intensify, standardise and improve data collection on femicide (see Section 5 for a summary of the existing (and agreed) variables for data collection).

([7]) The categories are not mutually exclusive, but are simply intended to give an idea of the focus of studies on femicide.
([8]) Criado Perez (2019) points to the fact that data gathering is based on the needs of a 'man's world'.

3. Overview of themes, problems and challenges described in the literature

This section gives an overview of key themes and issues discussed in the reviewed literature, with a particular focus on the challenges of data collection on femicide. It presents the background to the development of data collection systems for femicide. The major issues are, firstly, the problem of defining femicide and debates about the appropriateness of the term 'femicide' (see Section 3.1) and, secondly, poor data collection systems (see Section 3.2), the invisibility of femicide as a result of under-reporting (Section 3.3), biases in data gathering (see Section 3.4) and (poor) data governance (see Section 3.5).

3.1. Challenges in identifying femicide: the lack of common definitions

The analysis of the existing literature on femicide and feminicide, including the definitions introduced in the 1990s ([9]), shows that the definitions are contested and vary between different disciplines and approaches.

Corradi et al. (2016) discuss the distinct approaches to research on femicide and feminicide developed since the term was coined in 1976. They categorise the various approaches as follows:

1. a feminist approach, which confronts patriarchal domination at the same time as it investigates the killing of women;

2. a sociological approach, which focuses on the examination of the features specific to the killing of women that make it a phenomenon, per se;

3. a criminological approach, which distinguishes femicide as a unique sector in "homicide" studies;

4. a human rights approach, which extends femicide beyond the *lethal* and into *extreme* forms of violence against women; and

5. a decolonial approach, which examines instances of femicide in the context of colonial domination, including so-called "honour crimes"' (Corradi et al., 2016, p. 979).

Not all research on femicide refers to a common defining framework, and Corradi et al. (2016) suggest that future research on femicide should refer to the ecological framework of violence against women, a complex and multilayered interdisciplinary framework that understands and analyses femicide as a social phenomenon and as a 'violent act' based on 'the micro, meso and macro levels' (p. 988). However, it is also important to note that this model carries with its own limitations. Importantly, the inherently functionalist view of society and social relationships embedded within the ecological framework results in a fundamental inability to see power relationships. It cannot 'see' patriarchy, and patriarchal social relationships are central to the work emanating from the feminist movement on femicide. Sheehy (2017) stresses the importance of the contribution of feminist movement actors to defining femicide in specific contexts, as well as to processes of data collection.

Similarly, the UNODC's *Global Study on Homicide* distinguishes a feminist approach, focusing on patriarchy and gendered aspects. The UNODC (2018) uses the term 'femicide' to name either the violent killing of women or the killing of women in the realm of intimate partner violence. A significant proportion of the articles on femicide scanned for this review use the term to describe the killing of women, mostly in the context of intimate partner violence. Fairbairn et al.

([9]) In a review of two books on femicide (Bart and Moran's *Violence against Women* and Radford and Russell's *Femicide: The Politics of Woman Killing*), Edwards (1994) introduced the debate about definitions of femicide into criminological science.

(2017) add the problematic notion of 'intimate' when defining 'intimate partner violence / femicide': the official definition of 'intimate' might not include the killing of sex workers or dating relationships (p. 222). In examining death reviews in low- and middle-income countries, Dawson et al. (2017) point to the importance of the 'cultural appropriateness of such reviews', that is, the contextualisation of definitions of partner femicide (in this case) in social and cultural contexts (p. 264) ([10]). Definitions of (partner) femicide, as well as the creation of variables to identify (partner) femicide, need to take social and economic conditions into account in order to illuminate specific conditions of (partner) femicide when making international comparisons.

Menjívar and Walsh (2017) use the term 'feminicide', in contrast to 'femicide', to highlight the role of institutional or state violence and to focus on the complicity of the state (institutional violence, misogynistic and discriminatory practices) in the deaths of women (CEGS, 2020). In doing so, they distinguish between patterns of 'omission (inaction)', which include indirect mechanisms such as failure to provide 'prevention, protection, and prosecution', as well as patterns of 'commission (actions)', including direct actions of 'sexual violence, threats, and the targeting of women leaders for persecution and police harassment' (Menjívar and Walsh, 2017, p. 222). Commission also comprises failure to act or dismissal of the seriousness of a crime, and therefore the active denial of a thorough investigation by the authorities. In addition, politically and socially active women might become victims of femicide, and activism might be seen as an indicator of a gender-motivated killing (see below).

At this juncture, it is perhaps worth noting that the targeting of women under conditions of state-sanctioned and non-sanctioned violence occurs not only in peacetime but also in conflict and post-conflict situations. For example, the killing of women as a feature of genocide is well documented (Hagan and Rymond-Richmond, 2009; Rafter, 2016). In terms of counting femicide cases, this observation serves to remind policymakers of the importance of understanding violence(s) against women as part of a continuum in which the context of such violence(s) varies alongside the complicity of states in their patterns of commission and omission in responding to such violence(s). This work serves as a reminder not to lose sight of femicide as a constituent element in the continuum of women's experiences of violence(s).

Critical discussion of the usage and/or legal implementation of the category 'femicide'

There have been some critical discussions of the usage and/or legal implementation of the category 'femicide'. Ingala Smith (2018) points to the danger of 'depoliticisation' through the policy frameworks of the EU and the UN. This argument builds on two points: firstly, the Vienna Declaration on Femicide uses almost gender-neutral language when discussing perpetrators, which obscures the fact that the overwhelming majority of perpetrators are male; secondly, the fact that the Vienna Declaration on Femicide makes no direct mention of women killed in the course of commercial sexual exploitation could be read as silent complicity with the commodification of women (Ingala Smith, 2018, p. 164). From a radical feminist standpoint, Ingala Smith (2018) speaks against the practice of mainly counting dead women, instead focusing on the political act of killing women in patriarchal societies (p. 168).

A more detailed discussion is offered by Howe and Alaattinoğlu (2018) in their collection of feminist essays reviewing and discussing the benefits of and obstacles (depoliticisation) to using criminal law to strategically combat femicide. The anthology is a committed yet critical continuation of the discussion initiated by Smart (1989) in *Feminism and the Power of Law*. Howe and Alaattinoğlu (2018) offer a controversial examination of law reforms that feminists sought and fought for. They also provide a space for questions that go beyond these reflections on concrete struggles, by understanding law and justice as a discursive field for gender struggles and by exploring spaces and possibilities for feminist interventions.

([10]) This concerns the issue of 'honour crimes' (Salameh et al., 2018).

Finally, in their study of domestic homicide, Liem and Koenraadt (2018) offer a critique and explanation of their dismissal of the term 'femicide', criticising the difficulties in operationalising the term, as well as its focus on the victimisation of women instead of their agency. In their own work, the authors prefer the term 'intimate partner homicide'.

In contrast, Corradi and Stöckl (2014) criticise this view and research on femicide as following too broad a theoretical design and seeking to understand the causes of femicide as an outcome of gender inequality. Situating and understanding the causes of femicide in this way stretches understandings of the nature, extent and causes of femicide. For example, Walklate et al. (2020) talk of 'slow femicide' as one way of thinking about the toll on women's lives resulting from their wider experiences of gender inequality and the violence(s) associated with this. Corradi and Stöckl (2014) claim that this emphasis on critical inquiry into societies has diminished analytical considerations of the 'varying circumstances and characteristics of violent events' (p. 615).

This review follows the recommendation of Corradi and Stöckl (2014) and aims to improve data collection on femicide as an individual crime, an individual practice in specific situations, and with specific intentions and motivations. The review acknowledges that femicide is also based in an unequal gender structure and is thus a form of 'structural violence', 'based on gender discrimination, sexism and misogyny, taking advantage of any of the relationships of trust, kinship, authority or other unequal power relationships with the victim' (CEGS, 2020, p. 14). It thus draws on the statement that the lack of 'international homogenisation' of statistical data on femicide/feminicide results in a multiplicity of definitions and the absence of common protocols for recording within statistical systems (CEGS, 2020, p. 12).

3.2. Lack of data on femicide

It is important to note at the outset, and as has been implied in the discussion above, that what is and is not defined in law as a criminal act frames the data that is and is not collected on such criminality. While there are different ways in which national governments and international organisations have endeavoured to overcome the limitations of what is and is not framed by the law (most notably by the introduction of criminal victimisation survey data and using other sources of administrative data), the presumption remains that any criminal code defines the behaviours considered to be acceptable/unacceptable in any particular national context. The role of the law in this regard renders efforts to harmonise counting practices difficult. For example, comparing data on homicide (which, in some jurisdictions, includes the killing of women) and/or data on femicide (which counts women more explicitly) with data on feminicide (which incorporates what counts as femicide differently again) is fraught with challenges. Thus, Dawson and Carrigan (2020) have stressed the importance of 'collecting more nuanced and appropriate information' (p. 2). In criminological and forensic investigations of femicide, the absence of comparable data collection and documentation standards, the use of non-obligatory reporting systems and a lack of awareness within criminal and medical investigations are frequently mentioned as limitations for research and statistical purposes and policy measures alike. This is especially evident in the forensic literature. The comparative analyses at Member State and international levels show that different organisations across the globe have started to gather and harmonise data on the gender-motivated killing of women (EIGE, 2021c). The EU-funded COST Action 'Femicide across Europe' was launched in 2013 to critically analyse femicide in Europe. This scientific network reflects on definitions, contexts and perpetrators of femicide, and also criticises the poor data situation on femicide across Europe (Weil et al., 2018). Corradi and Stöckl (2014) claim that there is a need to improve the comparability of data across European countries. They suggest studying whether policies on intimate partner violence and women's activism have an impact on intimate partner femicide, in order to assess the countries' approaches to preventing femicide. In order to do so, more countries will have to conduct 'secondary ana-

lyses on the context of IPH, including information on how many women reported previous IPV and the socio-demographic characteristics of the couple, to increase awareness and inform prevention strategies' (Corradi and Stöckl, 2014, p. 614). In a similar vein, in its #CallItFemicide campaign in 2019, the Canadian Femicide Observatory for Justice and Accountability (CFOJA) suggested variables that could be used to identify femicide.

There are very few concrete recommendations that go beyond a broadly framed request to improve investigation, documentation and reporting systems, or to train investigative and medical professionals. An exception is provided by Walby et al. (2017), who stressed that a shared measurement framework on basics is still lacking, and thus the development of measurements for all forms of gender-based violence, including femicide, is required. Collecting data for the measurement of femicide is seen as very challenging, even if 'homicide gets close to meeting the challenge' (Walby et al., 2017, p. 104), meaning that statistics on 'femicide (gender disaggregated homicide)' 'meet or nearly meet the criteria for indicators' and thus for gathering sound and reliable data on the number of femicides (p. 163). For Walby et al. (2017), the central measurement issue is not so much the law itself, but how the law results in measurement categories that can render gender more or less invisible. Thus, for them, in collecting data on acts of killing, however they might be defined in law, it is important to have data on the act itself, the sex of the perpetrator and the sex of the victim. They discuss homicide data collected by the UNODC / International Classification of Crime for Statistical Purposes (ICCS), which is disaggregated by the sex of the victim and the relationship between the victim and the offender, thereby allowing a femicide indicator to be built. However, Walby et al. (2017) admit 'weaknesses in comparability between countries on counting rules and in the completeness of nationally available data on the relationship between perpetrator and victim' (p. 163).

3.3. Under-reporting and invisibility of femicide through data gathering

One of the main limitations of existing data sets is under-reporting and rigid investigation, as well as the invisibility of femicide that happens outside the realm of intimate relationships (such as honour killings, dowry-related deaths and the killing of indigenous women and girls) (see above and Walklate et al., 2020, pp. 33–45). Even when the intimate partner is the perpetrator, the killing of female partners is systematically marginalised or made invisible in flawed data sets, making the 'invisibility of femicide' an issue requiring further contemplation (p. 62). Walklate et al. therefore emphasise the lack of scientific knowledge production and stress the risks of gathering data, suggesting that ongoing attention and reflections on methods of data gathering and knowledge production on femicide are needed (p. 65).

Other literature points to different mechanisms that render femicide invisible: Menjívar and Walsh (2017) put a spotlight on the complicity of the state, institutional violence and society through the ongoing practices of under-reporting and concealing femicide/feminicide. Dayan (2018) stresses the possible under-recording of femicide in Israel due to a lack of detailed investigations regarding femicide–suicide, since both victim and perpetrator are dead (Bosch-Fiol and Ferrer-Perez (2020) report the same issue in Spain).

In 'Killed out of love', on media coverage of intimate partner femicide in Hong Kong, Hernández (2017) highlights the differences in awareness of domestic violence within society, including among groups of professionals working on cases of potential femicide, as a contributing factor in under-reporting. Often only 'repeated and extreme infliction of physical harm' is counted as violence, and other harms, such as psychological harm, monetary control or any violation of women's rights, are not counted, and, as a result, are not considered risk factors for femicide (Hernández, 2017, p. 1456).

3.4. Biases in data gathering

One of the major biases discussed in the literature is ethnic and cultural bias. Only recently has Canada highlighted the problem of missing data on indigenous women and girls being killed (CFOJA, 2019). In their analyses of femicide in Canadian media coverage, Shier and Shor (2016) highlight the different treatment of femicide as culturalised and/or pathologised, depending on the reading of the perpetrator as belonging to the 'West' or the 'East'. The authors note that, through these explanations, biases of a modern, liberal, Western society and a traditional, patriarchal, Eastern world are reproduced, while complex and intersecting patterns, as well as dynamics of gender norms, patriarchy, misogyny and other forms of gender-related violence, are concealed. The COST Action network similarly stresses that it is important to be sensitive to intersectional factors causing femicide, such as cultural, social, economic and legislative contexts. However, the network is careful in referring to cultural contexts to explain femicide – in order to avoid essentialising certain communities by blaming their 'culture'; the network instead suggests collecting data on social norms, gender roles and ideas of femininity and masculinity (Grzyb et al., 2018). Nevertheless, it remains a challenge to classify the killing of migrants or indigenous women without discriminating against their communities. In a criminological study, Cullen et al. (2019) observe that it is impossible to identify victims as Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander women in current data sets, as no reliable information on ethnicity has been collected.

