

**Issues in measuring and comparing the incidence of intimate partner homicide and femicide – A  
focus on Europe**

**Abstract**

Intimate partner homicide is an important contributor to homicide rates worldwide, disproportionately affecting women as victims. Still, major gaps exist in the measurement of intimate partner homicide, with many homicides not being identified as intimate partner homicides. This article provides an overview of the main issues in the collection and reporting on intimate partner homicide, focusing in particular on the data situation in Europe. Sources of homicide data - national and police statistics, court statistics and files, mortuary data and newspaper databases - face similar challenges, namely absence or missing information on the victim-offender relationship, and different categorizations of key parameters, such as definition of intimate partner homicide, and identification of reporting periods. This is concerning, as strong and reliable data on the incidence and contextual information of intimate partner homicide and femicide is important to advice effective prevention strategies.

## Introduction

Intimate partner homicide (IPH) is an important contributor to the murder of men and women globally. A systematic review estimated that across 66 countries between 1989 and 2011, at least 14 percent of all homicides were perpetrated by an intimate partner, with intimate partners committing at least 39 percent of female and six percent of male homicides (Stöckl et al., 2013). In recent years, the notion of *femicide* has expanded in social and epidemiological research to grasp the basic differences which underpin the killing of a female, as opposed to a male victim. Femicide was coined by feminists Radford and Russell (1992), picked up and disseminated by Mexican sociologists, and in 2006 it was introduced for the very first time in official documents of the UN General Assembly (United Nations 2006). The word is poignant; it refers to misogynist motives in the killing of women. Its political substance has pushed authors to extend it to many different forms of gender-based violence (Corradi, Marcuello-Servòs et al. 2016). This article refers to intimate partner femicide (IPF) if it relates to a female victim of intimate partner homicide.

Despite this increase in attention, in many countries of the world, statistics on IPHs do not exist or are unreliable. For instance, crime reports in most countries count annual cases of homicides in general, some do not differentiate the gender of victims and perpetrators or provide information on the victim-offender relationship, making IPH invisible in country statistics. In those countries where IPH numbers and rates are available, there is often still a substantial number of homicide cases with missing information on the victim-offender relationship and the information rarely goes beyond the mentioning of incidents. This not only hinders the exploration of the scope of the problem, the national differences in legal and reporting systems also limit the comparability across countries and years and the implication and relevance of having a better knowledge of gender based violence including femicide and its implication and risk factors helping set up preventive programs. Having no or flawed data can make the issue of IPH invisible or underestimate its occurrence. Furthermore, the lack of comparability over years and across countries makes it difficult to see whether the prevalence and

incidence rate of such killings vary from country to country or between communities and whether they are increasing or decreasing in time.

In a previous study, the authors assembled expert opinions regarding strategies that might feasibly be employed to promote, develop and implement an integrated and differentiated femicide data collection system in Europe at both the national and international levels among experts in femicide in Europe participating in the Cost Action on Femicide in Europe. As a result, a conceptual map emerged, consisting of 69 strategies organized in 10 clusters, which fit into two domains: “Political action” and “Technical steps”; and there was consensus regarding the high relevance of strategies to institutionalize national databases and raise public awareness through different stakeholders (Vives-Cases et al., 2016a, Vives-Cases et al., 2016b).

This article aims to explore the main measurement issues around IPH, by discussing them in consideration of the main sources of information. Although the article will draw on international examples and strategies, a strong focus will be on the data situation in Europe, as it mainly draws on the experience and knowledge of researchers working on femicide, IPH and intimate partner violence across Europe.

### **Existing sources of information for intimate partner homicide**

National mortality, crime or police statistics, court data, mortuary statistics or newspaper searches are the main sources of data and information on IPHs, each having different advantages and disadvantages.

#### ***National mortality, crime statistics and police statistics***

In most countries with information on IPHs, the police provide the data and national statistics offices, Home offices, the Ministries of Home Affairs, or the Ministries of Interior make them publicly available. A few of these countries, for example the UK, regularly update their statistics with recent police and court data (Smith et al., 2012). The clear advantage of official statistics is that they provide national

numbers on the incidence of all IPH in the whole country and make it possible to compare the rates of IPH for men and women to establish where prevention strategies must be targeted. Unfortunately, reliable statistics on IPH only exist in a few countries. Cases with missing information on the victim-offender relationship are comparatively high as police crime statistics often only report the perpetrators known at the time the murder is registered. Because of the different legal definitions and ways of counting cases, national statistics are often not comparable across countries, for example, some differ in whether they only report convicted or suspected perpetrators, attempted and completed homicides or in their definitions of murder, manslaughter and homicides (Smit et al., 2013).

