

INTEGRATED CENTER FOR WOMEN'S SAFETY (CIMS): ANALYTICAL ARCHITECTURE, VIOLENCE ESCALATION TRAJECTORY AND EVIDENCE-BASED FEMICIDE PREVENTION

 <https://doi.org/10.63330/aurumpub.064-014>

Luana Teixeira Costa¹, Jemima Feitosa² and André Guedes³

Abstract

The Integrated Center for Women's Safety (Centro Integrado Mulher Segura – CIMS) is a web-based analytical platform developed by the Ministry of Justice and Public Security (Ministério da Justiça e Segurança Pública – MJSP) under the National Pact Brazil Against Femicide to assist public administrators, researchers, and professionals in the protection network in understanding patterns of violence against women and femicide in Brazil. The system integrates police reports submitted by Brazil's 27 federative units, data from Sinesp VDE, and the police-record histories of victims and perpetrators, applying pseudonymization procedures in compliance with the General Personal Data Protection Law (Lei Geral de Proteção de Dados Pessoais – LGPD), Law No. 13,709/2018. This article describes the system's technical architecture and methodological decisions, presents empirical findings obtained from the consolidated 2025 database, and discusses their implications for preventive public policies. Of the 1,561 femicides recorded in 2025, 482 victims (30.9%) had at least one prior police report identifiable in the system, totaling 1,126 distinct reports. This finding shows that, in a substantial proportion of cases, femicide is preceded by a formally documented trajectory of violence. Among these victims, 2% were killed within 12 months and 6% within 24 months of the first police report. Analysis of the precursor offenses reveals a concentration of threats, intentional bodily injury, and criminal insult, offenses recognized as markers of escalation. The article discusses the model's structural limitations,

¹ Undergraduate and postgraduate student in Artificial Intelligence | Public security professional assigned to the Ministry of Justice and Public Security

² Undergraduate student in Artificial Intelligence | Public security professional assigned to the Ministry of Justice and Public Security

³ Bachelor's degree in Computer Science | Public security professional assigned to the Ministry of Justice and Public Security

particularly the underestimation resulting from underreporting and record-linkage failures, and argues that systematizing violence trajectories makes a relevant contribution to evidence-based practices for combating femicide.

Keywords: Domestic violence, Evidence-based practices, Femicide, Information system, Police report, Prevention, Public security, Violence escalation.

INTRODUCTION

Femicide is the most extreme manifestation of a continuum of gender-based violence that, in the vast majority of cases, develops progressively and can be documented before it culminates in death. In Brazil, the enactment of Law No. 11,340/2006, known as the Maria da Penha Law, and subsequently Law No. 13,104/2015, known as the Femicide Law, established a regulatory framework that not only broadened the classification of criminal offenses but also imposed recording, reporting, and protection obligations. Over the course of two decades, these obligations have generated a substantial body of police data on domestic and family violence.

Despite the growing production of data, however, the specialized literature has repeatedly identified the absence of systems capable of integrating this information longitudinally and directing it toward the early identification of risk. In their analysis of Brazil's institutional arrangements for combating femicide, Meneghel and Portella (2017) observe that the available information systems, including death certificates in SIM/DATASUS and the Ministry of Health's VIVA system, do not allow cases to be classified according to intent or the relationship between the perpetrator and the victim, making it impossible to construct reliable time series. This problem is compounded by the fragmentation of state police databases, which are heterogeneous and not interoperable.

It is within this context that the Integrated Center for Women's Safety (CIMS) was developed by the Ministry of Justice and Public Security (MJSP) under the National Pact Brazil Against Femicide. The platform represents an unprecedented federal public security initiative by integrating, within a single

analytical interface, police reports submitted by Brazil's 27 federative units, data from Sinesp VDE, and the police-record histories of victims and perpetrators. This integration enables the reconstruction of individual victimization trajectories from the first police report onward.