Another bias, described by Walklate et al. (2020), is the individualisation of femicide through counting procedures. In accordance with the critique of depoliticisation and oversimplification of counting, most data sets focus only on sex and are unable to capture the gender-related dynamics of femicide. They emphasise a focus on 'gender' (i.e. the gender identity of a person) and a 'gender-critical' analysis of counting femicide cases. Walklate et al. (2020) argue instead for a form of 'thick counts' that do not individualise the crime. Counting, they claim, should focus on the life and life strategies of women and perpetrators, as well as on their responsibilities (for others) and challenges. They argue that the assessment of risk factors of femicide should be situated within the 'structure, culture, time and space' of unequal gender relations (Walklate et al., 2020, p. 101). They also emphasise the danger or risk of forgetting 'the killing of women already marginalised' (p. 71). This risk already corrupts the data sets currently available (e.g. in the exposure of the ways in which administrative data can hide indigenous women's experiences, illustrated in the report of the National Inquiry into Missing and Murdered Indigenous Women and Girls emanating from Canada (Government of Canada, 2019). There are other features of femicide that could be hidden too; for example, the deaths of older women could be wrongly categorised as accidental, and failure to capture data on sexuality could mean that misogyny is not identified as a factor contributing to the killing of lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender (LGBT) people.

3.5. Data governance

The views described in this section are derived from the scientific literature review. Further considerations on the work of the responsible institutions are available in EIGE's *Measuring Femicide in the EU and Internationally: An assessment* (2021c) and *Femicide: A classification system* (2021e).

Walby et al. (2017) note the fragmentation of public data presentation and the insufficient accessibility of data. The authors suggest better coordination of data gathering and public data presentation, concluding that coordination should include 'providing the context in which agreement on indicators and benchmarks is agreed', 'providing guidance on the application of agreed definitions' of data collection and analysis, 'providing guidance on the methodology to be used to collect administrative data', and funding of research, as well as including stakeholders such as civil society organisations (Walby et al., 2017, p. 146). Walby et al. argue for a 'greater alignment' of different 'measurement practices' within and between countries (p. 160).

In an international comparison of domestic/family violence death reviews, Bugeja et al. (2015) conclude that the governance of domestic violence and femicide needs an 'appropriate surveillance body' that needs to 'recognise the ecological framework adopted by WHO [World Health Organization] in understanding violence and its prevention' (p. 186). Most of the death reviews examined worked on this basis. The UN Women report by Kendall (2020) offers some useful guidance on appropriate protocols for ensuring good governance of data on violence against women, including guidance on information sharing. However, good governance also implies procedures for ensuring that good practices are followed, and this implies accountability. Walklate et al. (2020, p. 101) suggest that, in such processes, accountability for women's lives and their untimely deaths needs to be made central.

4. Significant debates on factors and variables used to identify (types of) femicide

This section presents the types of femicide and the variables used to identify those types of femicide described in the literature. It presents the types of femicide discussed in the literature (see Section 4.1), followed by categories used to identify femicide (see Section 4.2). The literature on risk assessment of intimate partner violence is discussed in Section 4.3, and the forensic perspective on identifying femicide is addressed in Section 4.4. The section closes by summarising the descriptive variables available for identifying femicide for statistical purposes (see Section 4.5).

4.1. Types of femicide discussed in the research

The comparative analysis at Member State and international levels includes typologies of femicide used by national and international organisations, as well as those of the EU Member States.

Femicide definitions 'differ according to discipline, researcher, or geographical location', and these 'varying definitions demonstrate difficulties in defining, measuring, and comparing femicide and its subtypes' (Dawson and Carrigan, 2020, p. 6). This section briefly discusses different types of femicide. There is evidently overlap among the different types, but distinction is nevertheless helpful. The work of Dobash and Dobash (2015) represents an abundant resource on three distinct types of femicide: intimate partner femicide, sexual murder and femicide of women older than 65. Femicide–suicide and femicide of young women/girls are also considered, as these are discussed in the literature as specific types of femicide.

Intimate partner femicide

Dobash and Dobash (2015) focus on male perpetrators, excluding dating relationships / partnerships and family members with whom there is no marital or similar partnership. They thus restrict their study to one specific form of intimate partner femicide, which in Western countries 'accounts for a substantial share of all homicides' (Liem and Koenraadt, 2018, p. 59).

Similarly, the UNODC (2018) includes 'female victims of homicide perpetrated by intimate partners', as this form of femicide 'covers most gender-related killings of women'. The restriction is legitimised by the fact that data on intimate partner femicide 'is comparable and can be aggregated at global level' (UNODC, 2018, p. 8). The UNODC includes family members in its definition of intimate partner when considering intimate partner homicide, but the inclusion/exclusion of this group varies between the research articles reviewed here. In a typology of intimate homicide, Elisha et al. (2010) (in a qualitative study in Israel) identified three types of perpetrators based on risk factors and gendered motives for femicide: the 'betrayed husband' (jealousy), the 'abandoned obsessive lover' (separation) and 'the tyrant' (control). They conclude that personal characteristics need to be included in an interpersonal and environmental–familial context (pp. 505–512).

Sexual murder / femicide

Sexual homicide is a gendered crime (Van Patten and Delhauer, 2007). Dobash and Dobash (2015) define sexual murders as distinct from intimate partner killings, noting that the lack

of a standardised categorisation means that definitions vary from 'the very narrow that only include rape' ([11]) to a 'broad definition of acts contained within a murder that might be defined as sexual in nature' (p. 119). These acts include 'the removal of clothing, positioning of clothing, sexual posing of the body, and "substitute sexual activity" such as masturbation over or near the body' (p. 108). In addition, 'police officers and other criminal justice professionals may not be trained to search for indicators of a sexual component within the context of a murder' (p. 119). The victim–perpetrator relationship is important for assessing sexual murder. Research shows that, in cases of sexual murder, previous disputes or violence between the victim and the offender are rare (Dobash and Dobash, 2015). Myers et al. (2006) discuss – from a forensic perspective – the different motivations behind sexual homicide and prioritise the sexual motivation theory, while acknowledging that anger, power and control can be the motivation for sexual femicide ([12]).

Dobash and Dobash (2015) also analysed perpetrators of sexual femicide and identified the following general characteristics:

- the men were younger than their victims, and were unemployed, single or separated/divorced, and living on their own;
- the men had a history of sexual violence and/or physical violence against women;
- the men blamed women and claimed to have punished them for their resistance.

Femicide of women aged 65+

The killing of elderly women has received some attention in recent years (Academic Council on the United Nations System, 2017; CFOJA, 2019; Long et al., 2017). It is a prevalent form of femicide as a result of the specific vulnerability of this group. Women over 65 can become victims of their intimate partner, but also of men outside a partnership. Dobash and Dobash (2015) found that those killed outside an intimate relationship 'appear to have been selected because of their "extra" vulnerability of being both older and a woman' (p. 250). Most of the murders they analysed were committed by men from the same neighbourhood, with the perpetrators often unemployed and chronically intoxicated (p. 220). The study found that 'over three-quarters of the homicide–suicides among the elderly involved the killing of a woman by a male partner'. In many of these cases, 'jealousy, possessiveness, and separation' were apparent (p. 196).

Femicide–suicide

Femicide–suicide is a specific form of femicide in which the male perpetrator kills a woman (often his spouse) and then himself. In some cases, children are also victims (familicide) (Liem and Oberwittler, 2012). Intimate femicide–suicide is most often associated with jealousy and possessiveness, following a history of intimate partner violence. Risk factors include estrangement and gun ownership (Mathews et al., 2008). Balica (2016) assessed the characteristics of cases of homicide–suicide in Romania between 2002 and 2013, such as environment (urban/rural), the migratory status of victims and perpetrators, and the relationship and characteristics of victims and perpetrators. She also suggested taking into consideration time, motivation and modus operandi.

Teenage femicide

Garcia et al. (2007) found that one subgroup of intimate partner homicide is the killing of teenagers who began their relationship with the perpetrator during their teens, with the result that they neither received education on intimate partner violence nor developed an 'emotional support system' and, thus, did not seek help. A study on teenage femicide in Romania showed that 'jealousy associated with the sus-

([11]) For 'rape homicide', see Abrahams et al. (2008).
([12]) A literature review is available in Karakasi (2017).

picion of infidelity' was the motive for this form of intimate partner violence (Balica, 2018). However, this type of femicide also includes 'honour killings', in most cases committed by family members to allegedly save the honour of the family.

Other types of femicide

Femicide perpetrated outside the family sphere, such as 'killings of female sex workers or gender-related killings of women and girls in conflict situations', are mentioned in Dobash and Dobash (2015), but not extensively discussed. Some of the forensic literature considers the killing of women in prostitution a specific type of femicide and suggests that solving cases presents a particular challenge (Chan and Beauregard, 2019). One of the research focuses of the COST Action network is to distinguish different forms of femicide and to establish a broad typology of femicide, such as 'racist femicide', 'homophobic femicide' or 'lesbicide', 'marital femicide', 'serial femicide', 'mass femicide', 'women death as a result of misogynous attitudes or social practices', 'female infanticide' and 'unnecessary lethal surgery (hysterectomies, clitoridectomies)' (Baldry and Magalhaes, 2018, pp. 80–81). CEGS similarly defines several situations of femicide: intimate partner killings, the torture and misogynist slaying of women, honour killings and other harmful-practice-related killings, female genital mutilation, the targeted killing of women and girls in the context of armed conflict, and cases of femicide connected with gangs, organised crime, drug dealers, and trafficking in women and girls, as well as hate crimes against lesbians and transgender people (CEGS, 2020, p. 15).

4.2. Variables used to identify femicide

To identify femicide, it is necessary to follow a 'procedure allowing and helping to identify and obtain the different elements' of a killing and to assess the 'contexts, circumstances and individual behaviour' (Lorente, 2019, p. 8). This section introduces the main sources of variables for statistical purposes and data sets. The findings and analyses of these publications support each other, although their focuses differ in respect of spatial and institutional locations.

Walklate et al. (2020), among others, make the distinction between 'thin' counts of femicide and 'thick' counts. For them, 'thin' counts are found largely in administrative data, where the focus is on a killing, its causes and its categorisation within the criminal law. 'Thick' counts delve further into the nature and extent of untimely deaths whose cause can be attributed to the consequences of the stresses and strains of living with violence(s): slow femicide. Both 'thin' and 'thick' counts lend themselves to different forms of analysis, which, in turn, can be either thin or thick. Forms of 'thick' analyses ([13]) of femicide within the reviewed works include the research of Dobash and Dobash (2015) in the United Kingdom, and the work of Toprak and Ersoy (2017) in Turkey. Both publications engage in cross-examination of an abundance of data sets, with analyses and discussion that open up paths to deeper insights into the social and individual dynamics that enable femicide. Vives-Cases et al. (2016) provide an in-depth analysis of how to improve the counting and reporting systems for femicide at European level. The authors recommend institutionalising and standardising national data sets (criminal, legal, social, medical) across Europe and training professionals to use those data sets. They

([13]) The rationale behind 'thick analysis' is that data is never fully isolated or neutral. Taking into account a wider range of elements, context and interpretations, 'thick data' enhances the depth and breadth of data analysis by creatively combining several analysis methods, allowing for a more comprehensive analysis. Therefore, thick analysis offers a more qualitative and context-oriented dimension.

suggest gathering at least the following information: sex of victim and perpetrator, type of relationship between victim and perpetrator, prior history of domestic violence and previous institutional interventions.

The UNODC's *Global Study on Homicide* (2018) offers a detailed analysis and discussion of the available and comparable global data sets on gender-related killing of women and girls ([14]). The COST Action *'Femicide across Europe'* presents a detailed overview of research, data collection, policies and actions to analyse and combat femicide in Europe (Weil et al., 2018). *Towards a Global Femicide Index: Counting the costs*, connected to the Monash Gender and Family Violence Prevention Centre at Monash University (Australia), has no recommendations on the concrete elements, factors or variables that could be used to identify and count femicide (Walklate et al., 2020). Rather, it is a resource that abounds with ways to deal with the ethical and political ambiguities connected to practices of reporting and counting femicide cases from an engaged, accountable and reflective scientific standpoint. It concentrates on data collection and provides a complex and elaborate critique of the practices of counting and data collecting, while arguing for their importance from an intersectional perspective. Walby et al. (2017) suggest variables that could be used to create indicators to measure the prevalence of gender-based violence and femicide. Finally, CEGS (2020) discusses the criteria for identifying femicide, including developing variables and criteria to measure femicide for statistical purposes (see Section 5 for more detail on these variables).

Intentional/unintentional killing of women and gendered motivations

Major debates about femicide revolve around the issues of intentionality, gender-specific situations and/or gender-specific motivations for the killing of women. The presence or absence of an appreciation of intentionality is framed by the criminal law in any specific jurisdiction. Nevertheless, the ICCS considers femicide as a specific category of intentional homicide (Bisogno et al., 2015). Some authors discuss whether intentionality should be an element of defining or identifying femicide, while others argue that the killing of a woman can be an intentional or unintentional act. Killings with or without intention can be classified as femicide, depending on other variables, such as the power context of an intimate partnership or the gendered structure of the context of the killing (e.g. women in prostitution or other insecure fields of work). Intention alone is not a sufficient description of femicide. Dawson and Carrigan (2020) stress that 'under Russell's definition, intent is not required; the death of a female by her male partner is femicide even if he did not mean to kill her, referred to as "covert femicide"' (p. 4). Lorente (2019) claims that intentionality develops from the interaction at cultural, social, relational and individual levels. This interaction has a gendered background or is 'gendered'. 'Gender motivation' might build the intentionality of the femicide at the personal level of the perpetrator (p. 5) and, as intimated above, its recognition; as a result, the ability to count intentionality will be dependent upon the ways in which it is taken account of within the criminal law system.

Intentionality may be based on the idea of control and domination of women or on the idea that a woman's behaviour is an attack on the male position. Wanting to use and/or hating women may also lead to the intention to kill a woman (e.g. the killing of a woman in prostitution or of a women's rights activist, or killing a woman because of non-conforming sexual behaviour or gender identity) (Lorente, 2019). Therefore, femicide can happen in a traffic argument or in a bank robbery, for example if a woman is killed by a male robber who sees his plans disturbed by a woman and is therefore angry and hates the woman (p. 7). Thus, femicide, whether intentional or unintentional, must be seen as a process and not as an single incident.

([14]) For more detail, see EIGE (2021c).

Lorente (2019) distinguishes between three layers of gender motivation and intentionality of femicide.

- Firstly, gender-motivated behaviour is grounded in (gendered) culture, that is, in the general inequality of women and men, and in roles that patriarchy has dedicated to men and women. Men and women follow these cultural references; women are constructed in patriarchy as being the property of men, and men are allowed to exercise power and control over women (p. 3).