### ***Court file's statistics***

Researchers have utilized court statistics and files to establish the number of men and women convicted for IPH, to describe the circumstances of the cases and compare them to non-partner homicides. The advantage of court statistics and files is that they provide the number of IPHs for which there is sufficient evidence that the perpetrator was a partner. In addition to that, court files are a source of rich information on homicides and the context in which they took place, as various prosecution files, witness statements and background information is gathered. Court files also allow the investigation of the context of attempted IPH, which seldom appear in official statistics, as they are legally different from fatal IPH. The disadvantages of using only court statistics without case files is that most of the time they only provide perpetrator and not victim related information. Examining case files is time-consuming as they are often not available, difficult to gain access to and not pre-marked as cases of IPH (Baldry and Ferraro, 2010). Furthermore, court statistics and files exclude relevant cases of IPH, like cases of homicides-suicides or cases that do not result in a conviction due to missing or flawed evidence. In terms of cross-national comparability, another problem is that legal codes differ across countries and that conviction rates vary.

### **Mortuary data**

Researchers use mortuary data in countries where national statistics, police or court statistics on IPH are not available or not complete enough to present reliable IPH estimates (Baldry and Winkel, 2008). The advantage of using mortuary data is that it includes cases for which the police has not started an investigation or which was not brought to the attention of courts, as for example in homicide-suicide cases. The disadvantage of using mortuary data is that the focus is on the victim. Information on the perpetrators is only available from the police who have brought the body. Mortuary data is also dependent on the depth, quality, accuracy and completeness of the mortuary assessment, the requirements on reporting on precipitating circumstances and its sources and characteristics of the incidence that may vary across jurisdictions and countries (Barber et al., 2008, Sanford et al., 2006).

### **Newspaper searches**

Newspaper searches on IPH can be a rich data source, as the reporting is often in-depth as journalist not only refer to the history of the victim-offender relationship, they often also highlight the context of the homicide and provide detailed information on its suspected reasons and the events preceding it. However, there are serious limitations to newspaper searches, as newspaper databases are often not representative for the whole country and in countries with high number of cases not all homicides are reported in the news; furthermore, the level of richness of information varies from case to case, from newspaper to newspaper, making comparability limited from a methodological point of view. Furthermore, in some countries newspaper searches are time consuming to conduct, double counting of cases is possible and the case construction relies on the skill of the journalists in reporting the homicide and its circumstances. Institutions conducting newspaper searches on IPH may not be long lasting, as they often rely on external economic support. One example is the Center of Reina Sofia foundation in Spain, which used to collect newspaper articles on femicide and female IPH and complement them with information from police sources (Centro Reina Sofía, 2010). It had to close down in 2011 due to a lack of funding. Another example, the EURES Databases developed by Fabio Piacenti for Italy, which mainly relies on private funding.

## **Measurement issues with intimate partner homicide**

All sources mentioned above publish information on male homicide and/or femicide. However, one or more of the following key issues often hamper the accurate reporting on male or female IPH.

### **1. No gendered information for victims and perpetrators of homicides**

In many European countries, IPH data are often not available because the police are not required to report the gender of the victim and/or perpetrator. Thus, differentiated information on women or men murdered by male or female perpetrators is missing. In European crime statistics, this aspect is improving due to the cautious harmonization of data. A minimum standard of recent police statistics is to include information on the gender of victims and suspected perpetrators, sometimes also with respect to the victim-offender relationship (EIGE, 2012). This is also what is required by the Council of Europe Convention on gender based violence and domestic violence<sup>1</sup>

### **2. Victim- offender relationship not known or reported**

Even though many countries report the yearly numbers of homicides in their country separately by gender and age, others in Europe do not state the victim-offender relationship or do not report intimate partners separately from other family or domestic homicides (Liem and Pridemore, 2011). The systematic review published in 2013 on the global prevalence of IPH also provides an overview of the scarcity of information on the number of homicides committed by intimate partners. Worldwide, in 2012 only 66 countries had information on the incidence of IPH among male or female homicides, with 32 countries reporting incidence of male and female IPH<sup>ii</sup>, 63 countries providing data on female IPH and 28 countries on male IPH. Although the study captured national and local statistics, police statistics, mortuary data, court data and prison data, few studies were found outside high-income countries and the Americas, with countries in the Americas mainly publishing data on IPF. In Europe, IPH numbers were found mainly for countries in Western Europe with a scarcity of data in Southern Europe and Eastern Europe (Stöckl et al., 2013). For example, in Italy the Direzione Centrale Polizia

---

<sup>1</sup> [http://www.coe.int/t/dghl/standardsetting/convention-violence/default\\_en.asp](http://www.coe.int/t/dghl/standardsetting/convention-violence/default_en.asp)

Criminale, which is an interforce organisation, only started gathering data on homicide stating the gender of the perpetrator and victim and their relationship in the last few years (Baldry, 2014). Before, another private research body collected these data based on newspaper report (Eu.r.e.s. – Ansa, 2013). This lack or slow uptake of reporting is due to a lack of policy focus on prevention of IPH, which has not been strong enough to demand collecting this data nor the necessary contextual individual dimensions required to inform a complete risk assessment of IPH.

