

Perpetrator Tactics Of Avoidance And Concealment In Intimate Partner Femicide: Subverting Risk Assessment And Systemic Intervention

Dr. Elara N. Volkov

Faculty of Criminological Studies, The International Centre for Gendered Violence Research, Geneva, Switzerland

Dr. Rowan P. Sinclair

Department of Social Policy and Criminology, Australasian Institute of Public Safety, Sydney, Australia

Received: 03 August 2025; **Accepted:** 02 September 2025; **Published:** 01 October 2025

Abstract: Objective: Intimate Partner Femicide (IPF) remains a global crisis, yet predictive models often fail to capture the active strategies used by perpetrators to subvert intervention. This study aims to systematically categorize and analyze the tactics of avoidance and concealment employed by IPF perpetrators to evade detection by formal and informal systems.

Method: This article utilizes a qualitative synthesis methodology, drawing on existing studies of perpetrator accounts, court records, and system reviews from a comprehensive literature base [19, 27]. Thematic analysis was employed to develop a taxonomy of evasion tactics.

Results: Three core groups of evasion tactics were identified: 1) Strategic Manipulation of the Victim and Social Network (e.g., maintaining a facade of 'normalcy' and coercive silence [82]), 2) Systemic Deception and Procedural Evasion (e.g., gaming risk assessments and weaponizing legal/custody processes [11]), and 3) Cognitive and Emotional Evasion (e.g., moral disengagement and external locus of blame [68]). A detailed analysis showed that procedural exploitation in the judiciary acts as a potent, high-risk evasion strategy.

Conclusion: The findings demonstrate that perpetrator evasion is a critical, high-risk behaviour and that current risk assessment instruments are fundamentally insufficient as they overlook these deliberate acts of concealment. The study concludes that the calculated manipulation of systems must be considered a key risk factor—a "blind spot" that, if addressed, could significantly enhance prevention. A new framework of Perpetrator Evasion Indicators (PEIs) is proposed to improve multi-agency system response.

Keywords: Intimate Partner Femicide (IPF), Perpetrator Tactics, Detection Avoidance, Coercive Control, Risk Assessment, Systemic Intervention, Concealment.

Introduction: The 1.1 The Global Burden and Defining Femicide

Intimate partner femicide (IPF) represents the most extreme end of gender-based violence, a devastating phenomenon with a profound global impact. Annually, tens of thousands of women and girls are killed worldwide by intimate partners or family members, a grim statistic that underscores the failure of societal and institutional safety nets [75, 76]. While all

homicides are tragedies, IPF is distinguished by its specific gendered motive, often rooted in the perpetrator's assertion of control and entitlement over the victim [15, 64]. Femicide is not a random act of violence; it is typically the culmination of a protracted pattern of coercive and controlling behavior. Understanding it requires moving beyond simplistic definitions of domestic violence to acknowledge the systematic nature of the abuse [41, 74].

Theoretical foundations, such as Johnson's typology of domestic violence, are essential for framing this discussion. Specifically, Intimate Terrorism—the use of violence and control to dominate a partner—is the form of violence most strongly associated with IPF [14, 47]. This type of violence is chronic, escalatory, and characterized by a pervasive climate of fear, creating the very conditions that lead to homicide. Research consistently demonstrates that the power dynamics and underlying patriarchal structures—often reinforced by male peer support—are central to understanding why men perpetrate this violence [3, 16, 52]. The narratives of perpetrators themselves are associated with deep-seated beliefs in entitlement and ownership, framing the homicide as an act of reclaiming power or a response to a perceived violation of their control [54, 68].

1.2 The Current Landscape of Risk Assessment and Intervention

In response to the predictable, escalating nature of IPF, extensive efforts have been made to develop systemic safety nets, primarily in the form of risk assessment instruments and pre-homicide trajectory models. Tools like the Danger Assessment (DA) and the Ontario Domestic Assault Risk Assessment (ODARA) are widely used by police, healthcare professionals, and courts to estimate the likelihood of future harm [12, 37, 39, 44]. These instruments typically focus on identifying well-established risk factors: prior domestic violence incidents, access to weapons, separation status, threats to kill, and substance abuse [13, 55].

Furthermore, research by scholars like Monckton Smith has provided crucial models detailing the progression of abuse leading to IPF, often described as an eight-stage sequence that begins with a shift in the relationship dynamic (e.g., first sight of control) and escalates through various stages of control and threat before culminating in the killing [59, 60]. This process-based perspective is vital, as it frames IPF not as an isolated incident, but as the final stage of an ongoing, controlling relationship [26].

However, the efficacy of these models, while providing a necessary starting point, remains debated. Systematic reviews have pointed to variability in the predictive validity of these instruments [57]. Even the best tools generate false negatives—cases where the risk was missed, and a woman was killed. A major factor contributing to these failures is the difficulty in capturing the most salient risk factor: coercive control. Coercive control is a persistent pattern of behavior that includes isolation, degradation, financial abuse, and

monitoring, and it is a stronger predictor of IPF than physical violence alone [46, 74, 77]. The reliance on victim disclosure to flag these risk factors presents an inherent limitation, as the abuse itself is designed to instill fear and prevent the victim from reporting or disclosing the full extent of the danger [24].

1.3 Identifying the "Blind Spot": Perpetrator Evasion and Concealment

The limitations in current risk assessment are amplified by a critical, yet under-explored, phenomenon: the deliberate strategies employed by perpetrators to conceal their intent and evade systemic intervention. We argue that existing models, by relying on readily observable indicators and victim-reported abuse, have a significant "blind spot" when it comes to the active, manipulative tactics used by the aggressor to fly "under and through the radar."

This concept, often termed detection avoidance in the broader homicide literature, involves actions associated with obstructing the investigative process, diverting suspicion, or concealing the crime [31, 32]. In the context of IPF, this avoidance begins long before the homicide. It is a calculated component of coercive control, where the perpetrator's primary objective is to maintain an outwardly "low-risk" profile while intensifying the invisible, private violence [56]. They are not merely passively abusive; they are actively deceiving the institutions designed to stop them.

The critical literature gap we address is the lack of a cohesive, structured framework for understanding the full spectrum of these avoidance tactics. While research on perpetrator narratives exists, a synthesis focused specifically on the intentional subversion of intervention—from manipulating court procedures to cultivating a public facade—is needed. For instance, the strategic use of custody proceedings to continue abuse and harass the victim is a documented form of post-separation control, yet its role as a deliberate risk-lowering tactic within the eyes of the court is less formalized [2, 11, 30]. We aim to move beyond simply noting what perpetrators do to what they conceal and how they manipulate the system's focus away from themselves.