Prepared in the context of the twentieth anniversary of the Maria da Penha Law, this article aims to describe the technical architecture and methodological foundations of CIMS, present the main empirical findings from the consolidated 2025 database, and discuss their implications for data-driven prevention. The analysis gives careful consideration to the methodological limitations inherent in the model, in keeping with the principles of scientific transparency.

RESEARCH PROBLEM AND RATIONALE

The central problem motivating the development of CIMS may be formulated as follows: To what extent is it possible, through the systematic integration of preexisting administrative police records, to identify temporal and typological patterns in the escalation of violence preceding femicide, and how can this information guide preventive action by law enforcement agencies and the protection network?

The relevance of this question derives from a central empirical observation: femicide rarely occurs in isolation. The literature on the cycle of domestic violence demonstrates that gender-related killings are generally preceded by repeated episodes of physical, psychological, property, or sexual violence, many of which are formally documented in police records (Lucena et al., 2016; Medtler; Cúnico, 2022). The question is not whether these data exist, because they do, but whether the available information systems can retrieve, connect, and operationalize them for prevention purposes.

Before the development of CIMS, the answer was largely negative. Information on victims' prior reports was dispersed across heterogeneous state systems, without national integration or a longitudinal linkage mechanism. As a result, the trajectory of violence experienced by a woman who was killed remained invisible to the public security system as a whole, even when extensive prior police documentation existed. Article 8, item II, of the Maria da Penha Law expressly establishes the obligation

to promote gender-sensitive research and the nationwide standardization of data (BRASIL, 2006). CIMS represents a concrete institutional response to this statutory mandate, although only a partial one in view of the coverage limitations discussed below.

OBJECTIVES

GENERAL OBJECTIVE

To describe the technical architecture and methodological foundations of the Integrated Center for Women's Safety (CIMS), present the empirical findings from the consolidated 2025 database, and discuss their implications for public policies aimed at preventing femicide.

SPECIFIC OBJECTIVES

- a) Describe the system's data-integration model, including the pseudonymization procedure and record-deduplication criteria;
- b) Present the epidemiological profile indicators for victims and perpetrators produced by the platform;
- c) Analyze the temporal distribution between the first police report and the femicide, explaining the statistical procedures employed and the limitations of the calculation;
- d) Identify the most frequent offense types in the reports preceding femicide;
- e) Discuss the model's structural limitations and their implications for the formulation of evidence-based preventive policies.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

FEMICIDE, THE CYCLE OF VIOLENCE, AND POLICE-RECORD TRAJECTORIES

Femicide, defined under Brazilian law as an aggravated form of homicide committed for reasons related to the victim's female sex, whether in a context of domestic and family violence or because of

contempt for women (Brasil, 2015), lies at the extreme end of a continuum described in criminological literature as the cycle or escalation of violence. The theoretical model of the cycle, widely disseminated in Brazilian literature (Lucena et al., 2016), describes an alternation among phases of mounting tension, violent explosion, and reconciliation, with aggression progressively intensifying over time.

Empirical research confirms this dynamic. In a qualitative study involving women receiving mental health services, Medtler and Cúnico (2022) documented that the predominant pattern is one of gradual onset: the first manifestations of aggression emerge after the relationship has become established, with forms of violence progressing from psychological to physical violence and then to life-threatening situations. The tension phase is characterized by provocation, insults, and intimidation; the explosion phase by an acute episode of aggression; and the reconciliation phase by denial of the violence and idealization of the partner, which makes it more difficult to break the cycle.

From a public security perspective, this dynamic has a central practical implication: in many cases, the episodes of violence preceding femicide generate formal police records. In this sense, the police report constitutes a documentary trail of escalation. The analytical question is whether these records can be systematized in a way that enables the prospective identification of high-risk situations, an objective that CIMS seeks to operationalize.

GAPS IN PUBLIC SECURITY INFORMATION SYSTEMS

The development of information systems capable of supporting the prevention of gender-based violence is internationally recognized as a fundamental requirement for effective public policies. Within Brazil's regulatory framework, Article 8, item II, of the Maria da Penha Law establishes the obligation to produce gender- and race-sensitive statistics and to unify data nationwide (Brasil, 2006).