Another issue that hampers the collection of national data on IPH is the lack of cooperation and transparency between different institutions collecting criminal and mortality data. For example, in Romania, several institutions collect criminal and mortality data, including the General Inspectorate of Police, the General Parquet, the National Institute of Statistics, the Superior Council of Magistrate, the Ministry of Justice, and the National Institute of Legal Medicine. While all these institutions produce annual reports with homicide data, they only report on them in their own capacity. The police reports the number of homicides they dealt with, while the Superior Council of Magistrates only reports on cases that appeared before the courts. None of them reports on the victim-offender relationship, although this information can be requested. The General Parquet, which coordinates activities by prosecutors, publishes the number of spousal homicides in their annual reports, however, they do not mention the gender of the spouse or homicides by not married intimate partners (Balica and Stöckl, 2016).

There are also positive examples how national statistics improved their reporting systems over the years. In Germany, the 2012 criminal statistics by the police include information on gender and victim-offender relationships including current and former intimate partner relationships and thus can now present the number of male IPH and IPF. In previous years, central criminal statistics in Germany only published information on how many relatives, including but not specifically listing partners murdered women and men (Bundeskriminalamt, 2013). The central criminal statistical office in Germany changed their reporting requirements of the regional federal states police offices. They now provide more differentiated information on IPH. Spain is a good example for how different types of data collected by

different institutions can provide a holistic overview of the occurrence and context of IPH. Since the enactment of its Gender Violence Law at the end of 2004, the Government Office for Gender Violence publishes annual and monthly reports on the incidence of IPF. This source of data provides detailed information on the murder context, the socio-demographic characteristics of perpetrator and victim and the occurrence of intimate partner violence before the murder. They receive their data from the forces of state security, the regional police offices, courts and prosecutors. Furthermore, the Spanish National Institute of Statistics annually publishes microdata on homicides, including information on age, sex, marital status and place of birth of the victim, apparent mode of killing, and size of municipality. In addition, the Association Federation of Separated and Divorced Women publishes newspaper-based information about IPF committed by any perpetrator. This database is an important source of advocacy and epidemiological surveillance (Vives-Cases et al., 2005). In addition, the General Judicial Council publishes an annual report on male IPH and IPF based on court assessment of the cases.

### **3. Missing entries for the victim-offender relationship**

Even if countries or specific studies report the number of men and women murdered by an intimate partner, the number of homicides with missing information on the victim-offender relationship is often high. The information is also often missing if the police does not identify a subject immediately and does not update the reported statistics or if national statistics do not update police statistics with court data. Missing information on the victim-offender relationship can have important implications for the prevalence of IPH. In their systematic review, Stöckl et al (2013) found that overall 21% of all homicides reported on did not have information about the victim–offender relationship, with a slightly higher percentage among male than female homicides. Depending on how homicide cases with missing information on the victim-offender relationship are treated, for example by only considering cases with known victim-offender relationship, instead of treating cases with unknown victim-offender relationships as non-partner homicides, the prevalence of IPH among all male and female homicides worldwide might be as high as 14 percent overall, 43 percent among IPF, and seven percent among male victims (Stöckl et al., 2013).



In the UK between 2000 and 2011, 2559 women and 5530 men were murdered, with intimate partners committing 1076 IPF and 306 male homicides. Information on the victim-offender relationship was missing for 209 female and 721 male victims, with the number of male victims with an unknown perpetrator being higher than the number of men murdered by an intimate partner (Smith et al., 2012). In South Africa, the perpetrators of 20 percent of 905 IPF remained unknown. The authors suggested that the missing information on the victim-offender relationship was partly due to limitations in the police investigations, record keeping or because the dockets were missing. The later might partially be due to bribery, especially if it was a case of IPH (Abrahams et al., 2009). In the US, many homicide cases reported in police statistics with an unknown victim-offender relationship are not unknown in the end, as the homicide was cleared after the police has already submitted their year-end report (Quinet and Nunn, 2014).

In the US, investigations of local mortality rates have consistently found fewer homicides reported by the FBI on the Supplementary Homicide Reports than by the National Center for Health Statistics. While one possible explanation might be variations in definitions, in many cases the police simply did not report the homicides compared to the medical examiners or coroners (Regoeczi and Riedel, 2003). Another potential reason for why approximately one third of homicide cases in the US have missing information on the victim-offender relationship in the US Crime statistics, is the significant decline in arrest clearances, dropping from 92 percent in the 1960s to 69 percent in 1999 (Regoeczi and Riedel, 2003).