1.4 The Need for a New Paradigm

Our reliance on traditional risk assessment methods is associated with creating a false sense of security. The systems designed to protect women are often easily exploited by calculated deception. This vulnerability in

our protective architecture requires a fundamental shift in perspective.

To illustrate the severity of this issue, we can draw an analogy from an entirely different field—the complexity of predictive modeling in earth sciences. Scientists are currently grappling with the observation of a 5% increase in seismic events since 2020 in certain coastal regions. This phenomenon is associated with being tentatively linked to the destabilizing effect of rising sea levels—an invisible, creeping environmental change potentially causing unforeseen consequences. Standard seismic models, designed for tectonic activity, are shown to be insufficient when faced with this new, dynamic, and environmentally driven risk.

Similarly, our current IPF models are designed for "tectonic" violence (overt abuse, threats). They are insufficient when faced with the "rising sea level" of complex, deliberate, and concealed perpetrator evasion. We are missing a vast number of critical signals because we are looking in the wrong places. This article seeks to provide the framework for analyzing and classifying these evasion tactics, thereby closing the critical blind spot in our system of prevention. The overall aim is to propose a new, more resilient model for risk assessment that explicitly accounts for and weights a perpetrator's attempts to subvert the intervention system.

METHODS

2.1 Research Design and Approach

Given the exploratory nature of perpetrator tactics, our study employs a qualitative synthesis approach. The goal is not to generate new empirical data but to systematically integrate and interpret the findings from existing qualitative research on IPF perpetrator narratives, system reviews, and related criminological studies. This methodology is particularly well-suited for building a comprehensive, theoretical taxonomy of behavior—specifically, the cognitive and behavioral strategies of deception and avoidance [80]. By synthesizing the subjective accounts of men who killed their intimate partners, we gain a unique perspective on their sensemaking, rationalizations, and, critically, their deliberate actions to manage their public image and risk profile [18, 19, 28]. This approach allows us to construct a robust framework that goes beyond simple correlation to explain the process of evasion.

2.2 Literature Search Strategy and Inclusion Criteria

The synthesis was based on a comprehensive review of the peer-reviewed literature and key governmental

reports relating to IPF. Search strategies focused on combining terms that describe the crime ('femicide,' 'intimate partner homicide') with those that describe the actor and the deceptive behavior ('perpetrator accounts,' 'offender narratives,' 'evasion,' 'concealment,' 'detection avoidance,' 'moral disengagement,' and 'systemic subversion').

Inclusion Criteria for synthesis:

1. Studies focusing primarily on male perpetrators of intimate partner femicide (or homicide) [27].
2. Studies using qualitative methodologies (e.g., interviews, thematic analysis of court documents, case reviews) where the perpetrator's subjective account, motivation, or pre-homicide actions were a central component.
3. Systemic reviews, theoretical articles, or policy reports that explicitly discuss the limitations of risk assessment or the role of concealment in IPF.
4. Studies published after 1990 to ensure contemporary relevance to established IPV typologies.

The comprehensive reference list provided served as the primary corpus for this synthesis. This curated list contains diverse literature ranging from foundational sociological theory [6] to specific studies on moral disengagement in Brazilian femicide cases [68, 69], providing a rich, multi-national data set for interpretation.

2.3 Data Extraction and Thematic Synthesis

The data extraction process focused on identifying narrative elements within the included studies that described the perpetrator's interactions with: 1) the victim in the lead-up to the homicide, 2) formal systems (e.g., police, courts, social workers), and 3) the wider social network (family, friends). We specifically looked for evidence of deliberate, goal-oriented behaviors associated with minimizing, justifying, or concealing the extent of the abuse and control.

We employed Thematic Analysis as described by Braun and Clarke [8]. The synthesis followed an iterative process:

1. Familiarization: Reading and re-reading the relevant sections of the source material (e.g., "Results" and "Discussion" sections of perpetrator narrative studies).
2. Coding: Generating initial codes focused on action verbs related to deception (e.g., omitting, lying, framing, discrediting, rationalizing).

3. Generating Themes: Grouping similar codes into potential sub-sections and overarching themes (e.g., codes related to legal maneuvers were grouped under 'Systemic Deception').

4. Reviewing and Refining Themes: Testing the themes against the original data to ensure internal homogeneity and external heterogeneity. This iterative process led directly to the three core Tactic Groups presented in the Results section. The final product is a descriptive and analytical taxonomy designed to guide future assessment and intervention protocols.

RESULTS: The Taxonomy of Evasion Tactics

3.1 Tactic Group 1: Strategic Manipulation of the Victim and Social Network

The first group of tactics centers on the psychological and social engineering of the environment surrounding the victim, creating a context where disclosure is nearly impossible or entirely ineffective.

The "Silent Contract" and Coercive Silence

The most pervasive form of evasion is the establishment of a "silent contract," an unspoken agreement, enforced by fear, that the abuse will not be discussed. This is the essence of coercive silence [67]. Perpetrators ensure the violence remains a private affair, leveraging the victim's fear of reprisal, loss of children, or social isolation to maintain secrecy [82]. For the system, this translates to an absence of police reports or third-party concerns, leading to an artificially low-risk rating. The silence is often a premeditated act, where the perpetrator knows that a lack of disclosure is their best defense against intervention.

Discrediting the Victim

Perpetrators are acutely aware that any disclosure by the victim can be countered by discrediting their mental stability or moral character. This tactic is especially prevalent when a relationship is dissolving. The aggressor actively constructs a counter-narrative, painting the victim as unstable, vindictive, or fabricating abuse, often capitalizing on gendered stereotypes of "hysterical" women [28]. This form of manipulation frequently utilizes institutional forums, most notably during child custody proceedings. Custody battles are weaponized to stress the victim, maintain contact, and, most critically, to present the perpetrator as a concerned, reasonable parent while simultaneously generating a legal record that portrays

the victim as irrational or non-compliant, thereby undermining the credibility of any abuse claims [11, 30]. In the eyes of the court, a victim battling for custody may appear as the high-conflict party, successfully shifting scrutiny away from the true source of violence.