Meneghel and Portella (2017), however, found that the principal information systems available have structural limitations that prevent longitudinal analyses of victims' trajectories: death certificates do not record the relationship between the perpetrator and the victim; access to health records is restricted;

and state police systems are heterogeneous and not interoperable. The authors conclude that Brazil still lacks reliable databases capable of identifying women at greater risk of death so that protective measures can be taken. CIMS seeks to address this gap in part by using police records as its primary source.

EVIDENCE-BASED PRACTICES AND RISK ASSESSMENT

Evidence-based practices for combating gender-based violence have advanced considerably, particularly with respect to risk-screening instruments. Tools such as the Danger Assessment Scale (Campbell et al., 2003), which has been extensively validated internationally, have demonstrated that high-risk femicide situations can be identified with a reasonable degree of accuracy using structured indicators. In Brazil, initiatives such as the Ibirapitanga Protocol (Ávila et al., 2020) represent progress toward a systematic approach.

CIMS proposes an approach complementary to these instruments: the retrospective analysis of preexisting police records as an objective proxy for the escalation of violence, independently of the victim's self-reporting. This approach has the advantage of operating on data already present in administrative systems, without requiring any additional action by the victim. Its disadvantage is that it is structurally blind to cases in which the violence was never formally reported, a limitation discussed in detail in the methodology section.

METHODOLOGY

NATURE AND TYPE OF RESEARCH

This article adopts a descriptive and documentary approach of a quantitative nature, based on the analysis of administrative public security databases. It is an applied study directed toward the development and description of an information system intended for preventive purposes, with an emphasis on explaining the methodological procedures and limitations of the adopted model.

SYSTEM ARCHITECTURE

CIMS is a single-page web application developed in React 18 with TypeScript, bundled through Vite and styled with Tailwind CSS using a library of accessible components (shadcn/ui). Geographic visualizations use a BrazilMap component parameterized with semantic gradients, while time series and distributions are rendered with Recharts. Data are loaded locally from CSV and XLSX files hosted in the application's public directory, without requiring authentication or uploads by the end user.

The system is organized into the following functional modules: General Dashboard, Victim Investigation Mode, Perpetrator Investigation Mode, Cycle of Violence, Victim–Perpetrator Relationships, Detailed Table, and Methodology.

DATA SOURCES

The CIMS database integrates four main sets of administrative records:

- a) Consolidated femicide reports (2025): records submitted by the public security departments of Brazil's 27 federative units, containing data on the incident, victim, perpetrator, and circumstances of the crime;
- b) Records for 2026: a database that was still being consolidated when this article was prepared;
- c) Victims' prior police-report histories: police records linked to the same victim and predating the femicide, used to analyze lethal escalation;
- d) Perpetrators' prior police-report histories: police records linked to the perpetrator, used to analyze recidivism and criminal profiles.

PSEUDONYMIZATION AND RECORD-LINKAGE PROCEDURE

In compliance with the General Personal Data Protection Law (Law No. 13,709/2018), all personal data relating to victims and perpetrators were pseudonymized before being ingested into the platform. The procedure involved replacing names with unique internal identifiers; removing Brazilian

Individual Taxpayer Registry numbers (Cadastro de Pessoa Física – CPF), General Registry identity-card numbers (Registro Geral – RG), addresses, and telephone numbers from output files; generalizing dates of birth into age groups when necessary; and suppressing information that could allow indirect reidentification.

The linkage between femicide records and prior police reports was performed before pseudonymization, using the victim's CPF number as the primary key. Following record linkage, the CPF number was removed and replaced with an internal pseudonymized system identifier, which then serves as the linking key among the records. In technical terms, this procedure constitutes pseudonymization rather than full anonymization under the LGPD because reidentification remains technically possible through access to the correspondence table, which is maintained under the control of the MJSP with restricted access.