Researchers have long assumed that homicides with unknown victim-offender relationships are mainly comprised of stranger homicides. However, studies conducted in the US suggest differently. For example, a study by Regoeczi and Riedler (2003), using data from the Los Angeles Police Department and homicide data for Chicago found that after imputing homicide cases with missing victim-offender relationships, the total number of IPH increased, while the proportional increase was among stranger homicides. Quinet et al's summary of the existing literature suggests that the majority of homicides

with unknown victim-offender relationships are stranger homicides, with the exception of two studies and their own (Quinet and Nunn, 2014).

#### **4. Victim-offender relationship categories are defined differently or incorrectly**

The differing definitions of intimate partner and legal codes as well as the collection of data in different years or without differentiating the gender of victims or partners make comparisons of incidence rates over time difficult within a country and nearly impossible across countries. Studies across countries vary in respect to their definition of intimate partners, some like Fiji including only married couples (Adinkrah, 1999), while others like the USA, Canada and UK including current and former partners, lovers, boyfriend and girlfriends and homosexual partners (Federal Bureau of Investigation, 2011, Dauvergne, 2004, Smith et al., 2012). Definitions of intimate partners can also vary over time. In Canada, statistics before 1997 only included married and common law couples, since then it has expanded to include same-sex couples (Dauvergne, 2004). Romania underwent several critical institutional changes during the last years, including restructuring of institutions, as well as changes in the reporting categories and parameters of recording cases. These changes affected the data collection substantially; they make time trend analyses of the last 5 to 10 years difficult. Across countries, the issue of timing also plays a role. Some countries like Ireland only publish their data for a time period from 1992 to 1996 (Dooley, 2001), other countries like the UK and Spain publish their numbers yearly (Smith et al., 2012). In addition to the timing and definition issues, legal codes on homicide are different across countries, hampering cross-country comparisons (Smit et al., 2013). Differences range as far as whether homicides need to be intentional, premeditated or aggravated for the laws in a country to consider them as homicides and what role intent plays and how to define it. Further differences between countries exist in respect to whether countries define assisted suicide, euthanasia, infanticide, assault leading to death and dangerous driving as homicides or not and whether they include attempted homicides in their statistics (Smit et al., 2013).

#### **Strategies used to deal with missing information on victim-offender relationship**

Obviously, improved collection and reporting of data on IPH are the only way to establish robust incidence numbers. Researchers have examined different strategies to deal with missing data on the victim-offender relationship.

### ***Data triangulation***

In the United States, several initiatives triangulate data from different sources to examine the true extent of IPH. One notable example is the Michigan Intimate Partner Homicide Surveillance System, which combined law enforcement reports, medical examiner records, death certificates and newspaper articles. Using multiple data sources, they identified at least 34% more IPH in Michigan from 1999 to 2000 than the Supplementary Homicide Reports, the most frequently cited data source from IPH case ascertainment and 22% more cases than newspapers would have reported (Biroscak et al., 2006). Other good examples are a study of homicides in Alaska, which used the Supplementary Homicide Reports, newspaper surveillance and Alaska Vital Statistics (Shai, 2010) and the multidisciplinary, interprofessional fatality death reviews set up in several towns and regions around the world that collect information on any preventable death in their vicinity (Albright et al., 2013, Bugeja et al., 2013).

### ***Data imputation methods***

Patterns in wounding and use of weapons may be useful victim-offender relationship when other information on the is not available (Last and Fritzson, 2005). Trojan and Kull's study of homicides in Cincinnati found that victims who had a current or former intimate relationship with their perpetrator were more likely to receive wounds to the face and be injured with a weapon from the scene compared to victims with non-partner perpetrators. Injury to the head and use of manual violence were more likely among intimates and family/friends compared with acquaintances or strangers. However, the groups did not significantly differ in terms of the overall amount of wounds inflicted (Trojan and Krull, 2012). Another finding is that when the perpetrator was an intimate partner, they were more likely to stay at the crime scene and wait for the police. In contrast, when the victim was an acquaintance or a

rival, the perpetrator was more likely to escape and to make an effort to dispose of the evidence (Radford and Russell, 1992). In both studies, the researchers made it clear that their findings should only be interpreted as a suggestion that can lend investigators assistance (Trojan and Krull, 2012).

Another strategy to deal with missing information on the victim-offender relationship, especially in representative datasets, is to investigate the relationship between missing and non-missing data and to use this information to impute what the missing values are likely to be. Regoeczi and Riedler (2003) found that trends in clearance rates supported the notion that the data is missing at random as the character of stranger homicides does not covary with the percent of uncleared homicides. As this lends some support to believe that the victim-offender relationship can be missing at random, other variables in the data set can be used to predict this difference (Regoeczi and Riedel, 2003).