- Secondly, gender-motivated killings might be located in society, that is, in contexts where gendered behaviour is practised, and in the situation in which the killing took place, for example the gendered structure of intimate partnership, abortion or female genital mutilation (FGM).

- Thirdly, gender-motivated killing occurs at the relational level between persons (p. 2).

Similarly, CEGS (2020) frames femicide as structural gendered violence, 'based on gender discrimination, sexism and misogyny, taking advantage of any of the relationships of trust, kinship, authority or other unequal power relationships with the victim' (p. 14). Cunha and Goncalves (2019) stress that contextual factors such as 'patriarchy, sexism, and gender roles' should be included in analyses of femicide (p. 2591).

Located at these three levels, gender motivation for, and/or the genderedness of, the murder of women can be associated with 'men's attempts to control and punish women for actions they deem inappropriate' (Dobash and Dobash, 2015, p. 27). The authors point out that qualitative and quantitative studies have confirmed 'the importance of possessiveness and separation in the thinking of men who murder', as well as involvement of the notion of 'male privilege and authority' on issues such as 'money, domestic work, and the care and custody of children' (p. 27). Gender motivations for femicide might be defined as men wanting to control women, to 'use' them, to punish them for allegedly misbehaving and/or to re-establish the value of the man (Lorente, 2019). An interesting finding is that intimate murders do not come 'out of the blue'; rather, they are as premeditated as a 'decision to annihilate her' (Dobash and Dobash, 2015, pp. 29, 253) and accompanied by a rationalisation that justifies the killing as an act that is the victim's fault. Similarly, Cunha and Goncalves' (2019) results challenge the assumption of murder 'as an inexplicable and sudden event' (p. 2577). Rather, they claim that these offences are explicable (p. 2587). Another study confirming these dynamics is that of Johnson et al. (2017). Building their analysis on interviews with perpetrators of intimate partner femicide from the Australian Homicide Project, the authors posit that intimate partner femicide is a distinct form of gendered violence that can be the end result of relationships marked by the processes of 'coercive control'.

Pasini (2016) supports this aspect of masculinity with regard to intimate partner femicide and develops several aspects of gendered motives for femicide: '(1) badly managed male aggressiveness; (2) slavery in human relationships; (3) various forms of jealousy; (4) emotional dependency' (p. 7). Abrunhosa et al. (2020) add 'controlling behaviours' to that list (p. 4). Jealousy has been identified as a motive, triggered by separation or estrangement (Vatnar et al., 2019). Men frequently apply the notion 'If I can't have you, no one can', and thus the decision to kill an intimate partner is often taken when a woman leaves such a man (Dobash and Dobash, 2015; Weizmann-Henelius et al., 2012). In these cases, men often see themselves as victims of women's behaviour and think that their violence was appropriate and that the woman deserved to be killed (Dobash and Dobash, 2015).

Some research has focused attention on the nature of the cohabiting relationship (i.e. whether or not the cohabitees are married) as a possible variable relating to the presence/absence of violence. It is suggested that men in cohabiting relationships might feel 'less control over their partners' and 'more threatened by intersexual competition' (Shackelford and Mouzos, 2015, p. 1322). This view suggests that these men are more likely (than married men) to be violent towards their partner or kill her, 'because these relationships are more prone

to dissolution and to infiltration by competitive males' (Cunha and Goncalves, 2019, p. 2587). Other work has also pointed to the age disparity between partners as a factor contributing to femicide, with men who are older than their female partners often wanting to exercise power and control over women (Dobash and Dobash, 2015; Sebire, 2017).

4.3. Risk factors and risk assessment

The major purposes of quantitative scientific work on gender-based homicide are to study the prevalence of this crime, the risk factors for domestic violence or intimate partner violence and the relationship that such factors might have with femicide. Both require sound and solid data. Secondary analyses of existing data try to identify risk factors for gender-based violence and femicide, with a focus on intimate partner homicide. These studies aim to establish femicide and intimate partner homicide (as the most common form of femicide) as crimes in their own right, rather than as a subcategory of homicide in general. In their review of the literature on homicide and intimate partner violence, Garcia et al. (2007) identified important dimensions of an assessment of intimate partner violence that might lead to femicide: gender, marital status, age, ethnicity and race, pregnancy, circumstances (e.g. separation), weapons and alcohol use (Campbell et al., 2003; Garcia et al., 2007; Karbeyaz et al., 2018 (for Turkey); Nicolaidis et al., 2003; Zara et al., 2019 (for Italy)) ([15]). Frye et al. (2008) scrutinised the role of neighbourhood environment and found that 'social disorganisation' of neighbourhoods in New York City (poverty, lack of relationships between neighbours) was not a significant risk factor. In Wisconsin, by contrast, Beyer et al. (2015) found that neighbourhood (social and cultural structure) plays a role in understanding intimate partner femicide as different from other forms of femicide ([16]). These findings point to the difficulties in identifying one all-embracing explanatory framework. Nevertheless, work of this kind has contributed to the growth and development of risk assessment instruments.

For example, Campbell et al. (2009) focused on the development and validation of one such instrument, the Danger Assessment (DA) tool: 'an instrument designed to assess risk factors for IPH' (p. 654) ([17]). In the light of the development of these kinds of tools, Messing et al. (2013) stress the importance of migration and demand a 'culturally competent intimate partner violence risk assessment' (p. 265), pointing to the fact that immigrant women experience specific vulnerabilities, such as dependence on their husband's immigrant status.

Many of these studies assume a continuum of intimate partner violence and intimate partner homicide and/or that intimate partner violence escalates into intimate partner homicide. However, the assumption of escalation has rarely been subjected to thorough investigation (Boxall and Lawler, 2021). Boxall and Lawler excavate the concept of escalation and point out that it can mean different things (e.g. escalation of the nature of the violence or its frequency). This work also points out that not all violence in relationships escalates. The key issue is knowing in which relationships escalation is most likely to happen. To date, research has found that 'previous domestic violence is a major risk factor for IPH in males' (Weizmann-Henelius et al., 2012, p. 1520). 'Across studies of risk factors for IPH, prior IPV is clearly the most common risk factor' (Campbell et al., 2009, p. 656). Dobash and Dobash (2015) found that 'ongoing disputes, and previous violence to the victim' are indicators for intimate partner homicide (p. 248). Similarly, Stöckl and Devries' (2013) in-depth study concludes that 'the reduction of intimate partner violence could lower homicide rates worldwide' (p. 1625). The aim of a number of studies is to assess 'lethality in violent intimate relationships' (Campbell et al., 2007, p. 260; Zara and Gino, 2018). At the same time, however, Sebire's study showed that 'not all relationship abuse results in lethal violence' (2017,

([15]) Zara et al. (2019) stress the importance of the link between abusive relations and intimate partner femicide.
([16]) See Beyer et al. (2013) for differences between urban and rural settings.
([17]) For an evaluation of risk assessment tools, see Graham et al. (2019).

p. 1494); in a similar vein, Abrunhosa et al. (2020) claim that, based on their research, 'violence perpetration (i.e. frequency of marital violence and prior history of violence) are not predictors' of intimate partner homicide (p. 15).

Overall, the research agrees on the following risk factors: the abuser being older than the woman (with a large age gap), cohabitating (rather than married), estrangement of partners, a child in the home who is not the biological child of the abuser, mental illness, alcohol and drug use, prior criminal involvement of the perpetrator and the presence of firearms in the home (Campbell et al., 2009; Carabellese et al., 2014 (for Italy)) ([18]). Following these findings, Campbell et al. (2009) added five new items to the original 15-item DA: abuser unemployment, a child who is not the offspring of the abuser, stalking behaviour by the abuser, the victim leaving the abuser after living together and the abuser being violent outside the home. A meta-analysis of risk factors for male perpetrators and female victimisation by Spencer and Stith (2020) points to the importance of 'exposure reduction' of intimate partner violence. The exposure reduction hypothesis views femicide as the end result of an escalating continuum and suggests that the likelihood that it will occur can be decreased by reducing the duration of contact with a violent partner (i.e. exposure) (Dugan et al., 2003; Reckdenwald and Parker, 2012).

In brief, the largely quantitative research yields the following – albeit contested – list of risk factors for intimate partner homicide ([19]):

- age of victim and perpetrator (woman significantly younger than man),
- abuser unemployment ([20]),
- mental illness (of victim and/or perpetrator),
- alcohol and/or drug abuse (of victim and/or perpetrator),
- form of relationship (higher risk if couple is cohabiting rather than married),
- pregnancy of woman,
- estrangement of couple,
- victim leaving the abuser after living together,
- coercive and controlling behaviour of perpetrator,
- violent and/or stalking behaviour by abuser (physical, psychological and/or sexualised violence) (former police measures against offender might lower the risk of ongoing domestic violence and intimate partner femicide),
- aggression against children,
- previous death threats to victim,
- abuser being violent outside the home,
- a child who is not the offspring of the abuser,
- presence of firearms in the home,
- immigrant status of victim and perpetrator ([21]).

([18]) For a comparison across 15 nations on the intersection of firearms and intimate partner homicide, see Zeoli et al. (2020).

([19]) The assessment of risk factors varies according to the region and time of the study, the availability of data and the epistemological and political position of the researchers. For example, Aldrige and Browne (2003), CFOJA (2019) and Corradi et al. (2016) reviewed a broad range of literature and data on risk factors, while Yilmaz et al. (2015) assessed risk factors in Turkey, Pereira et al. (2013) assessed risk factors in Portugal' and Abrahams et al. (2013) assessed risk factors in South Africa. Meel (2018), also in South Africa, stresses that poverty and human immunodeficiency virus (HIV) infection are risk factors, while Mathews et al. (2011) point to cultures of masculinity in South Africa.

([20]) Torrubiano-Dominguez et al. (2015) found that unemployment during the financial crisis had no effect on intimate partner femicide in Spain.

([21]) For risk and DA, see WHO (2012), *Understanding and Addressing Violence against Women: Femicide* (https://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/handle/10665/77421/WHO_RHR_12.38_eng.pdf?sequence=1); UN Women, *Latin American model protocol for the investigation of gender-related killings of women (femicide/feminicide*, p. 78 (https://lac.unwomen.org/en/digiteca/publicaciones/2014/10/modelo-de-protocolo).

4.4. Forensic perspective on identifying femicide

Forensic sciences focus on collecting and analysing scientific evidence during the criminal investigation for solving cases and prosecuting offenders, and provide a scientific basis for convictions. Both aims need specific and well-defined processes and variables. The literature reviewed here prioritises the victim's demographic characteristics and relationships, the location of the killing, the place where the victim was found, the modus operandi of the killing and the positioning of the victim's body (crime scene characteristics (Stein et al., 2010)). These factors and variables must be included in the documentation and investigation of the killing, as they allow conclusions to be drawn regarding the motivation for the murder, and thus the identity of the perpetrator (Fong et al., 2016 (for Taiwan)). Moreschi et al. (2016) reviewed cases of female homicide in an Italian region, with the aim of detecting the importance of documenting 'socio-demographic characteristics of victims and perpetrators, and the circumstances and risk factors surrounding the crimes' (p. 65).

Analysis of the crime scene is important when investigating a sexual homicide. In establishing the sexual motivation, the literature refers to the following factors: 'Adjustment or removal of the victim's clothing, seminal fluid on or near the body, sexual injury / sexual mutilation, sexualised positioning of the body, foreign object insertion and overkill type of injuries' (Häkkänen-Nyholm et al., 2009, p. 125; Myers et al., 2017, p. 940). In order to improve 'offender profiling', Chan et al. (2010) suggested including data on race and age in forensic investigations. Cases of 'staged murder' or 'concealed femicide' are discussed in the literature and are particularly instructive for highlighting data collection issues (Bitton and Dayan, 2019). Here, the exact documentation of the crime scene can help to determine if a woman has been murdered, rather than having committed suicide, thereby leading to the establishment of the motivation for the killing and identifying a case of femicide. Bitton and Dayan (2019) suggest redefining 'suspicion' in cases of women's death to include 'concealed femicide' (often staged as suicide). Suspicious death, by definition, occurs not 'out of place', but in a woman's home. Bitton and Dayan also suggest several circumstances that, if present, should lead a death to be described as suspicious, for example a woman's alleged suicide, the wish of one partner to end a relationship, prior domestic violence and the death of a woman in her own home. Rules and agreed procedures are needed for post-mortem examinations of women who have died in potentially suspicious circumstances, as are dedicated 'fatality review boards' (Bitton and Dayan, 2019, pp. 1069–1071).

4.5. Descriptive variables to identify femicide for statistical purposes

This section first summarises the descriptive variables used for identifying femicide that are discussed in the reviewed literature. To determine femicide, the gender motive and the 'gender-saturatedness' of killing women (Walby et al., 2017, p. 59), the literature refers to characteristics of the victim and the perpetrator, the relationship of the victim and the perpetrator, the situation of the murder, and cultural and social contexts. Similarly, Vives-Cases et al. (2016) suggest the following minimum variables: sex of the victim and the perpetrator, type of relationship between them, prior history of domestic violence and previous institutional interventions. Walby et al. (2017) suggest differentiating between three units of measurement – victim, perpetrator and event or incident – and collecting disaggregated data for the three units. Further information on records of previous violence, convictions and sanctions might help to assess the gendered structure of femicide.

Perpetrator and victim characteristics

Liem and Koenraadt (2018) stress that intimate partners should include not only spouses but also ex-spouses and persons in current or former de facto relationships, such as boyfriends, girlfriends or partners in same-sex relationships. Dobash et al. (2004) highlight the 'conventional guy' appearance of men who kill women in comparison with those who kill men, with their later book confirming that men who

kill women in intimate relations tend to be more 'conventional' or 'less disadvantaged' than other types of homicide perpetrators (Dobash and Dobash, 2015, p. 97). Follow-up studies showed that perpetrators of intimate partner homicide are a distinct group of homicide perpetrators whose sociodemographic histories do not stand out when compared with those of the general population. Caman et al. (2016) found that intimate partner homicide perpetrators in Sweden are less socially disadvantaged than non-intimate partner homicide perpetrators, with the former less likely to have a prior conviction. This argument is supported by a study on femicide in Turkey, which found that femicide perpetrators were much less likely than perpetrators of other types of homicide to have mental health issues or criminal records (Toprak and Ersoy, 2017). In addition to the 'conventional' murder type, men who kill women were found to have shown misogynistic thinking and violent behaviours during their lifespan. 'In short, men who murder women tend to "specialise" in perpetrating violence against women' (Dobash and Dobash, 2015, p. 249).