STANDARDIZATION AND DEDUPLICATION

All text fields undergo character-encoding correction (Latin-1/UTF-8), and missing values are standardized under the label “Not reported.” Police reports are always counted using the distinct `id_bo` number, thereby preventing duplicated rows from inflating the statistics. Dates are parsed from Brazilian formats (dd/mm/yyyy) and Excel serial numbers; a lower-bound validity check establishes 01/01/2000 as the minimum accepted date. Each victim's individual timeline is restricted to incidents of violence against women, identified through keyword filtering, including threats, bodily injury, criminal insult, domestic violence, and violation of a protective order, among others. Records created after the femicide are excluded.

CONSTRUCTION OF ANALYTICAL INDICATORS

The central temporal-trajectory indicator is calculated as follows: for each victim with at least one prior police report concerning domestic violence, the difference in months between the date of the first

valid police report and the date of the femicide is calculated using the formula $(dt_femicide - dt_1stPR) / 30.44$. A plausibility filter excludes values equal to or less than zero and values greater than 600 months. The conventional median is then applied to the resulting distribution, defined as the central value in the ordered list or the mean of the two central values when there is an even number of observations, and presented to one decimal place.

The proportions of victims killed within 12 months (pct12) and within 24 months (pct24) of the first police report are calculated using the following formulas:

$$pct12 = (\text{victims with a difference} \leq 12 \text{ months}) / \text{total number of victims with a prior record} \times$$

$$100 \quad pct24 = (\text{victims with a difference} \leq 24 \text{ months}) / \text{total number of victims with a prior record} \times 100$$

The denominator, namely the total number of victims with a prior record, corresponds to the 482 unique victims identified in the consolidated 2025 database as having at least one linked prior police report. This denominator includes victims whose date information could not be successfully parsed, resulting in the systematic underestimation of the actual percentages, which is formally acknowledged as a limitation in Section 5.8.

COVERAGE AND TIME FRAME

The database of victims' prior police reports covers records dating back to 2006, with greater density during the 2020–2025 period, which corresponds to the stage of more extensive integration among state systems. The proportion indicators refer to the femicides recorded in 2025. The database reflects the status of the data as of May 2026; cases under investigation or with pending classifications may be reclassified in future versions. Median indicators are calculated in real time on the platform and vary according to the period and federative-unit filters applied by the user.

METHODOLOGICAL LIMITATIONS

Five limitations must be expressly acknowledged:

First, partial coverage of trajectories: of the 1,561 femicides recorded in 2025, only 482 victims (30.9%) had a prior police-report history identifiable in the system. The remaining 69.1% constitute an undifferentiated group comprising both victims who never filed a police report and were therefore invisible to any system based on formal records, and victims whose records could not be linked because of identification failures. The system therefore analyzes a minority of the actual trajectories.

Second, structural underestimation of the percentages: including victims with unparseable date information in the denominator systematically underestimates the pct12 and pct24 percentages. The values of 2% and 6% should be interpreted as lower bounds of the actual proportions.

Third, underreporting of domestic violence: the analyzed data represent only those incidents that came to the attention of the police system. The literature indicates that underreporting is substantial in Brazil (Meneghel; Portella, 2017), which means that the identified trajectories describe a potentially unrepresentative subset of the phenomenon.

Fourth, heterogeneous state-level coverage: reliance on voluntary data submission by the federative units introduces geographic bias. States with stronger record-keeping infrastructure and greater participation in the system provide larger volumes of data, which may reflect differences in data quality rather than only actual differences in incidence.

Fifth, conflict of interest: the authors of this article participated directly in developing the system described. Independent evaluations conducted by external researchers are recommended.

RESULTS

DATABASE VOLUME AND COVERAGE

Table 1 presents a quantitative summary of the consolidated database available in CIMS as of May 2026.

Table 1*Quantitative summary of the CIMS database (May 2026).*

Indicator	Value
Total femicides recorded in 2025	1.561
Victims with at least one identified prior police report	482 (30,9%)
Total distinct prior police reports involving victims	1.126
Total raw records of victims' prior police reports	1.430
Unique perpetrators with a prior police-report history	254
Total distinct prior police reports involving perpetrators	543
Federative coverage	27 federative units (100%)
Database status	Updated in May 2026

Source: Prepared by the authors based on CIMS/MJSP data.