### **Information beyond the prevalence and incidence of IPH**

Data on IPH and IPF is not only important to establish its prevalence and incidence but also to inform prevention strategies as one cannot assume that interventions to prevent homicides in general are similarly effective for those committed by intimate partners. Thus, more information is needed on the circumstances of the homicides and the motives of the perpetrators, as well as prior reports of intimate partner violence to the police and support systems. Studies conducted in the United States highlight the importance of social disorganization and social deprivation in explaining IPH (Diem and Pizarro, 2010), the availability of guns (DeJong et al., 2011), and socio-economic characteristics, such as employment, marital status and age (Thomas et al., 2011).

In Europe, few studies investigate the contextual factors around IPH. In Austria, a study of court files of IPH convictions from 2008 to 2010 found that the main risk factors for men to murder their female partners are a history of intimate partner violence against the woman, women's attempts or decisions to end their relationship and male partner's jealousy. The number of women who murdered their intimate partners was far lower than that of men who murdered their partner. In total, in Austria current or former intimate partners attempt or successfully murdered one of 300 000 women per year

between 2008 and 2010. The main limitation of this study is that it excluded cases of IPH followed by suicide (Haller, 2014). Two German studies of court files also found that many IPF victims had experienced intimate partner violence prior to the murder (Greuel, 2009, Herbers et al., 2007). These studies also highlight the importance of preventing intimate partner violence to reduce homicide by identifying and supporting women who experience intimate partner violence.

A study using national data from Finland compared the social correlates of IPH to other forms of homicide. They found that male IPF offenders are similar to other homicide offenders as they are disproportionately often from socially disadvantaged groups, with a majority being middle-aged, permanently unemployed, alcoholics with a history of violence and a prior criminal conviction. Female IPH offenders, compared to female offenders of other homicides more often reported to have experienced violence by the IPH victim, which suggests that the homicide is often related to a defensive reaction to the violent behavior of the male homicide victim (Kivivuori and Lehti, 2012). A similar study conducted in the UK by Dobash and Dobash (2004) found that men who murder an intimate partner are more conventional than men who murder other men, however, they are more likely to have broken down relationships and a history of intimate partner violence.

A study of autopsy and police records in Southern Denmark further confirmed that many IPFs were cases of fatal intimate partner violence as well as cases of women killing their partners in self-defense (Leth, 2009). This is supported by a study from Switzerland, which found that approximately half of the female IPF victims between 2000 and 2004 had experienced prior intimate partner violence, with 39 percent reporting it to the police, while 46 percent of all male perpetrators were known to the police (Zoder, 2008). High rates of prior intimate partner violence were also found in dedicated studies on IPH in Spain and France (Ministere de l'Interieur, 2011, Ministerio de Sanidad Servicios Sociales e Igualdad, 2013). In Spain, between 2006 and 2011, 28 percent of women reported intimate partner violence to the police prior to the female IPH and 84 percent requested protective measures (Ministerio de Sanidad, 2013).

Apart from those examples, most sources presenting European data on IPH barely report more than the incidence numbers. Based on these existing studies, Table 1 summarizes recommendations on data collection.

### **Conclusions and recommendations**

This article outlined the main issues in IPH and IPF collection and reporting. The main sources of information come from national mortality, crime and police statistics, court files, mortuary data and newspaper searches. All these sources face similar challenges such as the absence or missing information on the victim-offender relationship, and different categorizations of key parameters, such as the definition of intimate partners, homicide and time periods.

Strong and reliable data on the incidence and contextual information on IPH is important.

Such information regarding femicide are useful also to understand what better could have been done to prevent any these violent crimes to happen in the first place.

For example, without information on the perpetrator and the victim and their relationship, a homicide cannot be solved. This is a serious criminal justice issue, as without arrests there is neither further processing of perpetrators nor a reduction of crimes (Regoeczi and Riedel, 2003). The absence of national data on IPH incidences also prevent the development of targeted policies to reduce homicide numbers.

Reliable data is thus important for the prevention of IPH because it will focus attention on the possible factors that may explain differences in IPH rates between geographical areas or social groups and focus on the underlying gendered and societal factors. Policies, campaigns and actions focused on reducing IPF might be different from those that reduce male IPH, and they should be closely linked to existing strategies addressing intimate partner violence. Providing services to abused women is one of the potential factors that lead to a decrease in male IPH in the US (Campbell et al., 2007, Johnson and Hotton, 2003). Improved identification and response to intimate partner violence and assessment of its severity and potential homicide risk by the criminal justice, health and social services is therefore a

crucial step for IPH prevention. A range of safety assessment aids, like the Danger Assessment Tool (Campbell et al., 2000) or Spousal Assault Risk Assessment (Baldry & Winkel, 2008; Kropp & Hart, 2000), and protocols for their use in different service settings, already exist but they should be extended and broadly used.