In an in-depth study of 11 intimate partner sex offenders, Weldon (2015) presents five implicit theories held by men about women ([22]). These are consistent with the findings of Dobash and Dobash (2015): normalisation of violence, desire to remain in control, implication of the act as a consequence of the actions of the partner and thereby blaming the victim, diminishing personal responsibility by blaming the incident on intoxication or being out of control, and perception of self as not a criminal or offender (also described as a dynamic of denial). (See also Gilchrist (2009) for an alternative taxonomy of implicit theories on intimate partner violence.)

Studies on risk factors for femicide suggest some important variables that help to identify these risks, including perpetrators' substance abuse (Abrunhosa et al., 2020; Weizmann-Henelius et al., 2012), unemployment (while high school education is seen as a protective factor for intimate partner violence and femicide) or 'emotional states' resulting from separation from the victim (Abrunhosa et al., 2020, p. 15).

Studies on the characteristics of victims of intimate partner homicide and non-intimate partner homicide are conflicting in some respects, but it is generally agreed that age is an important factor in intimate partner homicide. An example is found in the United States, with 'cohabiting women who are middle aged incurring the highest uxoricide risk' (Shackelford and Mouzos, 2015, pp. 1319–1321). An Australian study showed that women 'in cohabiting relationships' have a much higher uxoricide risk than women in marital relationships, especially younger women. The pattern is different in the United States, with 'cohabiting women who are middle aged incurring the highest uxoricide risk' (Shackelford and Mouzos, 2015, pp. 1319–1321).

Some variables in the studies stand out for their rarity or omission: pregnancy; the involvement of children (as witnesses, collateral victims or bereaved through the murder); occupation/profession of the victim; the involvement of women in prostitution; protective strategies used by the victim; the involvement of political activists; the involvement of gender and lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, intersex, queer and other (LGBTIQ+) people; health status; and able-bodiedness. Interestingly, some research shows that previous arrest of the abuser for domestic violence decreases the risk of intimate partner homicide (Weizmann-Henelius, 2012), although it is also evident that the risks of further violence increase post arrest, particularly for women belonging to ethnic minority groups (Sherman et al., 1991).

Overall, the literature suggests that solid data on intimate partner homicide must include the characteristics of the perpetrator and the victim, and should include the characteristics of the incident (Caman et al., 2016). Factors usually taken into consideration are criminal records, substance abuse, intoxication at the time of the offence and child-

([22]) The broader term 'implicit theories' refers to those sets of a priori basic beliefs that people use to understand their world and to guide their behaviour. In the specific case, Weldon (2015) refers to those gendered myths and shared beliefs on gender-based violence and intimate partner violence.

hood victimisation, but the motivational aspect of the offences is, however, missing. Chantler et al. (2019) identify as factors to be taken into consideration the gender, age and ethnicity of the perpetrator and victim ('victim and perpetrator profiles') (p. 486) and 'risk indicators' such as mental health difficulties, alcohol and housing problems, previous violent behaviour of the perpetrator, history of previous domestic violence, movement across borders or within the country and victims' language problems.

Prior history of domestic violence and former protective sanctions

Vives-Cases et al. (2016) claim that prior history of domestic violence and previous institutional interventions should be acknowledged as important elements in recording femicide. Similarly, Koppa and Messing (2019) suggest recording previous (including failed) efforts to seek help and protective actions/strategies used by victims prior to their murder. This, they argue, helps to better understand the dynamics of the murder of women and to develop preventive policies and actions. Their suggestion is supported by an Italian study that points out that histories of domestic and intimate violence are very likely to be under-reported within healthcare data systems (Mamo et al., 2015). Of course, this work takes as given involvement in the criminal justice system, since the data on which it is based is frequently rooted in that source of data. It is equally important to remember that many women are killed by their partners/ex-partners who have had no engagement with the criminal justice system or any other professional agency (see, for example, Thornton, 2017). This serves as a reminder of the importance of contextualising what is and what is not known about the nature and extent of femicide within the broader context of gender inequalities.

Situation, incident and event of murder

Motivations for the killing of women should be viewed not only individually, but as grounded in patriarchal social structures, such as gender roles within partnerships, prohibitive abortion laws, trafficking of women, FGM and 'honour crimes' (Grzyb et al., 2018). 'Individuals engaged in prostitution are at particular risk of becoming victims of homicide' (Skott et al., 2021).

The findings of Dobash and Dobash (2015) on the murder event reflect the common findings of research on intimate partner homicide, with the murder typically occurring in or near the home of the couple or the woman, and involving one or more of beating, kicking, hitting, choking, stabbing and strangling. For example Dobash and Dobash (2015, p. 64) reported 'A few of the murders involved more than 100 injuries'. On the method of killing, some findings differentiate the killing of women from that of men, including 'the use of a ligature and strangulation' and show that 'older women were often suffocated' (Dobash and Dobash, 2015, p. 248). One possible finding in a forensic investigation is 'overkilling', which might be an indicator for killing motivated by rage against the woman, and/or revenge (Aldridge and Browne, 2003). Somewhat more unusual is the finding of 'collateral murders', that is, the killing of 'those close to the victim' with the goal of punishing or hurting the victim even further, without necessarily killing them (Aldridge and Browne, 2003).

Summary of the literature review

This section closes with a brief summary of the factors identified in our review of the literature and/or suggested in the CEGS (2020) as identifying the killing of a woman as femicide:

- the aggressor has had a relationship with the victim or tried to establish/re-establish a relationship;
- the aggressor has exercised previous acts of violence (in the public or private sphere);
- the act occurs within a family relationship;
- reasons of honour, family reputation or religious beliefs are alleged as justification;
- pregnancy of the woman is a motive;

- hate crime against lesbians and transgender persons;
- hate crime against women's rights and political activists or journalists;
- murder as interfering with the political rights of the victim;
- other circumstances of subordination of the victim as a result of gender power relations;
- murder as part of the activities of a criminal group or gang ritual;
- situation of sex exploitation or sex trafficking;
- killing in armed conflict, where women are considered an enemy;
- the act occurs within the constellation of sexual violence
- overkilling;
- the woman was held incommunicado (in any situation);
- situations of harmful practices such as FGM.

The factors that identify the killing of a woman as femicide are summarised in the following section.

5. Towards descriptive variables for identifying femicide for statistical purposes

Several practical suggestions for investigative practices were found in the UN Women's *Latin American model protocol for the investigation of gender-related killings of women.* These were summarised by Dawson and Carrigan (2020) and Fitz-Gibbon et al. (2018), and mentioned in the UNODC's *Global Study on Homicide* (2018) and Weil et al. (2018). The latest document by CEGS aims to operationalise femicide for statistical purposes, including through 'criteria and variables' for identifying femicide/feminicide, as well as 'the criterion algorithms to meet each one', that is, to create an indicator of the prevalence of femicide/feminicide (CEGS, 2020, p. 6).

The following descriptive variables for identifying femicide combine elements from the literature reviewed. They should first help to develop protocols to allow killings to be identified as femicide, and then facilitate the extraction of cases of femicide from administrative data records for further statistical purposes.

These variables and their value are revisited in EIGE's proposed classification system on femicide (EIGE, 2021e).

5.1. Minimum data

Characteristics of victim and perpetrator

1. Victim

- Sex and gender.
- Sociodemographic data (age / date of birth, marital status, education, occupation, employment status, income, ethnicity, migration status, country of birth, citizenship/nationality, birth country of parents, country of residence, children, disability).
- Intoxication status.
- Non-conforming sexual behaviour or gender identity.
- Victim of sexual(ised) abuse/violence.
- Woman in prostitution or victim of sexual exploitation.
- Pregnancy.
- Presence of a child who is not the offspring of the perpetrator.

2. Perpetrator

- Sex and gender.
- Sociodemographic data (age/date of birth, marital status, education, occupation, employment status, income, ethnicity, migration status, country of birth, citizenship/nationality, birth country of parents, country of residence, children, disability).
- Prior history of violence against women.
- Intoxication status.
- Prior violence record (in public and/or private).

3. Relationship of victim and perpetrator

- Intimate relationship and family members:
  - intimate or sexual partners (cohabiting or not cohabiting, cohabiting in the past, curent partner or past partner),
  - family members or relatives (cohabiting or not cohabiting, cohabiting in the past).
- Other acquaintance:
  - perpetrator is an authority figure or has a care relationship;

  - perpetrator is a supervisor, employer or teacher;
  - pepetrator is a friend or acquaintance of the family of the victim;
  - perpetrator is a friend or acquaintance of the victim;
  - care relationship.
- Non-intimate relationship:
  - members of paramilitary or armed groups;
  - members of armed governmental forces;
  - unknown.

4. Circumstances surrounding the killing

- Crime scene and location of the murder.
- Prior domestic violence, protection orders, services used (by victim).
- Prostitution, sexual exploitation.
- Sexual(ised) abuse/violence.
- Degrading injuries to victim's body.
- Mutilation of victim's body.
- Harmful practices (FGM, illegal abortion).
- Part of activities of organised criminal group.
- Victim in line of fire when aggressor wanted to kill another woman.

5. Modus operandi / characteristics of killing situation / incident

- Availability/use of weapons.
- Ligature, strangulation.
- Position of the victim's body.
- Sexual abuse.
- Overkilling.

6. Gender motives

- Background / risk factors, such as gender inequality and dependency, economic situation / deprivation, prior domestic violence.
- Victim's intention to break up the relationship.
- Pregnancy of the victim.
- Custody conflict.
- Child who is not the offspring of the perpetrator.
- Economic problems.
- Jealousy.
- Possessiveness.
- Controlling behaviour.
- Prior history of violence against women.
- Hate motivated (lesbian or transgender victim, as well as women's rights activists, journalists and politicians).
- Alleged reasons of honour, family reputation, religious belief.
- Other criminal activity involved.
- Impeding the exercise of the victim's rights.

Additional data

The COST Action network suggests including additional background data on the following:

- general estimates of the prevalence of femicide,
- development over time,
- convictions for / state reactions to / laws on gender-based violence (Schröttle and Meshkova, 2018; Walby et al., 2017).

References

Abrahams, N., Martin, L. J., Jewkes, R., Mathews, S., Vetten, L. and Lombard, C. (2008), 'The epidemiology and the pathology of suspect rape homicide in South Africa', *Forensic Science International*, Vol. 178, pp. 132–138.

Abrahams, N., Mathews, S., Martin, L. J., Lombard, C. and Jewkes, R. (2013), 'Intimate partner femicide in South Africa in 1999 and 2009', *PLOS Medicine*, Vol. 10, No 4, pp. 1–8.

Abrunhosa, C., de Castro Rodrigues, A. and Cruz, A. R. (2020), 'Crimes against women: from violence to homicide', *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, pp. 1–24.

Academic Council on the United Nations System (ACUNS) (2017), *Femicide Volume VIII – Abuse and femicide of the older woman*, Vienna Liaison Office (https://www.unsavienna.org/index.php/en/cases/femicide-vol-viii-abuse-and-femicide-older-woman).

Acero Álvares, A. (2010), 'Aproximaciones a los conceptos de femicidio, feminicidio y homicidio en mujeres. Bases para su medición', *Boletín Epidemiológico*, Vol. 1, No 1, Centro de Referencia Regional sobre Violencia – CRRV, Dirección Regional Bogotá.

Aldridge, M. L. and Browne, K. D. (2003), 'Perpetrators of spousal homicide: a review', *Trauma, Violence, and Abuse*, Vol. 4, No 3, pp. 265–276.

Alisic, E., Groot, A., Snetselaar, H., Stroeken, T. and van de Putte, E. (2017), 'Children bereaved by fatal intimate partner violence: a population-based study into demographics, family characteristics and homicide exposure', *PLOS ONE*, Vol. 12, No 10, pp. 1–13.

Baldry, A. C. and Magalhaes, M. J. (2018), 'Prevention of femicide', in Weil, S., Corradi, C. and Naudi, M. (eds), *Femicide across Europe – Theory, research and prevention*, COST: Policy Papers, Policy Press, Bristol, pp. 71–92.

Balica, E. (2016), *Homicide–Suicides in Romania: Statistical data and media representations*, Peter Lang, New York.

Balica, E. (2018), 'Young intimate femicide in Romania. Incidence and risk factors', *Anthropological Researches and Studies*, Vol. 8, pp. 15–24.

Beyer, K. M. M., Layde, P. M., Hamberger, K. L. and Laud, P. W. (2013), 'Characteristics of the residential neighborhood environment differentiate intimate partner femicide in urban versus rural settings', *Journal of Rural Health*, Vol. 29, No 3, pp. 281–293.

Beyer, K. M. M., Layde, P. M., Hamberger, K. L. and Laud, P. W. (2015), 'Does neighborhood environment differentiate intimate partner femicides from other femicides?', *Violence Against Women*, Vol. 21, No 1, pp. 49–64.

Bisogno, E., Dawson-Faber, J. and Jandl, M. (2015), 'The International Classification of Crime for Statistical Purposes: a new instrument to improve comparative criminological research', *European Journal of Criminology*, Vol. 12, No 5, pp. 535–550.

Bitton, Y. and Dayan, H. (2019), '"The perfect murder": an exploratory study of staged murder scenes and concealed femicide', *British Journal of Criminology*, Vol. 59, No 5, pp. 1054–1075.

Bosch-Fiol, E. and Ferrer-Perez, V. A. (2020), 'Femicide, intimate partner violence and legal complaints in Spain', *Journal of Gender Studies*, Vol. 29, No 2, pp. 187–201.

Boxall, H. and Lawler, S. (2021), 'How does domestic violence escalate over time?', *Trends and Issues in Crime and Criminal Justice*, No 626, Australian Institute of Criminology, Canberra. (https://www.aic.gov.au/publications/tandi/tandi626).

Bradbury-Jones, C., Appleton, J. V., Clark, M. and Paavilainen, E. (2019), 'A profile of gen-

der-based violence research in Europe: findings from a focused mapping review and synthesis', *Trauma, Violence, and Abuse*, Vol. 20, No 4, pp. 470–483.

Bugeja, L., Dawson, M., McIntyre, S. J. and Walsh, C. (2015), 'Domestic/family violence death reviews: an international comparison', *Trauma, Violence, and Abuse*, Vol. 16, No 2, pp. 179–187.