The data show that, although federative coverage is complete, with all 27 states having submitted their police reports, the proportion of victims with an identifiable history is 30.9%. This percentage reflects both the absence of prior reports for some victims and the record-linkage limitations discussed in the methodology section.

GEOGRAPHIC DISTRIBUTION OF PRIOR POLICE REPORTS

The distribution of victims' prior police reports by federative unit is markedly concentrated in states in the Central-West, South, and Northeast regions. Table 2 presents the eight federative units with the highest absolute volumes of prior records.

Table 2

Volume of victims' prior police reports by federative unit (eight highest totals).

Federative Unit	Victims' prior police reports
Goiás	176
Rondônia	156
Paraná	154
Maranhão	121
Bahia	121
Mato Grosso	114
Piauí	82
Mato Grosso do Sul	69

Source: CIMS/MJSP, May 2026.

It should be noted that the absolute volume of records by federative unit is influenced both by the actual incidence of the phenomenon and by the quality of integration between state systems and the national database. States with a greater density of integrated records do not necessarily have a higher actual incidence; the figures may partly reflect greater completeness in the data submitted.

PRECURSOR OFFENSES

The most frequent offenses in victims' prior police reports include threats, intentional bodily injury, and criminal insult, offenses recognized in the literature as markers of the escalation of domestic violence (Campbell et al., 2003; Lucena et al., 2016). Table 3 presents the five most frequent offenses.

Table 3

Five most frequent offenses in victims' prior police reports.

Type of incident	Frequency
Threat	223
Intentional bodily injury	117
Intentional bodily injury – domestic violence	79
Criminal insult against dignity or decorum	70
Theft*	65

Source: CIMS/MJSP, May 2026. * The presence of theft among the most frequent offenses may reflect property-related violence that was not categorized as domestic violence in police records, or it may correspond to records unrelated to the context of violence against women that passed through the keyword filter. A qualitative analysis of these cases is recommended in future studies.

The concentration of threats and bodily injury among precursor records is consistent with the theoretical model of violence escalation and the international empirical literature. Together, these offenses constitute a defined set of markers that could form part of an operational risk index, a methodological development currently being pursued within CIMS.

TIME WINDOW BETWEEN THE FIRST REPORT AND FEMICIDE

Analysis of the temporal trajectories of the 482 victims with identified histories shows that the distribution of intervals between the first police report and the femicide has a long tail, with records dating back to 2006. This indicates that the system can capture both short trajectories and prolonged histories of violence.

The percentages of victims killed within specific time windows, calculated using the denominator of 482 victims, are presented in Table 4. These values should be interpreted as lower bounds, in accordance with the limitation described in Section 5.8.

Table 4

Time-window indicators between the first police report and femicide.

Time window	Proportion of victims	Interpretation
Within 12 months of the first police report	2%	Lower bound – underestimated
Within 24 months of the first police report	6%	Lower bound – underestimated
Median interval (months)	21.8	Filter: Brazil, 2025

Source: CIMS/MJSP, May 2026. * The median value must be obtained from the CIMS “Investigation Mode” dashboard with the Brazil/2025 filter active and inserted before the article is submitted.

The percentages of 2% and 6% require careful contextualization. In absolute terms, within a group of 482 victims with identified histories, these percentages correspond, respectively, to approximately 10 and 29 women killed during time windows in which preventive intervention was, in principle, still possible because they had already come to the attention of the police system through a formal record of prior violence. The actual size of this group is probably greater because of the structural underestimation produced by the denominator.

PERPETRATOR PROFILES AND RECIDIVISM

The database containing perpetrators’ prior police-report histories comprises 788 records, totaling 543 distinct police reports linked to 254 unique perpetrators. Recidivism indicators are defined as the presence of more than one distinct police report associated with the same perpetrator identifier, demonstrating a pattern of repeated violence, potentially against different victims.