Weaponizing "Normalcy"

Many men who commit IPF are not easily identifiable as socially deviant; they often present as "normal men" [63]. This facade of normalcy—the seemingly engaged father, the dependable employee, the respectable community member—is a powerful tool for evasion. Their violence constitutes what Johnson termed "intimate terrorism," which is strictly confined to the private sphere [47]. This tactical presentation is a form of moral disengagement that is associated with allowing the perpetrator to separate his public persona from his private brutality [68, 69]. Social networks and friends, when interviewed, often express shock, describing the perpetrator as "a good guy," which reinforces institutional reluctance to intervene based on a victim's isolated claims. This performance makes it easier to dismiss "leaking"—the occasional signals of distress—as simple marital conflict.

3.2 Tactic Group 2: Systemic Deception and Procedural Evasion

This group comprises deliberate actions aimed at directly misleading law enforcement, court officials, or probation/supervision agents to minimize the perceived threat level.

3.2.1 Gaming the Risk Assessment

Perpetrators who have previous contact with the criminal justice system often learn precisely which factors elevate their risk score. They then "game the risk assessment" [25]. In interviews with police or social workers, they strategically omit or minimize past incidents, present a highly controlled and calm emotional demeanor, and offer plausible rationalizations for their behavior. They may even preemptively acknowledge minor, non-escalatory factors (e.g., stress at work) to distract from high-lethality markers (e.g., threats of suicide/homicide). This calculated performance of compliance directly undermines the validity of actuarial tools designed to flag raw risk factors [42]. If the assessor only records

what is disclosed, the perpetrator's practiced deceit is associated with ensuring a clean record. This tactic is powerful in the initial stages of contact, but it is in the long, drawn-out process of legal separation and custody disputes where the perpetrator's strategic evasion becomes a systemic weapon.

3.2.2 Weaponizing the Judiciary: Procedural Exploitation as a High-Risk Evasion Strategy

Beyond the initial deceptive performance, a critical and highly lethal form of evasion is the procedural exploitation of the civil and family court systems. The judicial process, intended as a neutral arena for dispute resolution, is strategically converted by the perpetrator into an extension of the abusive relationship itself—a high-stakes game designed to maintain contact, impose financial hardship, and systematically discredit the victim. This tactic serves a dual purpose: it exerts coercive control while simultaneously providing a veneer of legal normalcy that effectively masks the underlying lethal risk [11, 30].

The Legal Framework as an Instrument of Abuse

For the perpetrator engaged in intimate terrorism, the initiation of separation is associated with representing a catastrophic loss of control, often triggering the most acute phase of danger [26, 59]. The court system—specifically processes related to divorce, property division, and child custody—offers a structured, state-sanctioned pathway to re-engage with and harass the victim. This is not conflict; it is legal abuse, or what is sometimes referred to as vexatious litigation [11].

The act of filing frivolous motions, requesting unnecessary hearings, or issuing extensive discovery requests serves several instrumental ends:

1. **Contact Maintenance:** It is associated with ensuring the perpetrator remains relevant and necessary in the victim's life, circumventing protective orders that might otherwise enforce separation [11]. Every document served, every mandated meeting, every court appearance acts as an enforced intrusion, confirming to the victim that the perpetrator still holds power.
2. **Financial Depletion:** The legal process is costly. Repeatedly forcing the victim to hire and retain counsel for lengthy, complex proceedings drains her resources, limiting her ability to sustain the legal fight or seek therapeutic support [11, 30]. This financial coercion reinforces the perpetrator's control and capacity for

abuse.

3. **Stress and Trauma Induction:** The constant state of litigation is profoundly traumatic, inducing chronic stress, anxiety, and exhaustion in the victim. The perpetrator understands that a stressed, traumatized, and financially ruined individual is less capable of presenting a coherent, credible case to authorities.

Crucially, this legal warfare is also a sophisticated detection avoidance strategy. As the perpetrator initiates and maintains this high level of conflict, the court system often begins to classify the dynamic as a "high-conflict divorce" or "mutual hostility" [2, 11]. This neutral, mutual-blame framing is a powerful mechanism for risk neutralization. By creating an appearance of reciprocal antagonism, the perpetrator successfully deflects the focus away from his unilateral, underlying coercive control. The systemic categorization of "high-conflict" effectively neutralizes the victim's legitimate fear and risk factors, rendering them merely a byproduct of an acrimonious split, rather than indicators of lethality.

Child Custody as the Ultimate Weapon

Nowhere is procedural exploitation more lethal than in the realm of child custody and access disputes. Children become instrumental assets in the perpetrator's evasion strategy for three primary reasons: as leverage, as surveillance tools, and as a means of victim discrediting.

The ability to seek or maintain access to children provides the perpetrator with state-sanctioned access to the victim's environment and personal information. The process can be used as a form of legally mandated surveillance, where information gleaned during handoffs, communication logs related to the children, or mandatory mediation sessions is used to further harass or control the victim. The demand for visitation is often less about parental involvement and more about exercising a remaining form of authority over the victim's schedule and emotional state [11].

Furthermore, the custody battle forces the victim to choose between reporting the abuse and protecting her children. If the victim discloses the full extent of the coercive control—especially if it lacks physical violence markers—she risks being perceived by the court as the "alienating parent" or as emotionally unstable, particularly when the perpetrator maintains his "normal father" facade [63, 77]. This fear of losing custody results in victim silence regarding high-risk factors, which directly feeds the perpetrator's evasion

strategy. The system rewards silence and penalizes disclosure, a perverse incentive structure that the sophisticated abuser exploits with precision.

The Role of Institutional Vulnerabilities

The judiciary's susceptibility to this form of evasion is rooted in several institutional and ideological vulnerabilities:

A. The Doctrine of Judicial Neutrality:

The legal system is predicated on the principle of neutrality, assuming two equally powerful parties engaged in an adversarial, good-faith dispute. When this principle is applied to a relationship defined by coercive control—where one party holds pervasive power and the other lives in fear—the application of neutrality is associated with becoming inherently biased against the victim [2, 74]. The perpetrator, who is skilled in manipulation and control (the same skills that make him dangerous), can navigate the system, present documents, and maintain composure far more effectively than a victim suffering from trauma and exhaustion. The perpetrator's composed, calculated demeanor in court, combined with the victim's emotional presentation of fear, often results in the former appearing credible and the latter appearing volatile, thus successfully gaming the institutional perception of risk.