Caman, S., Howner, K., Kristiansson, M. and Sturup, J. (2016), 'Differentiating intimate partner homicide from other homicide: a Swedish population-based study of perpetrator, victim, and incident characteristics', *Psychology of Violence*, Vol. 7, No 2, pp. 306–315.

Campbell, J. C., Webster, D., Koziol-McLain, J., Block, C., Campbell, D., Curry, M. A., Gary, F., Glass, N., McFarlane, J., Sachs, C., Sharps, P., Ulrich, Y., Wilt, S. A., Manganello, J., Xu, X., Schollenberger, J., Frye, V. and Laughon, K. (2003), 'Risk factors for femicide in abusive relationships: results from a multisite case control study', *American Journal of Public Health*, Vol. 93, No 7, pp. 1089–1097.

Campbell, J. C., Glass, N., Sharps, P. W., Laughon, K. and Bloom, T. (2007), 'Intimate partner homicide: review and implications of research and policy', *Trauma, Violence, and Abuse*, Vol. 8, No 3, pp. 246–269.

Campbell, J. C., Webster, D. W. and Glass, N. (2009), 'The danger assessment: validation of a lethality risk assessment instrument for intimate partner femicide', *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, Vol. 24, No 4, pp. 653–674.

Caputi J. and Russell D. E. H. (1990), 'Femicide: speaking the unspeakable', *The World of Women,* Vol. 1, No 2, pp. 34–37.

Carabellese, F., Tamma, M., La Tegola, D., Candelli, C. and Catanesi, R. (2014), 'Women victims of violent partners: the Italian situation amid culture and psychopathology', *Journal of Forensic Sciences*, Vol. 59, No 2, pp. 533–539.

CEGS (Global Centre of Excellence on Gender Statistics) (2020), *Operationalisation of Gender-related Killings of Women and Girls, Femicide/Feminicide: Towards a standardised measurement*, CEGS, UN Women (grey literature; article under revision).

CFOJA (Canadian Femicide Observatory for Justice and Accountability) (2019), *#CallItFemicide: Understanding gender-related killings of women and girls in Canada 2019*, CFOJA (https://www.femicideincanada.ca/home/allreports).

Chan, H. C. O. and Beauregard, E. (2019), 'Prostitute homicides: a 37-year exploratory study of the offender, victim, and offense characteristics', *Forensic Science International*, Vol. 294, pp. 196–203.

Chan, H. C. O., Myers, W. C. and Heide, K. M. (2010), 'An empirical analysis of 30 years, of US juvenile and adult sexual homicide offender data: race and age differences in the victim–offender relationship', *Journal of Forensic Sciences*, Vol. 55, No 5, pp. 1282–1290.

Chantler, K., Robbins, R., Baker, V. and Stanley, N. (2019), 'Learning from domestic homicide reviews in England and Wales', *Health and Social Care*, Vol. 28, No 2, pp. 485–493.

Cheng, P. and Jaffe, P. (2019), 'Examining depression among perpetrators of intimate partner homicide', *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, Vol. 57, pp. 1–22.

Corradi, C. and Stöckl, H. (2014), 'Intimate partner homicide in 10 European countries: statistical data and policy developments in cross-national perspective', *European Journal of Criminology*, Vol. 11, No 5, pp. 601–618.

Corradi, C., Marcuello-Servós, C., Boira, S. and Weil, S. (2016), 'Theories of femicide and their significance for social research', *Current Sociology*, Vol. 64, No 7, pp. 975–995.

Criado Perez, C. (2019), *Invisible Women: Exposing data bias in a world designed for men*, Abrams, New York.

Cullen, P., Vaughan, G., Li, Z. and Price, J. (2019), 'Counting dead women in Australia: an in-depth

case review of femicide', *Journal of Family Violence*, Vol. 34, pp. 1–9.

Cullen, P., Dawson, M., Price, J. and Rowlands J. (2021), 'Intersectionality and invisible victims: reflections on data challenges and vicarious trauma in femicide, family and intimate partner homicide research', *Journal of Family Violence*, Vol. 36, pp. 619–628.

Cunha S. O. and Goncalves A. R. (2019), 'Predictors of intimate partner homicide in a sample of Portuguese male domestic offenders', *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, Vol. 34, No 2, pp. 2573–2598.

Dawson, M. (2017), *Domestic Homicides and Death Reviews: An international perspective*, Palgrave Macmillan, London.

Dawson, M. and Carrigan, M. (2020), 'Identifying femicide locally and globally: understanding the utility and accessibility of sex/gender-related motives and indicators', *Current Sociology*, pp. 1–23.

Dawson, M., Mathews, S., Abrahams, N. and Campbell, J. (2017), 'Death reviews in the context of domestic homicide in low to middle-income countries: South Africa as a case study', in Dawson, M. (ed.), *Domestic Homicides and Death Reviews: An international perspective*, Palgrave Macmillan, London, pp. 345–372.

Dayan, H. (2018), 'Sociocultural aspects of femicide–suicide: the case of Israel', *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, Vol. 28, No 4, pp. 1–19.

Dobash, R. E. and Dobash, R. P. (2015), *When Men Murder Women*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Dobash, R. E., Dobash, R. P., Cavanagh, K. and Lewis, R. (2004), 'Not an ordinary killer – just an ordinary guy: when men murder an intimate woman partner', *Violence Against Women*, Vol. 10, No 6, pp. 577–605.

Dugan, L., Nagin, D. S. and Rosenfeld, R. (2003), 'Exposure reduction or retaliation? The effects of domestic violence resources on intimate-partner homicide', *Law and Society Review*, Vol. 37, No 1, pp. 169–198.

Edwards, S. (1994), 'Reviews', *British Journal of Criminology*, Vol. 34, No 3, pp. 399–491.

EIGE (2021c), *Measuring Femicide in the EU and Internationally: An assessment*, Publications of the European Union, Luxembourg.

EIGE (2021e), *Femicide: A classification system*, Publications Office of the European Union, Luxembourg.

Elisha, E., Idisis, Y. and Timor, U. (2010), 'Typology of intimate partner homicide: personal, interpersonal, and environmental characteristics of men who murdered their female intimate partner', , *Publications Office of the European Union, Luxembourg* , Vol. 54, No 4, pp. 494–516.

Fairbairn, J., Jaffé, P. and Dawson, M. (2017), 'Challenges in defining domestic homicide: considerations for research and practice', in Dawson, M. (ed.), *Domestic Homicides and Death Reviews: An international perspective*, Palgrave Macmillan, London, pp. 201–228.

Ferguson, C. (2015), 'Staged homicides: an examination of common features of faked burglaries, suicides, accidents and car accidents', *Journal of Police and Criminal Psychology*, Vol. 30, No 3, pp. 139–157.

Ferrara, P., Caporale, O., Cutrona, C., Sbordone, A., Amato, M., Spina, G., Ianniello, F., Fabrizio, G. C., Guadagno, C., Basile, M. C., Miconi, F., Perrone, G., Riccardi, R., Verrotti, A, Pettoello-Mantovani, M., Villani, A., Corsello, G. and Scambia, G. (2015), 'Femicide and murdered women's children: which future for these children orphans of a living parent?', *Italian Journal of Pediatrics*, Vol. 41, No 68.

Fitz-Gibbon, K., Walklate, S., McCulloch, J. and Maher, J. M. (2018), *Intimate Partner Violence, Risk and Security: Securing women's lives in a global world*, Routledge, London and New York.

Fong, W. L., Pan, C. H., Lee, J. C., Lee, T. T. and Hwa, H. L. (2016), 'Adult femicide victims in forensic autopsy in Taiwan: a 10-year retrospective study', *Forensic Science International*, Vol. 266, pp. 80–85.

Frye, V., Galea, S., Tracy, M., Bucciarelli, A., Putnam, S. and Wilt S. (2008), 'The role of neighborhood environment and risk of intimate partner femicide in a large urban area', *American Journal of Public Health*, Vol. 98, No 8, pp. 1473–1479.

Frye, V., Hosein, V., Waltermaurer, E., Blaney, S. and Wilt, S. (2016), 'Femicide in New York City', *Homicide Studies*, Vol. 9, No 3, pp. 204–228.

Garcia, L., Soria, C. and Hurwitz, E. L. (2007), 'Homicides and intimate partner violence: a literature review', *Trauma, Violence, and Abuse*, Vol. 8, No 4, pp. 370–384.

Gilchrist, E. (2009), 'Implicit thinking about implicit theories in intimate partner violence', *Psychology, Crime and Law*, Vol. 15, Nos 2–3, pp. 131–145.

Godínez Leal, L. (2008), 'Combating impunity and femicide in Ciudad Juarez', *NACLA Report on the Americas*, Vol. 41, No 3, pp. 31–33.

Government of Canada (2019), *Reclaiming Power and Place: The final report of the National Inquiry into Missing and Murdered Indigenous Women and Girls* (https://www.mmiwg-ffada.ca/final-report/).

Graham, L. M., Sahay, K. M., Rizo, C. F., Messing, J. T. and Macy, R. J. (2019), 'The validity and reliability of available intimate partner homicide and reassault risk assessment tools: a systematic review', *Trauma, Violence, and Abuse*, Vol. 22, No 1, pp. 1–23.

Grzyb, M., Naudi. M. and Marcuello-Servos, C. (2018), 'Femicide definitions', in Weil, S., Corradi, C. and Naudi, M. (eds), *Femicide across Europe: Theory, research and prevention*, COST: Policy Papers, Policy Press, Bristol, pp. 17–31.

Hagan, J. and Rymond-Richmond, W. (2009), *Darfur and the Crime of Genocide*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Häkkänen-Nyholm, H., Repo-Tiihonen, E., Lindberg, N., Salenius, S. and Weizmann-Henelius, G. (2009), 'Finnish sexual homicides: offence and offender characteristics', *Forensic Science International*, Vol. 188, Nos 1–3, pp. 125–130.

Hanlon, R. E., Brook, M., Demery, J. A. and Cunningham, M. D. (2016), 'Domestic homicide: neuropsychological profiles of murderers who kill family members and intimate partners', *Journal of Forensic Sciences*, Vol. 61, No 1, pp. 163–170.

Hernández, M. (2017),'"Killed out of love": a frame analysis of domestic violence coverage in Hong Kong', *Violence Against Women*, Vol. 24, No 12, pp. 1454–1473.

Howe, A. and Alaattinoğlu, D. (2018), *Contesting Femicide: Feminism and the power of law revisited*, Routledge, London.

Ingala Smith, K. (2018), 'Femicide', in Lombard, N. (ed.), *The Routledge Handbook of Gender and Violence*, Routledge, London, pp. 158–170.

Johnson, H., Eriksson, L., Mazerolle, P. and Wortley, R. (2017), 'Intimate femicide: the role of coercive control', *Feminist Criminology*, Vol. 14, No 1, pp. 3–23.

Karakasi, M. V. (2017), 'Sexual homicide: brief review of the literature and case report involving rape, genital mutilation and human arson', *Journal of Forensic and Legal Medicine*, Vol. 46, pp. 1–10.

Karbeyaz, K., Yeti Ş, Y., Güneş A. and Şi Mşek, Ü. (2018), 'Intimate partner femicide in Eskisehir, Turkey 25 years analysis', *Journal of Forensic and Legal Medicine*, Vol. 60, pp. 56–60.

Kelly, L. (1988), *Surviving Sexual Violence*, Polity Press, Cambridge.

Kendall, T. (2020), *A synthesis of evidence on the collection and use of administrative data on violence against women: Background paper for the development of global guidance*, UN Women, New York.

Koppa, V. and Messing, J. T. (2019), 'Can justice system interventions prevent intimate partner homicide? An analysis of rates of help seeking

prior to fatality', *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, pp. 1–25.

Liem, M. C. A. and Koenraadt, F. (2018), *Domestic Homicide: Patterns and dynamics*, Routledge, London.

Liem, M. C. A. and Oberwittler, D. (2012), 'Homicide followed by suicide in Europe', in Liem, M. C. A. and Pridemore, W. A. (eds), *Handbook of European Homicide Research: Patterns, explanations, and country studies*, Springer, New York, pp. 197–215.

Liem, M. C. A. and Pridemore, W. A. (eds) (2012), *Handbook of European Homicide Research: Patterns, explanations, and country studies*, Springer, New York.

Livingston, J. (2004), 'Murder in Juarez: gender, sexual violence, and the global assembly line', *Frontiers*, Vol. 25, No 1, pp. 59–76.

Long, J., Harper, K. and Harvey, H. (2017), *The Femicide Census: 2017 findings* (https://www.womensaid.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2018/12/Femicide-Census-of-2017.pdf).

Lorente, M. (2019), *Technical aspects of statistics on gender-related killings of women and girls (femicide/feminicide)*, November 2019 (grey literature).

Mamo, C., Bianco, S., Dalmasso, M., Girotto, M., Mondo, L. and Penasso, M. (2015), 'Are emergency department admissions in the past two years predictors of femicide? Results from a case–control study in Italy', *Journal of Family Violence*, Vol. 30, No 7, pp. 853–858.

Mathews, S., Abrahams, N., Jewkes, R., Martin, L. J., Lombard, C. and Vetten, L. (2008), 'Intimate femicide–suicide in South Africa: a cross-sectional study', *Bulletin of the World Health Organization*, Vol. 86, No 7, pp. 552–558.

Mathews, S., Jewkes, R. and Abrahams N. (2011), '"I had a hard life": exploring childhood adversity in the shaping of masculinities among men who killed an intimate partner in South Africa', *British Journal of Criminology*, Vol. 51, pp. 960–977.

Meel, B. (2018), 'Incidence of female homicide in the Transkei sub-region of South Africa', *Journal of Forensic and Legal Medicine*, Vol. 56, pp. 75–79.

Menjívar, C. and Walsh, S. D. (2017), 'The architecture of feminicide: the state, inequalities, and everyday gender violence in Honduras', *Latin American Research Review*, Vol. 52, No 2, pp. 221–240.

Messing, J. T., Amanor-Boadu, Y., Cavanaugh, C. E., Glass, N. E. and Campbell, J. C. (2013), 'Culturally competent intimate partner violence risk assessment: adapting the danger assessment for immigrant women', *Social Work Research*, Vol. 37, No 3, pp. 263–275.

Moreschi, C., Broi, U. D., Zamai, V. and Palese, F. (2016), 'Medico legal and epidemiological aspects of femicide in a judicial district of North Eastern Italy', *Journal of Forensic and Legal Medicine*, Vol. 39, pp. 65–73.