In accordance to a previous study about this issue (Vives-Cases et al., 2016a, Vives-Cases et al., 2016b), to improve data collection of IPH it is necessary to implement through reporting methods in the police systems and other relevant institutions, and to train healthcare professionals, psychologist and journalist, who report on IPH accordingly. Data entry systems need to be improved and mandatory reporting should be required. In addition, collaborations need to be established between institutions collecting information on homicides. The coordination with NGO newspaper databases may be especially interesting to promote new surveillance systems if governmental institutions provide no or only basic data on IPH. Training of journalists not only improve reporting, it can also lead to improved services for those experiencing intimate partner violence.

To promote cross-country comparisons, it is important to expand existing initiatives to improve the monitoring of homicides across countries. The European Homicide Monitor (EHM) is an interesting initiative in this regard, as it aims to study specific homicide types such as IPHs, homicides that take place within families, homicide-suicides that take place within a criminal milieu (Liem et al., 2013). The EHM, which is based on the data available within the countries, mirrors the measuring issues described in this article. The analysis of the homicide data of three countries shows that for a substantial number of homicide cases the victim-offender relationship was unknown (52% of all homicides in the Netherlands, 15% in Sweden and 5% in Finland) (Ganpat et al., 2011). Improvements on detection and reporting of the victim-offender relationship need to be primarily made both at the national level, and with cross-national initiatives across Europe. In Spain, the strong demand for an improved Monitoring Systems for Violence against Women has resulted in strong and reliable data on IPH as part of intimate partner violence monitoring, a process from which other countries can learn.

## References

- ABRAHAM, N., JEWKES, R., MARTIN, L. J., MATHEWS, S., VETTEN, L. & LOMBARD, C. 2009. Mortality of women from intimate partner violence in South Africa: a national epidemiological study. *Violence and victims*, 24, 546-556.
- ADINKRAH, M. 1999. Spousal homicides in Fiji. *Homicide Studies*, 3, 215-240.
- ALBRIGHT, D., BANKS, L., BROIDY, L., CRANDALL, C. & CAMPOS, G. 2013. Ethical conundrums in fatality review planning, data collection, and reporting: Viewing the work of review teams through the lens of evaluation. *Homicide Studies*, 17, 436-456.
- BALDRY, A. C. 2016. *Dai maltrattamenti all'uxoricidio, (from domestic violence to intimate partner homicide)*, 6th edition Milano, Franco Angeli.
- BALDRY, A. C. & FERRARO, E. 2010. *Uomini che uccidono. Cause, storie e investigazioni*, Milano, Eneit.
- BALDRY, A. C. & WINKEL, F. W. 2008. *Intimate partner violence prevention and intervention: the risk assessment and management approach*, Nova Science.
- BALICA, E. & STÖCKL, H. 2016. Homicide–suicides in Romania and the role of migration. *European Journal of Criminology*, Online first, doi:10.1177/1477370816633258
- BARBER, C. W., AZRAEL, D., HEMENWAY, D., OLSON, L. M., NIE, C., SCHAECHTER, J. & WALSH, S. 2008. Suicides and Suicide Attempts Following Homicide Victim–Suspect Relationship, Weapon Type, and Presence of Antidepressants. *Homicide Studies*, 12, 285-297.
- BIROSCAK, B. J., SMITH, P. K. & POST, L. A. 2006. A practical approach to public health surveillance of violent deaths related to intimate partner relationships. *Public Health Reports*, 121, 393.
- BUGEJA, L., BUTLER, A., BUXTON, E., EHRAT, H., HAYES, M., MCINTYRE, S.-J. & WALSH, C. 2013. The implementation of domestic violence death reviews in Australia. *Homicide Studies*, 17, 353-374.
- BUNDESKRIMINALAMT. 2013. *Polizeiliche Kriminalstatistik 2012* [Online]. <http://www.bka.de/DE/Publikationen/PolizeilicheKriminalstatistik/2012/2012Standardtabellen/pks2012StandardtabellenOpferuebersicht.html>: Bundeskriminalamt.
- CAMPBELL, J., SHARPS, P. W. & GLASS, N. 2000. Risk assessment for intimate partner violence. In: PINARD, G. & PAGANI, L. (eds.) *Clinical assessment of dangerousness: empirical contributions*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- CAMPBELL, J. C., GLASS, N., SHARPS, P. W., LAUGHON, K. & BLOOM, T. 2007. Intimate partner homicide review and implications of research and policy. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse*, 8, 246-269.
- CENTRO REINA SOFÍA 2010. *III Informe Internacional: violencia contra la mujer en las relaciones de pareja: estadísticas y legislación (III International Report: Partner Violence against Women: Statistics and Legislation)*, Centro Reina Sofía para el Estudio de la Violencia.
- CORRADI, C., MARCUELLO SERVOS, C., BOIRA SARTO S. & WEIL, S. 2016. Theories of femicide and their significance for social research. *Current Sociology*. DOI: 10.1177/0011392115622256
- DAUVERGNE, M. 2004. Homicide in Canada, 2003. *Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics*, 24.
- DEJONG, C., PIZARRO, J. M. & MCGARRELL, E. F. 2011. Can Situational and Structural Factors Differentiate Between Intimate Partner and “Other” Homicide? *Journal of Family Violence*, 26, 365-376.
- DIEM, C. & PIZARRO, J. M. 2010. Social structure and family homicides. *Journal of Family Violence*, 25, 521-532.
- DOBASH, R. E., DOBASH, R. P., CAVANAGH, K. & LEWIS, R. 2004. Not an Ordinary Killer—Just an Ordinary Guy When Men Murder an Intimate Woman Partner. *Violence Against Women*, 10, 577-605.
- DOOLEY, E. 2001. *Homicide in Ireland 1992-1996*, Dublin, Stationery Office, Government of Ireland.
- EIGE 2012. *Review of the Implementation of the Beijing Platform for Action in the EU Member States: Violence against Women - Victim Support.*, Luxembourg, European Institute of Gender Equality.
- EU.R.E.S. – ANSA 2013. *Rapporto Eures- ANSA sull'omicidio volontario in Italia Anno 2012*, Rome, Eures.



- FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION 2011. *Crime in the United States Expanded Homicide Data*, <http://www.fbi.gov/about-us/cjis/ucr/crime-in-the-u.s/2012/crime-in-the-u.s.-2012/violent-crime/murder>, Criminal Justice Information Services Division, US Department of Justice.
- GANPAT, S., GRANATH, S., HAGSTEDT, J., KIVIVUORI, J., LEHTI, M., LIEM, M. & NIEUWBEERTA, P. 2011. *Homicide in Finland, the Netherlands and Sweden. A First Study on the European Homicide Monitor Data*, Stockholm, The Swedish National Council for Crime Prevention.
- GREUEL, L. 2009. *Gewalteskalation in Paarbeziehungen*, Bremen, Institut für Polizei und Sicherheitsforschung.
- HALLER, B. 2014. Intimate Partner Killing. Convictions in Austria from 2008 to 2010. *SWS-Rundschau*, 54, 59-77.
- HERBERS, K., LAMBRECHT, J. & LÜTGERT, H. 2007. *Tötungsdelikte an Frauen durch (Ex-) Intimpartner Polizeiliche und nicht-polizeiliche Erkenntnisse zur Tatvorgeschichte*, Detmold
- JOHNSON, H. & HOTTON, T. 2003. Losing control homicide risk in estranged and intact intimate relationships. *Homicide Studies*, 7, 58-84.
- KIVIVUORI, J. & LEHTI, M. 2012. Social Correlates of Intimate Partner Homicide in Finland Distinct or Shared With Other Homicide Types? *Homicide Studies*, 16, 60-77.
- KROPP, R. & HART, S. (2000). The Spousal Assault Risk Assessment (SARA) Guide: Reliability and Validity in Adult Male Offenders, *Law and Human Behavior*, 24, 101-118.
- LAST, S. K. & FRITZON, K. 2005. Investigating the nature of expressiveness in stranger, acquaintance and intrafamilial homicides. *Journal of Investigative Psychology and Offender Profiling*, 2, 179-193.
- LETH, P. M. 2009. Intimate partner homicide. *Forensic Science, Medicine, and Pathology*, 5, 199-203.
- LIEM, M., GANPAT, S., GRANATH, S., HAGSTEDT, J., KIVIVUORI, J., LEHTI, M. & NIEUWBEERTA, P. 2013. Homicide in Finland, the Netherlands, and Sweden First Findings From the European Homicide Monitor. *Homicide Studies*, 17, 75-95.
- LIEM, M. C. & PRIDEMORE, W. A. 2011. *Handbook of European Homicide Research: Patterns, Explanations, and Country Studies*, Springer.
- MINISTERE DE L'INTERIEUR 2011. Etude nationale sur les morts violentes au sein du couple: Année 2010. *Ministere de l'Interieur - Delegation aux victimes, Direction Generale de la police nationale, Direction generale de la gendarmerie nationale*.
- MINISTERIO DE SANIDAD 2013. *5th Annual report by the national observatory on violence against women 2012*, Madrid, Ministerio de Sanidad, Servicios Sociales e Igualdad.
- MINISTERIO DE SANIDAD SERVICIOS SOCIALES E IGUALDAD 2013. *5th Annual report by the national observatory on violence against women 2012*, Madrid, Ministerio de Sanidad, Servicios Sociales e Igualdad.
- QUINET, K. & NUNN, S. 2014. Establishing the Victim-Offender Relationship of initially unsolved homicides: Partner, Family, Acquaintance, or Stranger? *Homicide Studies*, 18, 271-297.
- RADFORD, J. & RUSSELL, D. E. 1992. *Femicide: The politics of woman killing*, Twayne Pub.
- REGOECZI, W. C. & RIEDEL, M. 2003. The application of missing data estimation models to the problem of unknown victim/offender relationships in homicide cases. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*, 19, 155-183.
- SANFORD, C., MARSHALL, S. W., MARTIN, S. L., COYNE-BEASLEY, T., WALLER, A. E., COOK, P., NORWOOD, T. & DEMISSIE, Z. 2006. Deaths from violence in North Carolina, 2004: how deaths differ in females and males. *Injury Prevention*, 12, ii10-ii16.
- SHAI, D. 2010. Homicide in the High North: Alaska, 1999-2006. *Homicide Studies*, 14, 132-158.
- SMIT, P. R., DE JONG, R. R. & BIJLEVELD, C. C. 2013. Homicide Data in Europe: Definitions, Sources, and Statistics. In: LIEM, M. C. & PRIDEMORE, W. A. (eds.) *Handbook of European Homicide Research: Patterns, Explanations, and Country Studies*. New York: Springer.
- SMITH, K., OSBORNE, S., LAU, I. & BRITTON, A. 2012. *Homicides, Firearm Offences and Intimate Violence 2010/11: Supplementary Volume 2 to Crime in England and Wales 2010/11* London.