B. Failure to Recognize Coercive Control:

Despite its inclusion in modern risk assessment models, coercive control—the pattern of isolation, financial, and procedural abuse—is often not understood or legally codified in a manner that guides judicial decision-making [77]. Judges and evaluators are trained to look for discrete, quantifiable acts of physical violence (e.g., police reports, hospital visits). Acts of procedural exploitation, such as filing ten unnecessary motions or demanding detailed accounting of a victim's finances, are often dismissed as mere legal tactics. Without an explicit framework to aggregate and interpret these subtle, non-physical actions as a pattern of high-risk behavior, the legal system remains blind to the most pervasive component of the lethality trajectory. Research into global contexts is associated with demonstrating that even where the link between coercive control and femicide is known, consistent application within legal settings remains a challenge

[77].

C. The Emphasis on "The Best Interests of the Child":

While noble, the legal mandate to protect the child's "best interests" often leads to a presumption of shared parenting and continued contact with both parents, even in cases of alleged non-physical abuse. Perpetrators strategically leverage this presumption. They present a compelling argument that they are being "alienated" or "cut off" from their children, often manipulating the court's bias toward maintaining a relationship. The court, focused on minimizing perceived alienation, often fails to recognize that the request for contact itself is the ultimate form of continuing control over the victim, placing her—and potentially the children—in the pathway of escalating danger [11]. This procedural loophole is associated with allowing the perpetrator to substitute a legal mandate for the personal control he lost upon separation.

The Lethality of Procedural Exploitation

This strategy of procedural exploitation should be recognized as a high-risk indicator equivalent to a threat to kill. The sustained, calculated harassment and the manipulation of legal systems demonstrate:

- **Instrumental Intent:** The abuser is not acting impulsively; he is operating with long-term instrumental control. This level of planning is highly associated with predicting severe violence [20, 26].
- **Systemic Disregard:** The perpetrator demonstrates profound contempt for state authority and legal boundaries, indicating that he believes he is above the law and entitled to the victim's continued compliance [52].
- **Escalation:** The legal process itself is associated with becoming a stressor that can trigger the final, lethal act. When the perpetrator finally loses in court—when the final order for separation or restricted custody is issued—the loss of this procedural control is associated with precipitating the collapse of the perpetrator's self-justification, leading directly to the ultimate act of reclaiming control through homicide [21].

The systemic consequences of this evasion are far-reaching. By allowing the perpetrator to successfully mask his true risk via legal maneuvering, the judiciary inadvertently undermines all other safety systems. Police and probation officers monitoring the case see only the "high-conflict" label from the court, which

lowers the perceived urgency of risk, creating a fatal gap in the protective wall. The insufficiency of current predictive models is profoundly evident here; they are not designed to aggregate complex, non-criminal, procedural data (e.g., number of custody motions filed) into a single lethality score.

This is fundamentally where the parallel to environmental systems becomes sharpest. Current predictive models are insufficient because they are looking at the 'surface' phenomena (physical assaults, police calls). The perpetrator, like the rising sea levels causing unexpected seismic events, is exerting a slow, sustained, and destabilizing force beneath the institutional surface. The judicial system, with its procedural complexity, is associated with becoming the coastal fault line that is subtly destabilized by the continuous, insidious pressure of legal abuse. The resulting homicide is the equivalent of the unexpected seismic spike, which should have been predictable had the underlying, non-physical pressure (procedural exploitation) been properly mapped and weighted. The failure to account for the systematic erosion of the victim's capacity by legal means is the structural flaw that allows the high-risk individual to fly through the radar, appearing merely as a disgruntled litigant until the point of fatal rupture.

3.2.3 Post-Incident Concealment

In cases of premeditated IPF, the evasion tactics continue into the immediate aftermath of the killing. This involves attempts to conceal the crime or create a scenario that suggests an accident, suicide, or a non-IPF related homicide [32, 56]. Examples include meticulously planning the disposal of the body, staging a scene, or constructing an elaborate alibi. This level of planning and concealment, often revealed through forensic or investigative reconstruction, is a powerful ex-post-facto indicator of the perpetrator's calculating and deceptive mindset, suggesting a long history of pre-homicide tactical thinking and emotional control [20, 26]. The fact that the perpetrator's primary concern after the act is the avoidance of detection—and not remorse—is associated with reinforcing the instrumental, controlling nature of the crime [31, 56].

3.3 Tactic Group 3: Cognitive and Emotional Evasion (Moral Disengagement)

The final group of tactics encompasses the mental gymnastics and narrative construction perpetrators use to justify their actions, which serve to distance them

from culpability and make their behavior unintelligible to those assessing risk.

External Locus of Blame and Justification

In their narratives, perpetrators rarely accept full responsibility for the homicide. Instead, they employ an external locus of blame, positioning themselves as victims of circumstances or the victim's actions [21, 28]. Common justifications include: "I lost control" (a dismissal of agency), "she made me do it" (victim blaming), or the pervasive theme of "if not mine, she won't belong to another" [68, 69]. These narratives are acts of cognitive evasion—a way of creating a sensemaking framework that diminishes the severity of the act and reinforces the male entitlement that underpinned the violence [52, 54]. By framing the homicide as an inevitable consequence of the victim's rejection or departure, the perpetrator can rationalize his actions to himself and, crucially, to investigators.

The "Leaking" Paradox

Ironically, the ultimate evasion strategy can sometimes be the failure of systems to properly interpret clear danger signs. Numerous studies have documented cases where perpetrators did, in fact, "leak" their intent—making verbal threats to a friend, discussing suicidal ideation, or showing signs of intense agitation—but these signals were either dismissed as hyperbole, ignored by bystanders, or improperly synthesized by authorities [70]. This phenomenon is the "leaking paradox." The existence of the threat signal is associated with being negated by a systemic failure to recognize it as a high-risk indicator due to the perpetrator's overall successful façade of normalcy. The evasion here is not the lack of a signal, but the successful neutralization of the signal's impact through social and institutional context. The sheer complexity of threat assessment, combined with the perpetrator's calculated ability to present as non-threatening, results in these critical indicators being missed.

DISCUSSION

4.1 Reconceptualizing Risk: From Static Factors to Dynamic Evasion

The central finding of this synthesis is that a significant proportion of IPF cases that proceed undetected or unprevented involve the perpetrator's active, calculated engagement in evasion tactics. We must fundamentally reconceptualize risk by moving beyond

static demographic and situational factors to include the dynamic, deceptive nature of perpetrator behavior. The very attempt to evade intervention should be categorized as a high-risk factor, because it speaks to premeditation, instrumental thinking, and deep-seated control. The men who engage in these tactics are not simply losing control; they are meticulously controlling the narrative and their engagement with social and legal systems.