Myers, W. C., Husted, D. S., Safarik, M. E. and O'Toole, M. E. (2006), 'The motivation behind serial sexual homicide: is it sex, power, and control, or anger?', *Journal of Forensic Sciences*, Vol. 51, No 4, pp. 900–907.

Myers, W. C., Chan, H. C., Mariano, T., Safarik, M. and Geberth, V. (2017), 'Sexual homicide by older male offenders', *Journal of Forensic Sciences*, Vol. 62, No 4, pp. 940–946.

Nicolaidis, C., Curry, M. A., Ulrich, Y., Sharps, P., McFarlane, J., Campbell, D., Gary, F., Laughon, K., Glass, N. and Campbell, J. (2003), 'Could we have known? A qualitative analysis of data from women who survived an attempted homicide by an intimate partner', *Journal of General Internal Medicine*, Vol. 18, pp. 788–794.

Niemi, J., Peroni, L. and Stoyanova, V. (2020), *International Law and Violence against Women: Europe and the Istanbul Convention*, Routledge, London.

Pasini, W. (2016), 'Le féminicide: aspects psychodynamiques', *Sexologies*, Vol. 25, No 1, pp. 7–10.

Pereira, R., Vieira, D. N. and Magalhaes, T. (2013), 'Fatal intimate partner violence against women

in Portugal: a forensic medical national study', *Journal of Forensic and Legal Medicine*, Vol. 20, No 8, pp. 1099–1107.

Pritchard, C. (2012), 'Family violence in Europe, child homicide and intimate partner violence', in Liem, M. C. A. and Pridemore, W. A. (eds), *Handbook of European Homicide Research: Patterns, explanations, and country studies*, Springer, New York, pp. 171–183.

Radford J. and Russell D. E. H. (1992), *Femicide: The politics of woman killing*, Twayne/Gale Group, New York.

Rafter, N. (2016), *The Crime of all Crimes: Toward a criminology of genocide*, New York University Press, New York.

Reckdenwald, A. and Parker, K. F. (2012), 'Understanding the change in male and female intimate partner homicide over time: a policy- and theory-relevant investigation', *Feminist Criminology*, Vol. 7, No 3, pp. 167–195.

Reckdenwald, A., Yohros, A. and Szalewski, A. (2017), 'Healthcare professionals, rurality, and intimate femicide', *Homicide Studies*, Vol. 22, No 2, pp. 161–187.

Reckdenwald, A., Szalewski, A. and Yohros, A. (2018), 'Place, injury patterns, and female-victim intimate partner homicide', *Violence Against Women*, Vol. 25, No 6, pp. 654–676.

Roberts, Y. (2021), 'End femicide: 278 dead – the hidden scandal of older women killed by men', *The Guardian*, 7 March (https://www.theguardian.com/society/2021/mar/07/end-femicide-278-dead-the-hidden-scandal-of-older-women-killed-by-men).

Russell, D. E. H. and Harmes, R. (eds) (2001), *Femicide in Global Perspective*, Teacher's College Press, New York.

Sabri, B., Campbell, J. C. and Messing, J. T. (2021), 'Intimate partner homicides in the United States, 2003–2013: a comparison of immigrants and nonimmigrant victims', *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, Vol. 36, Nos 9–10, pp. 4735–4757.

Salameh, H. O. G., Salameh, R. J., Shwaiki, M. and Abder-Rahman, H. (2018), 'Forensic medical aspects of femicide in Jordan', *Journal of Forensic and Legal Medicine*, Vol. 56, pp. 90–93.

Schröttle, M. and Meshkova, K. (2018), 'Data collection: challenges and opportunities', in Weil, S., Corradi, C. and Naudi, M. (eds), *Femicide across Europe: Theory, research and prevention*, COST: Policy Papers, Policy Press, Bristol, pp. 33–52.

Sebire, J. (2017), 'The value of incorporating measures of relationship concordance when constructing profiles of intimate partner homicides: a descriptive study of IPH committed within London, 1998–2009', *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, Vol. 32, No 10, pp. 1476–1500.

Shackelford, T. K. and Mouzos, J. (2015), 'Partner killing by men in cohabiting and marital relationships: a comparative, cross-national analysis of data from Australia and the United States', *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, Vol. 20, No 10, pp. 1310–1324.

Shalhoub-Kervorkian, N., and Daher-Nashif, S. (2013), 'Femicide and colonization: between the politics of exclusion and the culture of control', *Violence Against Women*, Vol. 19, No 3, pp. 295–315.

Sheehy, E. (2017), 'A feminist reflection on domestic violence death reviews', in Dawson, M. (ed.), *Domestic Homicides and Death Reviews: An international perspective*, Palgrave Macmillan, London, pp. 373–402.

Sherman, L., Schmidt, J., Regab, D., Gartin, P. and Cohn E. (1991), 'From initial deterrence to long-term escalation: short custody arrest for ghetto poverty violence', *Criminology*, Vol. 29, pp. 821–850.

Shier, A. and Shor, E. (2016), 'Shades of foreign evil', *Violence Against Women*, Vol. 22, No 10, pp. 1163–1188.

Skott, S., Beauregard, E. and Darjee, R. (2021), 'Sexual and nonsexual homicide in Scotland: is there a difference?', *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, Vol. 36, Nos 7–8, pp. 3209–3230.

Smart, C. (1989), *Feminism and the Power of Law*, Routledge, London.

Smith, M. D. and Zahn, M. A. (eds) (1999), *Homicide: A sourcebook of social research*, Sage, Thousand Oaks, CA.

Spencer, C. M. and Stith, S. M. (2020), 'Risk factors for male perpetration and female victimization of intimate partner homicide: a meta-analysis', *Trauma, Violence, and Abuse*, Vol. 21, No 3, pp. 527–540.

Stansfield, R., Mancik, A., Parker, K. F. and Delacruz, M. (2019), 'County variation in intimate partner homicide: a comparison of Hispanic and non-Hispanic victims', *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, Vol. 249, No 3, pp. 1–20.

Stein, M., Schlesinger, L. B. and Pinizzotto, A. J. (2010), 'Necrophilia and sexual homicide', *Journal of Forensic Sciences*, Vol. 55, No 2, pp. 443–446.

Stöckl, H. and Devries, K. (2013), 'Global estimates of homicide risk related to intimate partner violence – authors' reply', *The Lancet*, Vol. 382, No 9905, pp. 1625–1626.

Thornton, S. (2017), 'Police attempts to predict domestic murder and serious assaults: is early warning possible yet?', *Cambridge Journal of Evidence-Based Policing*, Vol. 1, pp. 64–80.

Toprak, S. and Ersoy, G. (2017), 'Femicide in Turkey between 2000 and 2010', *PLOS ONE*, Vol. 12, No 8, pp. 1–16.

Torrubiano-Dominguez, J., Vives-Cases, C., San-Sebastián, M., Sanz-Barbero, B., Goicolea, I. and Álvarez-Dardet, C. (2015), 'No effect of unemployment on intimate partner-related femicide during the financial crisis: a longitudinal ecological study in Spain', *BMC Public Health*, Vol. 15, No 1, pp. 189–196.

UNODC (United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime) (2015), *International Classification of Crime for Statistical Purposes (ICCS)*, UNODC, Vienna (https://www.unodc.org/documents/data-and-analysis/statistics/crime/ICCS/ICCS_English_2016_web.pdf).

UNODC (United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime) (2018), *Global Study on Homicide – Gender-related killing of women and girls*, UNODC, Vienna (https://www.unodc.org/documents/data-and-analysis/GSH2018/GSH18_Gender-related_killing_of_women_and_girls.pdf).

Van Patten, I. T. and Delhauer, P. Q. (2007), 'Sexual homicide: a spatial analysis of 25 years of deaths in Los Angeles', *Journal of Forensic Sciences*, Vol. 52, No 5, pp. 1129–1141.

Vatnar, S. K. B., Friestad, C. and Bjørkly, S. (2019), 'A comparison of intimate partner homicide with intimate partner homicide–suicide: evidence from a Norwegian national 22-year cohort', *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, pp. 1–26.

Vives-Cases, C., Goicolea, I., Hernández, A., Sanz-Barbero, B., Gill, A. K., Costanza Baldry, A., Schröttle, M. and Stöckl, H. (2016), 'Expert opinions on improving femicide data collection across Europe: a concept mapping study', *PLOS ONE*, Vol. 11, No 2, pp. 1–14.

Walby, S., Towers, J., Balderston, S., Corradi, C., Francis, B., Heiskanen, M., Helweg-Larsen, K., Mergaert, L., Olive, P., Kelly, E., Stockl, H. and Strid, S. (2017), *The concept and measurement of violence against women and men* , Policy Press, Bristol.

Walklate, S., Fitz-Gibbon, K., McCulloch, J. and Maher, J. M. (2020), *Towards a Global Femicide Index: Counting the costs*, Routledge, London.

Wattis, L. (2016), 'Revisiting the Yorkshire Ripper murders', *Feminist Criminology*, Vol. 12, No 1, pp. 3–21.

Weil, S. (2016), 'Making femicide visible', *Current Sociology*, Vol. 64, No 7, pp. 1124–1137.

Weil, S., Corradi, C. and Naudi, M. (eds) (2018), *Femicide across Europe*, Policy Press, Bristol.

Weizmann-Henelius, G., Grönroos, L. M., Putkonen, H., Eronen, M., Lindberg, N., Häkkänen-Nyholm, H. (2012), 'Gender-specific risk factors for intimate partner homicide – a nationwide register-based study', *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, Vol. 27, No 8, pp. 1519–1539.

Weldon, S. (2015), 'Implicit theories in intimate partner violence sex offenders: an interpretative phenomenological analysis', *Journal of Family Violence*, Vol. 31, No 3, pp. 289–302.

Whittemore, R. and Knafl, K. (2005), 'The integrative review: updated methodology', *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, Vol. 52, No 5, pp. 546–553.

Yilmaz, E., Kumral, B., Canturk, N., Erkol, Z. and Okumos, A. M. (2015), 'Analysis and comparison of domestic femicide cases in the cities of Diyabakir and Tekirdag, Turkey: a preliminary study', *Journal of Forensic and Legal Medicine*, Vol. 34, pp. 17–23.

Zara, G. and Gino, S. (2018), 'Intimate partner violence and its escalation into femicide. Frailty thy name is "violence against women"', *Frontiers in Psychology*, Vol. 9, pp. 1777.

Zara, G., Freilone, F., Veggi, S., Biondi, E., Ceccarelli, D. and Gino, S. (2019), 'The medicolegal, psycho-criminological, and epidemiological reality of intimate partner and non-intimate partner femicide in North-West Italy: looking backwards to see forwards', *International Journal of Legal Medicine*, Vol. 133, No 4, pp. 1295–1307.

Zeoli, A. M., Malinski, R. and Brenner, H. (2020), 'The intersection of firearms and intimate partner homicide in 15 nations', *Trauma, Violence, and Abuse*, Vol. 21, No 1, pp. 45–56.

Annexes

Annex 1. Journals and articles found and selected

Journal	Articles found	Articles selected
American Journal of Public Health	2	2
Anthropological Researches and Studies	1	1
BMC Public Health	1	1
British Journal of Criminology	3	3
Bulletin of the WHO	1	1
Current Sociology	3	3
European Journal of Criminology	2	2
Feminist Criminology	5	2
Forensic Science International	4	4
Frontiers in Psychology	1	1
Health and Social Care	1	1
Homicide Studies	6	2
International Journal of Legal Medicine	1	1
International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology	1	1
Italian Journal of Pediatrics	1	1
Journal of Family Violence	8	3
Journal of Forensic and Legal Medicine	6	6
Journal of Forensic Sciences	7	7
Journal of Gender Studies	1	1
Journal of General Internal Medicine	1	1
Journal of Interpersonal Violence	17	13
Journal of Rural Health	1	1
Latin American Research Review	1	1
PLOS Medicine	1	1
PLOS ONE	3	3

Journal	Articles found	Articles selected
Psychology of Violence	1	1
Sexologies	1	1
Social Work Research	1	1
The Lancet	2	1
The World of Women	1	1
Trauma, Violence, and Abuse	7	7
Violence Against Women	9	4
Violence and Victims	1	0
	102	79

Annex 2. Categorisation of references selected

The following table shows the reviewed literature, categorised according to its feminist, sociological, criminological and decolonial approaches, as proposed by Corradi et al. (2016).