- STÖCKL, H., DEVRIES, K., ROTSTEIN, A., ABRAHAMS, N., CAMPBELL, J., WATTS, C. & MORENO, C. G. 2013. The global prevalence of intimate partner homicide: a systematic review. *The Lancet*, 382, 859-865.
- THOMAS, K. A., DICHTER, M. E. & MATEJKOWSKI, J. 2011. Intimate Versus Nonintimate Partner Murder A Comparison of Offender and Situational Characteristics. *Homicide Studies*, 15, 291-311.
- TROJAN, C. & KRULL, A. C. 2012. Variations in Wounding by Relationship Intimacy in Homicide Cases. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 27, 2869-2888.
- VIVES-CASES, C., ÁLVAREZ-DARDET, C., COLOMER, C. & BERTOMEU, A. 2005. Health advocacy in violence against women: an experience. *Gaceta Sanitaria*, 19, 262-264.
- VIVES-CASES, C., GOICOLEA, I., HERNÁNDEZ, A., SANZ-BARBERO, B., GILL, A. K., BALDRY, A. C., SCHRÖTTLE, M. & STÖCKL, H. 2016a. Correction: Expert Opinions on Improving Femicide Data Collection across Europe: A Concept Mapping Study. *PloS one*, 11, e0154060.
- VIVES-CASES, C., GOICOLEA, I., HERNÁNDEZ, A., SANZ-BARBERO, B., GILL, A. K., BALDRY, A. C., SCHRÖTTLE, M. & STÖCKL, H. 2016b. Expert Opinions on Improving Femicide Data Collection across Europe: A Concept Mapping Study. *PloS one*, 11, e0148364.
- ZODER, I. 2008. *Tötungsdelikte in der Partnerschaft- Polizeilich registrierte Fälle 2000-2004*, Neuchatel, Bundesamt für Statistik.

**Table 1: Information of interest on intimate partner homicides**

<p><b>Scope</b> Prevalence and rates by age and gender Prevalence of attempted homicide by age and gender</p> <p><b>Socio-economic characteristics of victim and perpetrator</b> Sex, age, education level, employment status, religion and income level Country of origin and if applicable immigration status, ethnicity Area of residence Drug or alcohol dependence Psychiatric problems and criminal record of the perpetrator</p> <p><b>Relationship information</b> Relationship status (married, separated, cohabiting, lovers, short- term relationship) Relationship duration Number and age of children and if applicable custody issues Economic dependencies Prior domestic violence (reported and unreported) and if applicable willingness to leave the partner, social support available, help requested from different services (police, medical, social), restraining orders or institutional protection in place and whether they were breached.</p> <p><b>Situational factors</b> Time (year, months, day of the week, time of the day the homicide took place) Geographical information (region, rural/urban, home versus outside the home) Mode of homicide (weapon, strangulation, ...) Alcohol or drug usage of perpetrator and/or victim Stated and deducted motives of the intimate partner homicide Witnesses of the homicide Collateral murders to the homicide (who else was killed) Suicides and suicide attempts after the murder Behaviour after the murder Sexual offence before/during the murder Acting alone/with other people</p> <p><b>Children</b> Custody issues History of abuse Social-psychological mal-adaptation</p> <p><b>Legal outcomes</b> Criminal proceedings and judgment</p>
--

## Endnotes

---

<sup>ii</sup> Four countries did not provide data for men and women separately