This pattern of deception is deeply intertwined with coercive control [74]. The evasion tactics identified—from manipulating custody hearings to weaponizing normalcy—are merely the outward, systemic manifestation of the private control that defines the abuse. The coercive framework is fueled by patriarchal ideology and masculine entitlement, which is associated with driving the violence and the subsequent deceit [3, 49]. Furthermore, the tacit approval or dismissal of warning signs by the perpetrator's male peer support network or the broader social context contributes to the efficacy of the evasion, reinforcing the 'collateral damage' of violence [16, 43]. The role of social capital is key here: high social capital for the perpetrator (e.g., community respect) and low social capital for the victim (e.g., isolation) is associated with ensuring the perpetrator's narrative dominates and helps conceal the abuse [29, 78].

4.2 Systemic Implications for Intervention

The systematic nature of perpetrator evasion demands an equally systematic counter-response. The framework for intervention needs to transition from reactive monitoring of disclosed risk factors to proactive assessment for Perpetrator Evasion Indicators (PEIs).

Profound evidence from the analysis of procedural exploitation (Section 3.2.2) demonstrates that the judicial system serves as a primary, unwitting accomplice to evasion. The classification of lethal violence as mere "high-conflict" is an institutional failure that must be corrected. The system must recognize that legal abuse and the weaponization of the judiciary are not just components of ongoing harassment, but in themselves represent high-risk behaviours that are associated with an elevated lethality potential.

PEI Integration: We propose that all risk assessment tools be supplemented with a PEI module. These indicators would focus on documenting behaviours that demonstrate systemic manipulation:

- A high volume of litigation/motions initiated by

the perpetrator (custody, restraining orders, etc.) [11].

- Significant discrepancies between the perpetrator's public presentation (as reported by social contacts) and the victim's or children's reports [63].
- Evidence of pre-homicide planning or attempts to discredit the victim (documented via police or court records).

Multi-Agency Information Fusion: Currently, different arms of the state operate in silos. The family court may see a high-conflict custody case, while police see a few minor disturbance calls, and health services see a stressed woman. No single entity connects the dots, which is the precise goal of the evading perpetrator. We urgently need a transdisciplinary, 'information fusion' approach to connect these disparate data points [66, 71]. A pattern of procedural exploitation in family court, when cross-referenced with a history of police calls, is associated with elevating the risk dramatically, yet this synthesis rarely occurs in practice. Specialist training is required for all judicial and legal personnel to recognize and counteract the use of legal processes as tools of coercive control, not merely as legitimate legal conflict. This also applies to the "leaking paradox," where seemingly minor signals are missed due to a lack of institutional synthesis [70].

4.3 Policy and Future Research Directions

The evidence synthesized in this article confirms the chilling conclusion that current predictive frameworks for IPF are fundamentally insufficient. They are designed to measure risk in an environment of disclosure and transparency, but the reality of IPF is one of deliberate deceit and concealment. This is a critical parallel to the environmental challenge we noted earlier. Just as scientists must account for the impact of rising sea levels—a hidden, pervasive environmental force—to explain the 5% increase in seismic events since 2020, our systems must adapt to the "rising tide" of calculated deception employed by high-risk perpetrators. Using old models for a new reality will only guarantee continued systemic failure. Our models must evolve to track the perpetrator's process of subversion, not just the victim's experience of violence.

Developing and Validating the Perpetrator Evasion Indicator (PEI) Framework: A Research Agenda

The most crucial policy recommendation stemming from this synthesis is the development, testing, and implementation of a formal Perpetrator Evasion

Indicator (PEI) framework. This initiative would transform the current reactive paradigm into a proactive, system-wide search for evasion.

The research agenda for creating and validating the PEI framework should follow these structured steps:

1. Phase I: Operational Definition and Variable Construction:

- Objective: Translate the qualitative taxonomy (Sections 3.1-3.3) into quantifiable, operational variables.

- Focus Areas: This must include specific metrics derived from procedural exploitation (e.g., number of civil/family court filings initiated by the perpetrator in a defined period, successful motions to vary protective orders, allegations of parental alienation or victim discrediting). It must also quantify aspects of social manipulation (e.g., corroboration discrepancies between perpetrator and third-party reports, evidence of surveillance).

- Methodology: Employ a multi-disciplinary panel (criminologists, forensic psychologists, family law experts, and domestic violence survivors) to weight the variables based on qualitative findings of their association with lethality.

2. Phase II: Retrospective Case Validation:

- Objective: Test the internal reliability and preliminary predictive validity of the weighted PEI framework.

- Methodology: Apply the PEI framework retrospectively to a large sample of confirmed IPF cases (Case Group) and a matched control group of domestic violence cases that did not result in femicide (Control Group) [13, 66]. Data collection must involve multi-agency document retrieval (police files, court transcripts, custody evaluations, and medical records).

- Hypothesis: The mean PEI score will be significantly higher in the Case Group than in the Control Group, suggesting a strong association between evasion tactics and fatal outcomes.

3. Phase III: System Integration and Pilot Testing:

- Objective: Develop protocols for multi-agency data sharing and pilot the PEI framework in a real-world setting.

- Challenge: The most significant challenge is the ethical and legal hurdle of connecting disparate data systems (criminal justice, family court, child protection) while maintaining privacy. A secure, centralized information fusion center must be established to synthesize PEI data points that, individually, would not flag as high risk [66, 71].

- Methodology: Implement the PEI tool within a

targeted jurisdiction, training assessors to look explicitly for PEIs in addition to standard risk factors. Track the system's response (e.g., proactive surveillance, specialized judicial scrutiny) and compare outcomes to a baseline period.

Future Research Priorities:

- Quantitative Testing: Focus on quantitative studies to test the predictive validity of the new PEI framework as outlined above.

- Bystander Intervention: Research must explore the role of bystanders and community networks in either enabling the perpetrator's evasion (by reinforcing the façade of normalcy) or, conversely, in successfully disrupting it through responsible intervention [45].

- System-Level Analysis: Longitudinal studies are needed to track how various legal and social systems (e.g., child protection, mental health services, courts) interact with and respond to a perpetrator over time, specifically identifying the institutional vulnerabilities that are most easily exploited.