Reference	Criminological	Feminist	Sociological	Decolonial	Issues/indicators mentioned
Abrahams, N., Martin, L. J., Jewkes, R., Mathews, S., Vetten, L. and Lombard, C. (2008), 'The epidemiology and the pathology of suspect rape homicide in South Africa', *Forensic Science International*, Vol. 178, pp. 132–138	x				Risk factors
Abrahams, N., Mathews, S., Martin, L. J., Lombard, C. and Jewkes, R. (2013), 'Intimate partner femicide in South Africa in 1999 and 2009', *PLOS Medicine*, Vol. 10, No 4, pp. 1–8		x			Risk factors of intimate partner femicide
Abrunhosa, C., de Castro Rodrigues, A. and Cruz, A. R. (2020), 'Crimes against women: from violence to homicide', *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, pp. 1–24	x		x		Risk factors
Acero Álvares, A. (2010), 'Aproximaciones a los conceptos de femicidio, feminicidio y homicidio en mujeres. Bases para su medición', *Boletín Epidemiológico*, Vol. 1, No 1, Centro de Referencia Regional sobre Violencia – CRRV, Dirección Regional Bogotá		x	x		Definitions of femicide/feminicide, descriptive variables to identify femicide/feminicide
Aldridge, M. L. and Browne, K. D. (2003), 'Perpetrators of spousal homicide: a review', *Trauma, Violence, and Abuse*, Vol. 4, No 3, pp. 265–276		x			Risk factors

Reference	Criminological	Feminist	Sociological	Decolonial	Issues/indicators mentioned
Alisic, E., Groot, A., Snetselaar, H., Stroeken, T. and van de Putte, E. (2017), 'Children bereaved by fatal intimate partner violence: a population-based study into demographics, family characteristics and homicide exposure', *PLOS ONE*, Vol. 12, No 10, pp. 1–13	x		x		• Sex of victim = female • Victim–perpetrator relationship • Sociodemographic data of victim/perpetrator • Sociodemographic data of children • Child witness/victim • Recorded intimate partner violence/ domestic violence • Recorded child maltreatment or child neglect • Recorded help-seeking: previous involvement of social or mental healthcare services • Circumstances/motive • Crime scene/location
Balica, E. (2016), *Homicide–Suicides in Romania: Statistical data and media representations*, Peter Lang, New York	x	x			Risk factors
Balica, E. (2018). 'Young intimate femicide in Romania. Incidence and risk factors'. *Anthropological Researches and Studies*, Vol. 8, pp. 15–24				x	Risk factors
Beyer, K. M. M., Layde, P. M., Hamberger, K. L. and Laud, P. W. (2013), 'Characteristics of the residential neighborhood environment differentiate intimate partner femicide in urban versus rural settings', *Journal of Rural Health*, Vol. 29, No 3, pp. 281–293		x			Sociodemographic data

Reference	Criminological	Feminist	Sociological	Decolonial	Issues/indicators mentioned
Beyer, K. M. M., Layde, P. M., Hamberger, K. L. and Laud, P. W. (2015), 'Does neighborhood environment differentiate intimate partner femicides from other femicides?', *Violence Against Women*, Vol. 21, No 1, pp. 49–64		x			Sociodemographic data
Bisogno, E., Dawson-Faber, J. and Jandl, M. (2015), 'The International Classification of Crime for Statistical Purposes: a new instrument to improve comparative criminological research', *European Journal of Criminology*, Vol. 12, No 5, pp. 535–550	x				Sex of victim = female
Bitton, Y. and Dayan, H. (2019), '"The perfect murder": an exploratory study of staged murder scenes and concealed femicide', *British Journal of Criminology*, Vol. 59, No 5, pp. 1054–1075	x				• Fatality reviews • Circumstances/motive ('concealed femicide') • Crime scene/location
Bosch-Fiol, E. and Ferrer-Perez, V. A. (2020), 'Femicide, intimate partner violence and legal complaints in Spain', *Journal of Gender Studies*, Vol. 29, No 2, pp. 187–201	x	x			• Circumstances/motive • Crime scene/location
Bradbury-Jones, C., Appleton, J. V., Clark, M. and Paavilainen, E. (2019), 'A profile of gender-based violence research in Europe: findings from a focused mapping review and synthesis', *Trauma, Violence, and Abuse*, Vol. 20, No 4, pp. 470–483		x	x		Discussion
Bugeja, L., Dawson, M., McIntyre, S. J. and Walsh, C. (2015), 'Domestic/family violence death reviews: an international comparison', *Trauma, Violence, and Abuse*, Vol. 16, No 2, pp. 179–187			x		Evaluation of domestic/family violence death reviews

Reference	Criminological	Feminist	Sociological	Decolonial	Issues/indicators mentioned
Caman, S., Howner, K., Kristiansson, M. and Sturup, J. (2016), 'Differentiating intimate partner homicide from other homicide: a Swedish population-based study of perpetrator, victim, and incident characteristics', *Psychology of Violence*, Vol. 7, No 2, pp. 306–315	x				Risk factors
Campbell, J. C., Webster, D., Koziol-McLain, J., Block, C., Campbell, D., Curry, M. A., Gary, F., Glass, N., McFarlane, J., Sachs, C., Sharps, P., Ulrich, Y., Wilt, S. A., Manganello, J., Xu, X., Schollenberger, J., Frye, V. and Laughon, K. (2003), 'Risk factors for femicide in abusive relationships: results from a multisite case control study', *American Journal of Public Health*, Vol. 93, No 7, pp. 1089–1097	x				Risk factors
Campbell, J. C., Glass, N., Sharps, P. W., Laughon, K. and Bloom, T. (2007), 'Intimate partner homicide: review and implications of research and policy', *Trauma, Violence, and Abuse*, Vol. 8, No 3, pp. 246–269	x		x		Risk factors
Campbell, J. C., Webster, D. W. and Glass, N. (2009), 'The danger assessment: validation of a lethality risk assessment instrument for intimate partner femicide', *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, Vol. 24, No 4, pp. 653–674	x				Risk assessment
Caputi, J. and Russell, D. E. H. (1990), 'Femicide: speaking the unspeakable', *The World of Women*, Vol. 1, No 2, pp. 34–37		x			Definitions of femicide/ feminicide

Reference	Criminological	Feminist	Sociological	Decolonial	Issues/indicators mentioned
Carabellese, F., Tamma, M., La Tegola, D., Candelli, C. and Catanesi, R. (2014), 'Women victims of violent partners: the Italian situation amid culture and psychopathology', *Journal of Forensic Sciences*, Vol. 59, No 2, pp. 533–539			x		Risk factors
Chan, H. C. O. and Beauregard, E. (2019), 'Prostitute homicide: a 37-year exploratory study of the offender, victim, and offense characteristics', *Forensic Science International*, Vol. 294, pp. 196–203	x				Victim and offender characteristics
Chan, H. C. O., Myers, W. C. and Heide, K. M. (2010), 'An empirical analysis of 30 years of US juvenile and adult sexual homicide offender data: race and age differences in the victim–offender relationship', *Journal of Forensic Sciences*, Vol. 55, No 5, pp. 1282–1290	x				Data on race and age
Chantler, K., Robbins, R., Baker, V. and Stanley, N. (2019), 'Learning from domestic homicide reviews in England and Wales', *Health and Social Care*, Vol. 28, No 2, pp. 485–493			x		Victim and offender characteristics
Cheng, P. and Jaffe, P. (2019), 'Examining depression among perpetrators of intimate partner homicide', *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, Vol. 57, pp. 1–22	x		x		• Intimate partner femicide • Sex of victim = female • Victim–perpetrator relationship • Sociodemographic data of victim/perpetrator • Depression • Recorded help-seeking: previous involvement of social or mental healthcare services

Reference	Criminological	Feminist	Sociological	Decolonial	Issues/indicators mentioned
Corradi, C. and Stöckl, H. (2014), 'Intimate partner homicide in 10 European countries: statistical data and policy developments in cross-national perspective', *European Journal of Criminology*, Vol. 11, No 5, pp. 601–618		x	x		Connection between data gathering and policies on violence against women
Corradi, C., Marcuello-Servós, C., Boira, S. and Weil, S. (2016), 'Theories of femicide and their significance for social research', *Current Sociology*, Vol. 64, No 7, pp. 975–995		x	x		Discussion
Criado Perez, C. (2019), *Invisible Women: Exposing data bias in a world designed for men*, Abrams, New York					General critique of gender-neutral data collection
Cullen, P., Vaughan, G., Li, Z. and Price, J. (2019), 'Counting dead women in Australia: an in-depth case review of femicide', *Journal of Family Violence*, Vol. 34, pp. 1–9	x		x		• Gender-based fatal violence (femicide) • Sex of victim = female • Sex of perpetrator = unknown • Victim–perpetrator relationship • Sociodemographic data of victim • Perpetrator (sociodemographics, substance use, mental health, violence and criminal history) • Crime scene/location • Weapon/method of killing • Murder–suicide, additional victims, • (Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander women were not able to be reliably identified)
Cunha, S. O. and Goncalves, A. R. (2019), 'Predictors of intimate partner homicide in a sample of Portuguese male domestic offenders', *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, Vol. 34, No 2, pp. 2573–2598	x				Risk factors

Reference	Criminological	Feminist	Sociological	Decolonial	Issues/indicators mentioned
Dawson, M. (2017), *Domestic Homicides and Death Reviews: An international perspective*, Palgrave Macmillan, London		x	x		Problem of definition of femicide, and thus challenges for data gathering; suggestions to improve data gathering
Dawson, M. and Carrigan, M. (2020), 'Identifying femicide locally and globally: understanding the utility and accessibility of sex/gender-related motives and indicators', *Current Sociology*, pp. 1–23		x	x		Definition of femicide and indicators of femicide
Dawson, M., Mathews, S., Abrahams, N. and Campbell, J. (2017), 'Death reviews in the context of domestic homicide in low to middle-income countries: South Africa as a case study', in Dawson, M. (ed.), *Domestic Homicides and Death Reviews: An international perspective*, Palgrave Macmillan, London, pp. 345–372	x		x		Context and data collection of femicide in low- and middle-income countries
Dayan, H. (2018), 'Sociocultural aspects of femicide–suicide: the case of Israel', *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, Vol. 28, No 4, pp. 1–19		x	x		• Femicide–suicide • Sex of victim = female • Perpetrator commits suicide within a week of the killing • Victim–perpetrator relationship • Sociodemographic data of victim/perpetrator and chronic health problems, country of origin, employment status, access to a gun, prior criminal record, substance abuse, prior restraining orders, and prior record of domestic violence • Circumstances/motive • Crime scene/location • Weapon/method of killing

Reference	Criminological	Feminist	Sociological	Decolonial	Issues/indicators mentioned
Edwards, S. (1994), 'Reviews', *British Journal of Criminology*, Vol. 34, No 3, pp. 399–401	x				Discussion on the definition of femicide in criminological science
Elisha, E., Idisis, Y. and Timor, U. (2010), 'Typology of intimate partner homicide. personal, interpersonal, and environmental characteristics of men who murdered their female intimate partner', *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, Vol. 54, No 4, pp. 494–516			x		• Risk factors • Gendered motives for femicide
Fairbairn, J., Jaffé, P. and Dawson, M. (2017), 'Challenges in defining domestic homicide: considerations for research and practice', in Dawson, M. (ed.), *Domestic Homicides and Death Reviews: An international perspective*, Palgrave Macmillan, London, pp. 201–228			x		Discussion of definition of 'intimate'
Ferrara, P., Caporale, O., Cutrona, C., Sbordone, A., Amato, M., Spina, G., Ianniello, F., Fabrizio, G. C., Guadagno, C., Basile, M. C., Miconi, F., Perrone, G., Riccardi, R., Verrotti, A, Pettoello-Mantovani, M., Villani, A., Corsello, G. and Scambia, G. (2015), 'Femicide and murdered women's children: which future for these children orphans of a living parent?', *Italian Journal of Pediatrics*, Vol. 41, No 68			x		• Sex of victim = female • Age • Victim–perpetrator relationship • Sex worker • Pregnancy • Children (collateral, witness, relationship with victim/perpetrator) • Place of the murder • Killing method • Circumstances/motive
Fong, W. L., Pan, C. H., Lee, J. C., Lee, T. T. and Hwa, H. L. (2016), 'Adult femicide victims in forensic autopsy in Taiwan: a 10-year retrospective study', *Forensic Science International*, Vol. 266, pp. 80–85	x				Circumstances/motive

Reference	Criminological	Feminist	Sociological	Decolonial	Issues/indicators mentioned
Frye, V., Galea, S., Tracy, M., Bucciarelli, A., Putnam, S. and Wilt, S. (2008), 'The role of neighborhood environment and risk of intimate partner femicide in a large urban area', *American Journal of Public Health*, Vol. 98, No 8, pp. 1473–1479			x		Risk factors
Frye, V., Hosein, V., Waltermaurer, E., Blaney, S. and Wilt, S. (2016), 'Femicide in New York City', *Homicide Studies*, Vol. 9, No 3, pp. 204–228	x				• Sex of victim = female • Aged 13 years and older • Victim–perpetrator relationship • Intimate partner femicide (*n* = 447) included all homicides characterised as (a) definite intimate partner femicide, (b) probable intimate partner femicide, (c) secondary intimate partner femicide or (d) intimate partner accidents). Non-intimate partner femicide (*n* = 584) included family (not intimate partner) homicides, family violence accidents, robbery, drugs, sex crimes, random (victim was an innocent bystander), justifiable homicide, and other.
Garcia, L., Soria, C. and Hurwitz, E. L. (2007), 'Homicides and intimate partner violence: a literature review', *Trauma, Violence, and Abuse*, Vol. 8, No 4, pp. 370–384	x		x		Risk factors
Graham, L. M., Sahay, K. M., Rizo, C. F., Messing, J. T. and Macy, R. J. (2019), 'The validity and reliability of available intimate partner homicide and reassault risk assessment tools: a systematic review', *Trauma, Violence, and Abuse*, Vol. 22, No 1, pp. 1–23		x			Risk factors

Reference	Criminological	Feminist	Sociological	Decolonial	Issues/indicators mentioned
Häkkänen-Nyholm, H., Repo-Tiihonen, E., Lindberg, N., Salenius, S. and Weizmann-Henelius, G. (2009), 'Finnish sexual homicides: offence and offender characteristics', *Forensic Science International*, Vol. 188, Nos 1–3, pp. 125–130	x				Offender and victim characteristics
Hanlon, R. E., Brook, M., Demery, J. A. and Cunningham, M. D. (2016), 'Domestic homicide: neuropsychological profiles of murderers who kill family members and intimate partners', *Journal of Forensic Sciences*, Vol. 61, No 1, pp. 163–170	x				Perpetrator profile, risk factors
Hernández, M. (2017), '"Killed out of love": a frame analysis of domestic violence coverage in Hong Kong', *Violence Against Women*, Vol. 24, No 12, pp. 1454–1473		x	x	x	• Sex of victim = female • Sex of perpetrator = male • Victim–perpetrator relationship • Femicide, the murder or attempted murder of a woman by her male intimate partner
Johnson, H., Eriksson, L., Mazerolle, P. and Wortley, R. (2017), 'Intimate femicide: the role of coercive control', *Feminist Criminology*, Vol. 14, No 1, pp. 3–23	x	x			• Intimate partner femicide • Sex of victim = female • Age (15 years and older) • Victim–perpetrator relationship • Sex of perpetrator= male (men convicted of killing intimate partners)
Karakasi, M. V. (2017), 'Sexual homicide: brief review of the literature and case report involving rape, genital mutilation and human arson', *Journal of Forensic and Legal Medicine*, Vol. 46, pp. 1–10	x				Characteristics/ indicators of sexual femicide

Reference	Criminological	Feminist	Sociological	Decolonial	Issues/indicators mentioned
Karbeyaz, K., Yeti, Ş, Y., Güneş, A. and Şi Mşek, Ü. (2018), 'Intimate partner femicide in Eskisehir, Turkey 25-year analysis', *Journal of Forensic and Legal Medicine*, Vol. 60, pp. 56–60	x		x		Risk factors
Koppa, V. and Messing, J. T. (2019), 'Can justice system interventions prevent intimate partner homicide? An analysis of rates of help seeking prior to fatality', *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, pp. 1–25	x		x		• Intimate partner femicide • Sex of victim = female • Victim–perpetrator relationship • Recorded intimate partner violence/ domestic violence • Sociodemographic data of victim/perpetrator • Circumstances/motive • Crime scene/location • Weapon/method of killing
Liem, M. C. A. and Oberwittler, D. (2012), 'Homicide followed by suicide in Europe', in Liem, M. C. A. and Pridemore, W. A. (eds), *Handbook of European Homicide Research: Patterns, explanations, and country studies*, Springer, New York, pp. 197–215	x		x		Risk factors of suicide–homicide
Liem, M. C. A. and Pridemore, W. A. (eds) (2012), *Handbook of European Homicide Research: Patterns, explanations, and country studies*, Springer, New York	x		x		Definitions of homicide and intimate partner homicide