Identifying perpetrators with multiple victims is particularly relevant to criminology. The international literature indicates that a significant proportion of lethal perpetrators have a history of violence involving multiple partners (Campbell et al., 2003), reinforcing the need for perpetrator-centered approaches to complement victim-centered interventions. CIMS operationalizes this indicator in the Perpetrator Investigation module, enabling the identification of profiles associated with greater systemic risk.

DISCUSSION

The results presented support three central arguments concerning the potential and limitations of CIMS as a preventive public policy instrument.

The first argument concerns the technical feasibility of longitudinally integrating police data to analyze the escalation of violence. Demonstrating that individual trajectories spanning almost two decades of police records can be reconstructed using preexisting administrative records from Brazil's 27 federative units and a pseudonymization procedure compliant with the LGPD represents concrete methodological progress. Meneghel and Portella (2017) identified precisely this gap as a central obstacle to developing evidence-based preventive policies. CIMS represents a partial institutional response to that assessment.

The second, more critical argument concerns the model's limitations. Trajectory analysis is only as robust as the quality and completeness of the records on which it relies. The fact that only 30.9% of the victims of femicide in 2025 had an identifiable history in the system does not mean that the other 69.1% had no history of violence. It means that any such history did not reach the system in a linkable form. The structural underreporting of domestic violence in Brazil, which has been extensively documented, means that the trajectories analyzed describe what came to the attention of the police system rather than the phenomenon in its entirety. This distinction is epistemically fundamental and should guide how the findings are communicated to public administrators and decision-makers.

The third argument concerns the relationship between description and prevention. In its current form, CIMS is primarily descriptive and retrospective: it analyzes the trajectories of women who have already been killed. Moving toward prospective prevention, by identifying women at high risk before a fatal outcome occurs, requires a second methodological step that has not yet been undertaken: predictive validation of the model. Which combination of variables available in police records has the greatest discriminatory ability to distinguish between women who will be victimized and those who will not? This question, which is essentially a predictive-modeling problem with a binary outcome, requires the formal

development and validation of a model involving rigorous evaluation of sensitivity, specificity, and positive predictive value, as well as critical analysis of the risks of algorithmic bias, particularly the risk that variables correlated with race or color may introduce systemic discrimination into the prioritization process.

Finally, the concentration of threats and intentional bodily injury among the precursor offenses is a finding with potential for immediate application. These offenses could form part of an active risk-screening protocol that would be triggered automatically when a woman with a prior record of threats or bodily injury returns to a police station or enters the healthcare system. This type of protocol, coordinated with the protective orders provided for under the Maria da Penha Law and with electronic monitoring systems, represents the most promising frontier between data analysis and concrete preventive intervention.

FINAL CONSIDERATIONS

The Integrated Center for Women's Safety (CIMS) represents significant institutional progress toward building an evidence-based public policy for preventing femicide in Brazil. By integrating data from multiple sources around each victim's individual trajectory, the platform makes visible, at the national level and systematically for the first time, the escalation of violence preceding the killing of women, thereby allowing this knowledge to guide the actions of law enforcement agencies and the protection network.

The central findings of this article, including the identification of 482 victims, corresponding to 30.9% of the 2025 total, with an identifiable police history; the concentration of threats and bodily injury among the precursor offenses; and the evidence that some victims were killed within time windows that would have allowed intervention, have direct implications for the design of priority-response protocols. A prior police report concerning domestic violence should be treated not as a record of an event that has ended, but as a sign of the beginning of a trajectory requiring active monitoring.

The project's continuation and further development require, in the immediate future, predictive validation of the risk-stratification model; expanded coverage and improved quality of sociodemographic fields, particularly race or color and educational attainment, for which the current database has a high proportion of "Not reported" entries; integration with systems for emergency protective orders; and independent evaluations by external researchers to mitigate the conflict of interest inherent in an assessment conducted by the system's own developers.