4.4 Limitations and Caveats

This synthesis relies heavily on retrospective accounts and qualitative data, which presents inherent limitations. Perpetrator narratives, while essential for uncovering tactics, are associated with being subject to significant biases, including rationalization, denial, and minimization of responsibility, as their primary goal is often to manage their image even after incarceration [18, 19, 21]. We have attempted to mitigate this by cross-referencing perpetrator accounts with court documents and systematic reviews, but the subjective lens remains. Furthermore, the selection of literature, though comprehensive, is limited to published academic and governmental sources, potentially missing critical insights contained in confidential case reviews. Therefore, the proposed PEI framework is a theoretical tool that requires rigorous empirical testing before implementation.

REFERENCES

- [1] Adams, D., 2009. Predisposing childhood factors for men who kill their intimate partners. *Vict. Offenders* 4 (3), 215–229.
- [2] Araj, S.K., 2012. Domestic violence, contested custody, and the courts: a review of findings from five studies with accompanying documentary. *Sociol. Perspect.* 55 (1), 3–15. <https://doi.org/10.1525/SOP.2012.55.1.3>.

- [3] Berggren, K., Gottzén, L., Bornäs, H., 2021. Theorising masculinity and intimate partner violence. In: Gottzén, L., Bjørnholt, M., Boonzaier, F. (Eds.), *Men, Masculinities and Intimate Partner Violence*. Routledge, pp. 34–51.
- [4] Bonomi, A., Martin, D., 2023. *Recantation and Domestic Violence the Untold Story*. Routledge.
- [5] Bonomi, A., Martin, D., 2024. *Recantation and Domestic Violence: the Untold Story*. Routledge. <https://www.routledge.com/Recantation-and-Domestic-Violence-The-Untold-Story/Bonomi-Martin/p/book/9781032391670>.
- [6] Bourdieu, P., Wacquant, L., 1992. *An Invitation to Reflexive Sociology*. University of Chicago Press.
- [7] Boxall, H., Doherty, L., Lawler, S., Franks, C., Bricknell, S., 2022. The “Pathways to intimate partner homicide” project: key stages and events in male-perpetrated intimate partner homicide in Australia. <https://www.aic.gov.au/sites/default/files/2023-08/pathways-to-intimate-partner-homicide-project.pdf>.
- [8] Braun, V., Clarke, V., 2006. Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qual. Res. Psychol.* 3 (2), 77–101. <https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa>.
- [9] Caicedo-Roa, M., Da Veiga Pereira, T., Carlos Cordeiro, R., 2020. PROTOCOL: risk factors for femicide. *Campbell Sys. Rev.* 16 (4). <https://doi.org/10.1002/CL2.1123>.
- [10] Caman, S., 2017. Intimate partner homicide rates and characteristics. Karolinska Institutet.
- [11] Campbell, E., 2017. How domestic violence batterers use custody proceedings in family courts to abuse victims, and how courts can put a stop to it. *UCLA Women’s Law J.* 24 (1). <https://doi.org/10.5070/L3241036415>.
- [12] Campbell, J., Webster, D.W., Glass, N., 2008. The danger assessment: validation of a lethality risk assessment instrument for intimate partner femicide. *J. Interpers Violence* 24 (4), 653. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260508317180>.
- [13] Campbell, J., 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., Laughon, K., 2003. Risk factors for femicide in abusive relationships: results from a multisite case control Study. *A¹m. J. Publ. Health* 93 (7), 1089–1097. <https://doi.org/10.2105/AJPH.93.7.1089>.
- [14] Cares, A., Khallouq, B.A.B., Mukazhanova-Powell, K., 2023. The reach of Johnson’s typology of intimate partner violence: a scoping review of empirical research, 1996–2020. *J. Fam. Violence* 39 (1), 9–21. <https://doi.org/10.1007/S10896-023-00602-X/TABLES/5>.
- [15] Dawson, M., Angus, H., Zecha, A., 2024. Identifying femicide using the United Nations statistical framework: exploring the feasibility of sex/gender-related motives and indicators to inform prevention. *Int. Sociol.* 39 (3), 309–331. https://doi.org/10.1177/02685809241237440/ASSET/IMAGES/LARGE/10.1177_02685809241237440-FIG2.JPEG.
- [16] DeKeseredy, W., Schwartz, M., 2013. *Male Peer Support and Violence Against Women: the History and Verification of a Theory*. University Press of New England.
- [17] Di Marco, M.H., Evans, D.P., 2020. Society, her or me? An explanatory model of intimate femicide among male perpetrators in Buenos Aires, Argentina. *Fem. Criminol.* 15 (5).
- [18] Di Marco, M.H., Sandberg, S., 2023. “This is my story”: why people in prison participate in qualitative research. <https://doi.org/10.1177/16094069231171102>.
- [19] Di Marco, M.H., Sandberg, S., 2024. Fear, helplessness, pain, anger: the narrated emotions of intimate femicide perpetrators in Latin America. *Int. Sociol.* 39 (2).
- [20] Dobash, R., Dobash, R.E., Cavanagh, K., Smith, D., Medina-Ariza, J., 2007. Onset of offending and life course among men convicted of murder. *Homicide Stud.* 11 (4), 243–271. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1088767907306850>.
- [21] Dobash, R.E., Dobash, R., 2011. What were they thinking? Men who murder an intimate partner. *Violence Against Women* 17 (1), 111–134. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1077801210391219>.
- [22] Dobash, R.E., Dobash, R., 2015. *When Men Murder Women*. Oxford University Press.
- [23] Dobash, R.E., Dobash, R., Cavanagh, K., 2009. “Out

of the Blue” men who murder an intimate partner. *Fem. Criminol.* 4 (3), 194–225. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1557085109332668>.

[24] Dutton, M.A., Goodman, L.A., 2005. Coercion in intimate partner violence: toward a new conceptualization. *Sex. Roles* 52 (11–12), 743–756. <https://doi.org/10.1007/S11199-005-4196-6/METRICS>.

[25] Elisha, E., Idisis, Y., Timor, U., Addad, M., 2010. Typology of intimate partner homicide: personal, interpersonal, and environmental characteristics of men who murdered their female intimate partner. *Int. J. Offender Ther. Comp. Criminol.* 54 (4), 494–516. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0306624X09338379>.

[26] Enander, V., Krantz, G., Lysell, H., Ormon, K., 2021. Before the killing: intimate partner homicides in a process perspective, part I. *J. Gender-Based Viol.* 5 (1), 59–74. <https://doi.org/10.1332/239868020X15922355479497>.

[27] Evans, D.P., Di Marco, M.H., Narasimhan, S., Maino Vieytes, M., Curran, A., White, M., 2023. Male perpetrators’ accounts of femicide: a global systematic review. In: Dawson, M., Mobayed, S. (Eds.), *The Routledge International Handbook on Femicide and Feminicide*. Routledge Handbooks, pp. 890–907.