Reference	Criminological	Feminist	Sociological	Decolonial	Issues/indicators mentioned
Mamo, C., Bianco, S., Dalmasso, M., Girotto, M., Mondo, L. and Penasso, M. (2015), 'Are emergency department admissions in the past two years predictors of femicide? Results from a case–control study in Italy', *Journal of Family Violence*, Vol. 30, No 7, pp. 853–858			x		• Intimate partner femicide (husband, partner, ex-partner or relative) • Age 18+ years • Sex of victim • Relationship status • Education level • Work status • Professional status • Citizenship • Admission to emergency department prior to the murder
Mathews, S., Abrahams, N., Jewkes, R., Martin, L. J., Lombard, C. and Vetten, L. (2008), 'Intimate femicide–suicide in South Africa: a cross-sectional study', *Bulletin of the World Health Organization*, Vol. 86, No 7, pp. 552–558	x				
Mathews, S., Jewkes, R. and Abrahams, N. (2011), '"I had a hard life": exploring childhood adversity in the shaping of masculinities among men who killed an intimate partner in South Africa', *British Journal of Criminology*, Vol. 51, pp. 960–977	x		x		Sociodemographic characteristics
Meel, B. (2018), 'Incidence of female homicide in the Transkei sub-region of South Africa', *Journal of Forensic and Legal Medicine*, Vol. 56, pp. 75–79	x				Risk factors
Menjívar, C. and Walsh, S. D. (2017), 'The architecture of feminicide: the state, inequalities, and everyday gender violence in Honduras', *Latin American Research Review*, Vol. 52, No 2, pp. 221–240		x	x		Discussion of definitions of feminicide

Reference	Criminological	Feminist	Sociological	Decolonial	Issues/indicators mentioned
Messing, J. T., Aman-or-Boadu, Y., Cavanaugh, C. E., Glass, N. E. and Campbell, J. C. (2013), 'Culturally competent intimate partner violence risk assessment: adapting the danger assessment for immigrant women', *Social Work Research*, Vol. 37, No 3, pp. 263–275			x		Risk factors
Moreschi, C., Broi, U. D., Zamai, V. and Palese, F. (2016), 'Medico legal and epidemiological aspects of femicide in a judicial district of North Eastern Italy', *Journal of Forensic and Legal Medicine*, Vol. 39, pp. 65–73	x				• Sex of victim = female • Victim–perpetrator relationship • Sociodemographic data of victims: age, intoxication, nationality, occupation • Sociodemographic data of perpetrators: mental disorder, age, nationality • Circumstances/motive • Crime scene/location • Weapon/method of killing
Myers, W. C., Chan, H. C., Mariano, T., Safarik, M. and Geberth, V. (2017), 'Sexual homicide by older male offenders', *Journal of Forensic Sciences*, Vol. 62, No 4, pp. 940–946	x				• Circumstances/motive • Crime scene/location • Weapon/method of killing
Myers, W. C., Husted, D. S., Safarik, M. E. and O'Toole, M. E. (2006), 'The motivation behind serial sexual homicide: is it sex, power, and control, or anger?', *Journal of Forensic Sciences*, Vol. 51, No 4, pp. 900–907	x				Circumstances/motive

Reference	Criminological	Feminist	Sociological	Decolonial	Issues/indicators mentioned
Nicolaidis, C., Curry, M. A., Ulrich, Y., Sharps, P., McFarlane, J., Campbell, D., Gary, F., Laughon, K., Glass, N. and Campbell, J. (2003), 'Could we have known? A qualitative analysis of data from women who survived an attempted homicide by an intimate partner', *Journal of General Internal Medicine*, Vol. 18, pp. 788–794	x		x		Risk factors
Pasini, W. (2016), 'Le féminicide: aspects psychodynamiques', *Sexologies*, Vol. 25, No 1, pp. 7–10		x	x		Discussion of psychological risk factors
Pereira, R., Vieira, D. N. and Magalhaes, T. (2013), 'Fatal intimate partner violence against women in Portugal: a forensic medical national study', *Journal of Forensic and Legal Medicine*, Vol. 20, No 8, pp. 1099–1107			x		Risk factors
Reckdenwald, A., Yohros, A. and Szalewski, A. (2017), 'Healthcare professionals, rurality, and intimate femicide', *Homicide Studies*, Vol. 22, No 2, pp. 161–187	x				• Intimate partner femicide • Sex of victim = female • Sex of perpetrator = male • Victim–perpetrator relationship (partner) • Rural • Healthcare professional availability • Gender inequality • Female economic deprivation
Reckdenwald, A., Szalewski, A. and Yohros, A. (2018), 'Place, injury patterns, and female-victim intimate partner homicide', *Violence Against Women*, Vol. 25, No 6, pp. 654–676	x				• Intimate partner femicide • Sex of victim = female • Sex of perpetrator = unknown • Victim–perpetrator relationship • Sociodemographic data of victim/perpetrator • Crime scene/location • Weapon/method of killing

Reference	Criminological	Feminist	Sociological	Decolonial	Issues/indicators mentioned
Sabri, B., Campbell, J. C. and Messing, J. T. (2021), 'Intimate partner homicides in the United States, 2003–2013: a comparison of immigrants and nonimmigrant victims', *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, Vol. 36, Nos 9–10, pp. 4735–4757	x				• Intimate partner femicide • Sex of victim = female • Sex of perpetrator = male • Victim–perpetrator relationship • Sociodemographic data of victim/perpetrator • Circumstances/motive • Crime scene/location • Weapon/method of killing
Salameh, H. O. G., Salameh, R. J., Shwaiki, M. and Abder-Rahman, H. (2018), 'Forensic medical aspects of femicide in Jordan', *Journal of Forensic and Legal Medicine*, Vol. 56, pp. 90–93	x				Risk factors
Sebire, J. (2017), 'The value of incorporating measures of relationship concordance when constructing profiles of intimate partner homicides: a descriptive study of IPH committed within London, 1998–2009', *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, Vol. 32, No 10, pp. 1476–1500	x		x		Risk factors
Shackelford, T. K. and Mouzos, J. (2015), 'Partner killing by men in cohabiting and marital relationships: a comparative, cross-national analysis of data from Australia and the United States', *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, Vol. 20, No 10, pp. 1310–1324	x		x		Risk factors
Sheehy, E. (2017), 'A feminist reflection on domestic violence death reviews', in Dawson, M. (ed.), *Domestic Homicides and Death Reviews: An international perspective*, Palgrave Macmillan, London, pp. 373–402		x			Discussion of definitions of femicide and indicators of intimate partner femicide

Reference	Criminological	Feminist	Sociological	Decolonial	Issues/indicators mentioned
Shier, A. and Shor, E. (2016), 'Shades of foreign evil', *Violence Against Women*, Vol. 22, No 10, pp. 1163–1188		x	x	x	Discussion of definitions of femicide
Skott, S., Beauregard, E. and Darjee, R. (2021), 'Sexual and nonsexual homicide in Scotland: is there a difference?', *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, Vol. 36, Nos 7–8, pp. 3209–3230	x				Risk factors
Spencer, C. M. and Stith, S. M. (2020), 'Risk factors for male perpetration and female victimization of intimate partner homicide: a meta-analysis', *Trauma, Violence, and Abuse*, Vol. 21, No 3, pp. 527–540			x		Risk factors
Stansfield, R., Mancik, A., Parker, K. F. and Delacruz, M. (2019), 'County variation in intimate partner homicide: a comparison of Hispanic and non-Hispanic victims', *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, Vol. 249, No 3, pp. 1–20	x		x		• Intimate partner femicide • Sex of victim = female • Legal firearm dealer availability • Economic disadvantage • Rural
Stein, M., Schlesinger, L. B. and Pinizzotto, A. J. (2010), 'Necrophilia and sexual homicide', *Journal of Forensic Sciences*, Vol. 55, No 2, pp. 443–446	x				• Crime scene/location • Weapon/method of killing
Toprak, S. and Ersoy, G. (2017), 'Femicide in Turkey between 2000 and 2010', *PLOS ONE*, Vol. 12, No 8, pp. 1–16		x	x		• Sex of victim = female • Sex of perpetrator = male • Victim–perpetrator relationship • Sociodemographic data of victim/perpetrator • Recorded intimate partner violence/ domestic violence • Recorded abuse • Circumstances/motive • Crime scene/location • Weapon/method of killing

Reference	Criminological	Feminist	Sociological	Decolonial	Issues/indicators mentioned
Torrubiano-Dominguez, J., Vives-Cases, C., San-Sebastián, M., Sanz-Barbero, B., Goicolea, I. and Álvarez-Dardet, C. (2015), 'No effect of unemployment on intimate partner-related femicide during the financial crisis: a longitudinal ecological study in Spain', *BMC Public Health*, Vol. 15, No 1, pp. 189–196	x				• Intimate partner femicide • Sex of victim = female • Age (15 years and older) • Victim–perpetrator relationship
Van Patten, I. T. and Delhauer, P. Q. (2007), 'Sexual homicide: a spatial analysis of 25 years of deaths in Los Angeles', *Journal of Forensic Sciences*, Vol. 52, No 5, pp. 1129–1141		x			Gendered motive
Vatnar, S. K. B., Friestad, C. and Bjørkly, S. (2019), 'A comparison of intimate partner homicide with intimate partner homicide–suicide: evidence from a Norwegian national 22-year cohort', *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, pp. 1–26	x				Risk factors
Vives-Cases, C., Goicolea, I., Hernández, A., Sanz-Barbero, B., Gill, A. K., Costanza Baldry, A., Schröttle, M. and Stöckl, H. (2016), 'Expert opinions on improving femicide data collection across Europe: a concept mapping study', *PLOS ONE*, Vol. 11, No 2, pp. 1–14		x	x		• Ensuring that all types of data collection systems (crime, court, etc.) gather at least the following information: sex of victim and perpetrator, victim–perpetrator relationship, prior history of domestic violence and previous institutional interventions • Discussion
Wattis, L. (2016), 'Revisiting the Yorkshire Ripper murders', *Feminist Criminology*, Vol. 12, No 1, pp. 3–21	x	x			• Sexual femicide • Sex of victim = female • Perpetrator (man convicted of killing several women)
Weil, S. (2016), Making femicide visible', *Current Sociology*, Vol. 64, No 7, pp. 1124–1137		x	x		Discussion

Reference	Criminological	Feminist	Sociological	Decolonial	Issues/indicators mentioned
Weizmann-Henelius, G., Grönroos, L. M., Putkonen, H., Eronen, M., Lindberg, N. and Häkkänen-Nyholm, H. (2012), 'Gender-specific risk factors for intimate partner homicide – a nationwide register-based study', *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, Vol. 27, No 8, pp. 1519–1539	x		x		Risk factors
Weldon, S. (2015), 'Implicit theories in intimate partner violence sex offenders: an interpretative phenomenological analysis', *Journal of Family Violence*, Vol. 31, No 3, pp. 289–302		x	x		Discussion – not mentioning femicide
Yilmaz, E., Kumral, B., Canturk, N., Erkol, Z. and Okumos, A. M. (2015), 'Analysis and comparison of domestic femicide cases in the cities of Diyabakir and Tekirdag, Turkey: a preliminary study', *Journal of Forensic and Legal Medicine*, Vol. 34, pp. 17–23	x				Risk factors of domestic femicide
Zara, G. and Gino, S. (2018), 'Intimate partner violence and its escalation into femicide. Frailty thy name is "violence against women"', *Frontiers in Psychology*, Vol. 9, p. 1777	x	x			• Intimate partner femicide • Sex of victim = female • Victim–perpetrator relationship • Sex of perpetrator = male

Reference	Criminological	Feminist	Sociological	Decolonial	Issues/indicators mentioned
Zara, G., Freilone, F., Veggi, S., Biondi, E., Ceccarelli, D. and Gino, S. (2019), 'The medicolegal, psycho-criminological, and epidemiological reality of intimate partner and non-intimate partner femicide in North-West Italy: looking backwards to see forwards', *International Journal of Legal Medicine*, Vol. 133, No 4, pp. 1295–1307	x				• Sex of victim = female • Sex of perpetrator = male • Victim–perpetrator relationship • Intimate partner femicide (killing of a woman by a person (usually her husband or ex-partner) with whom she had been emotionally close)/ non-intimate partner femicide (femicide by strangers or acquaintances) • Nationality • Age • Employment status • Profession • Criminal career • Motive/circumstances
Zeoli, A. M., Malinski, R. and Brenner, H. (2020), 'The intersection of firearms and intimate partner homicide in 15 nations', *Trauma, Violence, and Abuse*, Vol. 21, No 1, pp. 45–56			x		Risk factors

GETTING IN TOUCH WITH THE EU

IN PERSON
All over the European Union there are hundreds of Europe Direct information centres. You can find the address of the centre nearest you at: https://europa.eu/european-union/contact_en

ON THE PHONE OR BY EMAIL
Europe Direct is a service that answers your questions about the European Union.

You can contact this service:
– by freephone: 00 800 6 7 8 9 10 11 (certain operators may charge for these calls),
– at the following standard number: +32 22999696, or
– by email via: https://europa.eu/european-union/contact_en

FINDING INFORMATION ABOUT THE EU

ONLINE
Information about the European Union in all the official languages of the EU is available on the Europa website at: https://europa.eu/european-union/index_en

EU PUBLICATIONS
You can download or order free and priced EU publications from: https://op.europa.eu/en/publications. Multiple copies of free publications may be obtained by contacting Europe Direct or your local information centre (see https://europa.eu/european-union/contact_en).

EU LAW AND RELATED DOCUMENTS
For access to legal information from the EU, including all EU law since 1952 in all the official language versions, go to EUR-Lex at: http://eur-lex.europa.eu

OPEN DATA FROM THE EU
The EU Open Data Portal (http://data.europa.eu/euodp/en) provides access to datasets from the EU. Data can be downloaded and reused for free, for both commercial and non-commercial purposes.

www.eige.europa.eu

Publications Office
of the European Union