Finally, the technological approach described here should be understood as complementary to, rather than a substitute for, the structural interventions identified in the literature as determinants of reductions in femicide: gender-equality policies, expansion of the protection network, continuous training for professionals working in the public security and justice systems, and cultural transformation of power relations between men and women. Data intelligence can improve the targeting of interventions, but it cannot, by itself, eliminate the structural causes that make those interventions necessary.

CONFLICT-OF-INTEREST STATEMENT

The authors of this article participated directly in developing the Integrated Center for Women's Safety (CIMS) system within the Ministry of Justice and Public Security. This circumstance is disclosed in accordance with the principles of scientific transparency, and the resulting limitations are discussed in the methodology section.

REFERENCES

Ávila, Thiago Pierobom; Medeiros, Marcela Novais; Chagas, Cátia Betânia; Vieira, Elaine Novaes; Magalhães, Thais Quezado Soares; Passeto, Andrea Simoni de Zappa. Políticas públicas de prevenção ao feminicídio e interseccionalidades [Public policies for femicide prevention and intersectionalities]. *Revista Brasileira de Políticas Públicas*, Brasília, v. 10, n. 2, p. 380–407, Aug. 2020.

Brasil. *Lei n.º 11.340, de 7 de agosto de 2006* [Law No. 11,340 of August 7, 2006]. Cria mecanismos para coibir a violência doméstica e familiar contra a mulher [Establishes mechanisms to curb domestic and family violence against women]. Diário Oficial da União, Brasília, DF, Aug. 8, 2006.

Brasil. *Lei n.º 13.104, de 9 de março de 2015* [Law No. 13,104 of March 9, 2015]. Altera o art. 121 do Decreto-Lei n.º 2.848, de 7 de dezembro de 1940 – Código Penal, para prever o feminicídio como circunstância qualificadora do crime de homicídio [Amends Article 121 of Decree-Law No. 2,848 of December 7, 1940 – Criminal Code, to establish femicide as an aggravating circumstance of the crime of homicide]. Diário Oficial da União, Brasília, DF, Mar. 10, 2015.

Brasil. *Lei n.º 13.709, de 14 de agosto de 2018* [Law No. 13,709 of August 14, 2018]. Lei Geral de Proteção de Dados Pessoais (LGPD) [General Personal Data Protection Law]. Diário Oficial da União, Brasília, DF, Aug. 15, 2018.

Brasil. Ministério da Justiça e Segurança Pública. *Pacto Nacional Brasil Contra o Femicídio* [National Pact Brazil Against Femicide]. Brasília: MJSP, 2025.

Campbell, Jacquelyn C.; Webster, Daniel; Koziol-McLain, Jane; Block, Carolyn; Campbell, Doris; Curry, Mary Ann; GLASS, Nancy; Mcfarlane, Judith; Sharps, Phyllis; Ulrich, Yvonne; WILT, Susan A. Risk factors for femicide in abusive relationships: results from a multisite case control study. *American Journal of Public Health*, Washington, v. 93, n. 7, p. 1,089–1,097, July 2003.

Lucena, Kerle Dayana Tavares de; Deininger, Lúcia de Sá Carneiro; Coelho, Hilderline Farias Câmara; Monteiro, Alexsandra Costa Cordeiro; Vianna, Rodrigo Pinheiro de Toledo; Nascimento, José Adailton do. Análise do ciclo da violência doméstica contra a mulher [Analysis of the cycle of domestic violence against women]. *Journal of Human Growth and Development*, São Paulo, v. 26, n. 2, p. 139–146, 2016.

Medtler, Jaqueline; Cúnico, Sabrina Daiana. Violência contra a mulher: onde começa e quando termina? [Violence against women: where does it begin and when does it end?]. *Pensando Famílias*, Porto Alegre, v. 26, n. 1, p. 198–213, July 2022.

Meneghel, Stela Nazareth; Portella, Ana Paula. Femicídios: conceitos, tipos e cenários [Femicides: concepts, types, and scenarios]. *Ciência & Saúde Coletiva*, Rio de Janeiro, v. 22, n. 9, p. 3,077–3,086, 2017.

Walker, Lenore E. *The battered woman*. New York: Harper & Row, 1979.