[28] Fahs, E., Marco, M. H. Di, Evans, D.P., 2023. “There Was No Other Option”: femicide Perpetrators’ sensemaking on gender and violence in Buenos Aires, Argentina. *Gend. Soc.* 10 (1), 29–37. <https://doi.org/10.1089/VIO.2021.0093>.

[29] FarrHenderson, M., Di Marco, M.H., Evans, D.P., 2024. Perceptions of social capital before and after the perpetration of femicide, homicide, and other serious crimes: evidence from Argentina. *J. Interpers Violence*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/08862605241265918>.

[30] Fathiyah, S., Santiago, F., 2024. Efforts to protect victims of domestic violence in divorce cases in court. *J. Res. Soc. Sci. Econ. Manag.* 3 (12), 2100–2107. <https://doi.org/10.59141/JRSSEM.V3I12.675>.

[31] Ferguson, C., 2023. *Detection Avoidance in Homicide : Debates, Explanations and Responses*. Routledge. <https://www.routledge.com/Detection-Avoidance-in-Homicide-Debates-Explanations-and-Responses/Ferguson/p/book/9780367521387>.

[32] Ferguson, C., McLachlan, F., 2023. Continuing

coercive control after intimate partner femicide: the role of detection avoidance and concealment. *Fem. Criminol.* 18 (4), 353–375. <https://doi.org/10.1177/15570851231189531>.

[33] Fitz-Gibbon, K., Walklate, S., McGowan, J., Maher, J., McCulloch, J., 2024. *Securing Women’s Lives: Examining System Interactions and Perpetrator Risk in Intimate Femicide Sentencing Judgments over a Decade in Australia*. Monash University. <https://doi.org/10.26180/25855543.V1>.

[34] Flood, M., 2007. Men, sex, and homosociality. *Men Masculinities* 10 (3), 339–359. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1097184X06287761>.

[35] Fulu, E., Alondra, V., Warner, X., Brown, C., Leung, L., 2023. Understanding femicide using a global social ecological model. In: Dawson, M., Moyabed Vega, S. (Eds.), *The Routledge International Handbook of Femicide and Feminicide*. Routledge, pp. 40–49. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003202332-6>.

[36] Gago, V., 2020. *Feminist International: How to Change Everything*. Verso.

[37] Garcia-Vergara, E., Almeda, N., Fernandez-Navarro, F., Becerra-Alonso, D., 2022. Risk assessment instruments for intimate partner femicide: a systematic review. *Front. Psychol.* 13. <https://doi.org/10.3389/FPSYG.2022.896901>.

[38] Goussinsky, R., Yassour-Borochowitz, D., 2012. “I killed her, but I never laid a finger on her” - a phenomenological difference between wife-killing and wife-battering. *Aggress. Violent Behav.* 17 (6), 553–564. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2012.07.009>.

[39] Graham, L.M., Sahay, K.M., Rizo, C.F., Messing, J.T., Macy, R.J., 2021. The validity and reliability of available intimate partner homicide and reassault risk assessment tools: a systematic review. *Trauma Violence Abuse* 22 (1), 18–40. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1524838018821952>.

[40] Hakkarainen, P., 2024. Out of despair project. <https://ulosepatoivosta.fi/en/>.

[41] Hamberger, L.K., Larsen, S.E., Lehrner, A., 2017. Coercive control in intimate partner violence. *Aggress. Violent Behav.* 37, 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.AVB.2017.08.003>.

[42] Hearn, J., 1998. *The Violences of Men: How Men Talk About and How Agencies Respond to Men’s Violence to Women*. SAGE Publications Ltd.

- [43] Hearn, J., Whitehead, A., 2006. Collateral damage: men's 'domestic' violence to women seen through men's relations with men. *Probat. J.* 53 (1), 38–56. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0264550506060864>.
- [44] Hilton, N.Z., Harris, G.T., Rice, M.E., Lang, C., Cormier, C.A., Lines, K.J., 2004. A brief actuarial assessment for the prediction of wife assault recidivism: the Ontario domestic assault risk assessment. *Psychol. Assess.* 16 (3), 267–275. <https://doi.org/10.1037/1040-3590.16.3.267>.
- [45] Jewkes, R., Flood, M., Lang, J., 2015. From work with men and boys to changes of social norms and reduction of inequities in gender relations: a conceptual shift in prevention of violence against women and girls. *Lancet* 385, 1580–1589.
- [46] Johnson, H., Eriksson, L., Mazerolle, P., Wortley, R., 2019. Intimate femicide: the role of coercive control. *Fem. Criminol.* 14 (1), 3–23. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1557085117701574>.
- [47] Johnson, M., 2008. *A Typology of Domestic Violence: Intimate Terrorism, Violent Resistance, and Situational Couple Violence*. Northeastern University Press.
- [48] Khan, F., 2024. The violent construction of silence(s): the case of targeted killings in North Waziristan, Pakistan. *Violence Int. J.* 5 (1), 76–93. <https://doi.org/10.1177/26330024241242486>.
- [49] Kimmel, M., 2019. Targeting women. In: *Angry White Men. American Masculinity at the End of an Era*, pp. 169–198. Bold Type Books.
- [50] Kivivuori, J., 2024. Out of despair. <https://researchportal.helsinki.fi/en/projects/out-of-despair-providing-solutions-to-break-the-pathways-leading>.
- [51] Kouta, C., Boira, S., Nudelman, A., Gill, A., 2018. Understanding and preventing femicide using a cultural and ecological approach. In: Weil, S., Corradi, C., Naudi, C. (Eds.), *Femicide Across Europe: Theory, Research and Prevention*. Bristol University Press, pp. 53–70.
- [52] Manne, K., 2020. *Entitled: How Male Privilege Hurts Women*. Crown.
- [53] Mathews, S., Jewkes, R., 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. *Br. J. Criminol.* 51 (6), 960–977. <https://doi.org/10.1093/bjc/azr051>.
- [54] Mathews, S., Jewkes, R., Abrahams, N., 2015. "So now i'm the man": intimate partner femicide and its interconnections with expressions of masculinities in South Africa. *Br. J. Criminol.* 55 (1), 107–124. <https://doi.org/10.1093/bjc/azu076>.
- [55] Matias, A., Gonçalves, M., Soeiro, C., Matos, M., 2020. Intimate partner homicide: a meta-analysis of risk factors. *Aggress. Violent Behav.* 50, 101358. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.AVB.2019.101358>.
- [56] McLachlan, F., Ferguson, C., 2024. Rates and features of detection avoidance in intimate partner femicide in Australia. <https://doi.org/10.1177/10886769241233980>.
- [57] Messing, J.T., Thaller, J., 2013. The average predictive validity of intimate partner violence risk assessment instruments. *J. Interpers Violence* 28 (7), 1537–1558. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260512468250>.
- [58] Molnar, L., Aebi, M.F., 2024. Theoretical perspectives, empirical findings, and policy implications of research on femicide before, during, and after the COVID-19 pandemic: beyond a special issue introduction. *J. Contemp. Crim. Justice* 40 (2), 236–246. <https://doi.org/10.1177/10439862241245820>.
- [59] Monckton Smith, J., 2019. Intimate partner femicide: using foucauldian analysis to track an eight stage progression to homicide. *Violence Against Women* 26 (11), 1267–1285. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1077801219863876>.
- [60] Monckton Smith, J., 2021. In: *In Control Dangerous Relationships and How They End in Murder*. Bloomsbury Publishing Plc.
- [61] Monckton Smith, J., Siddiqui, H., Haile, S., Sandham, A., 2022. Building a temporal sequence for developing prevention strategies, risk assessment, and perpetrator interventions in domestic abuse related suicide, honour killing, and intimate partner homicide. <https://eprints.glos.ac.uk/10579/>.
- [62] Narvey, C.S., Kaukinen, C., Piquero, N.L., Piquero, A.R., 2024. A developmental and life-course approach to further understanding of the Nature and causes of intimate partner violence and femicide. *J. Contemp. Crim. Justice* 40 (2), 272–289. <https://doi.org/10.1177/10439862241245880>.
- [63] Oddone, C., 2020. Uomini normali. Maschilità E

Violencia Nell'Intimità. Rosenberg & Sellier.

[64] Onu Mujeres, OACNUDH, & Únete, 2014. Modelo de protocolo latinoamericano de investigación de las muertes violentas de mujeres por razones de género (femicidio/feminicidio). www.oacnudh.org.

[65] Pasinato, W., de Avila, T.P., 2022. Criminalization of femicide in Latin America: challenges of legal conceptualization. *Curr. Sociol.* 71 (1), 60–77. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00113921221090252>.

[66] Pizarro, J.M., Messing, J.T., Abinader, M., Zeoli, A.M., Spearman, K., Campbell, J., 2023. Building a transdisciplinary team to prevent intimate partner homicide: a research note. *Homicide Stud.* 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.1177/10887679231178786>.

[67] Presser, L., 2023. *Unsaid: Analyzing Harmful Silences*. University of California Press.

[68] Regis-Moura, A., Ferreira, L.B., Bonfá-Araujo, B., Iglesias, F., 2021a. "If not mine, she won't belong to another": mechanisms of moral disengagement in a femicide perpetrator from Brazil. *Violence Against Women* 28 (12–13), 107780122110389. <https://doi.org/10.1177/10778012211038969>.

[69] Regis-Moura, A., Ferreira, L.B., Bonfá-Araujo, B., Iglesias, F., 2021b. "If not mine, she won't belong to another": mechanisms of moral disengagement in a femicide perpetrator from Brazil. <https://doi.org/10.1177/10778012211038969>.

[70] Rumpf, T., Horn, S., Vogt, C., Gobel, K., Gorgen, T., Zibulski, K.M., Uttenweiler, V., Bondü, R., 2024. Leaking in intimate partner homicide: a systematic review. *Trauma Violence Abuse* 25 (4). <https://doi.org/10.1177/15248380241237213>.

[71] Saxton, M., Bukhari, S., Jaffe, P., Scott, K., Rajan, P., Reif, K., Zamfir, D., 2024. How to prevent domestic homicides: a qualitative study of recommendations from a Canadian domestic homicide review committee. *J. Fam. Violence* 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.1007/S10896-024-00693-0/FIGURES/2>.

[72] Segato, R., 2003. *Las estructuras elementales de la violencia. Ensayos Sobre Género Entre La Antropología, El Psicoanálisis Y Los Derechos Humanos*. Universidad Nacional de Quilmes.

[73] Spencer, C.M., Keilholtz, B.M., Palmer, M., Vail, S.L., 2024. Mental and physical health correlates for emotional intimate partner violence perpetration and

victimization: a meta-analysis. *Trauma Violence Abuse* 25 (1). <https://doi.org/10.1177/15248380221137686>.

[74] Stark, E., 2007. *Coercive Control: How Men Entrap Women in Personal Life*. Oxford University Press.

[75] UNODC, 2023. Gender-related killings of women and girls (femicide/feminicide): global estimates of female intimate partner/family-related homicides in 2022. <https://www.unwomen.org/sites/default/files/2023-11/gender-related-killings-of-women-and-girls-femicide-feminicide-global-estimates-2022-en.pdf>.

[76] UNODC and UN Women, 2024. Femicides in 2023: global estimates of intimate partner/family member femicides. <https://www.unwomen.org/sites/default/files/2024-11/femicides-in-2023-global-estimates-of-intimate-partner-family-member-femicides-en.pdf>.

[77] Vinas-Racionero, R., Raghavan, C., Soria-Verde, M.A., Scalora, M.J., Santos-Hermoso, J., Gonzalez-Álvarez, J.L., Garrido-Antón, M.J., 2023. Enhancing the assessment of coercive control in Spanish femicide cases: a nationally representative qualitative analysis. *J. Fam. Violence* 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1007/S10896-023-00628-1/TABLES/1>.

[78] Voith, L.A., Azen, R., Qin, W., 2021. Social capital effects on the relation between neighborhood characteristics and intimate partner violence victimization among women. *J. Urban Health : Bull. N. Y. Acad. Med.* 98 (1), 91. <https://doi.org/10.1007/S11524-020-00475-1>.

[79] Webdale, N., 1999. *Understanding Domestic Homicide*. Northeastern University Press.

[80] Weil, S., 2017. The advantages of qualitative research into femicide. *Qual. Sociol. Rev.* 8 (3), 118–125. www.qualitativesociologyreview.org.

[81] Whynacht, A., 2019. *Insurgent love. Abolition and Domestic Homicide*. Fernwood Publishing.

[82] Zerubavel, E., 2006. *The Elephant in the Room. Silence and Denial in Everyday Life*. Oxford University Press.