

Analysis of the Profile and Pattern of Violence Against Women in Brazil (2009–2021)

Análise do Perfil e Padrão da Violência Contra Mulheres no Brasil (2009–2021)

Análisis del Perfil y Patrón de la Violencia contra las Mujeres en Brasil (2009–2021)

RESUMO

Objetivo: Analisar o perfil da violência no Brasil e os desfechos relacionados aos tipos de violência contra a mulher (VCM) no período de 2009 a 2021. **Método:** Estudo transversal com dados públicos provenientes das notificações compulsórias de VCM ao longo de 13 anos. As variáveis dependentes foram violência física e psicológica, e as independentes incluíram faixa etária, escolaridade, raça/cor, agressor e encaminhamentos. **Resultados:** Foram analisadas 2.872.993 notificações de casos de violência ocorridos entre 2009 e 2021. Entre as vítimas, 57,3% eram adultas, 46,9% tinham até o ensino médio completo, 40,0% se autodeclararam brancas, 37,7% eram solteiras, 10,0% possuíam alguma deficiência e 46,0% residiam na Região Sudeste. **Conclusão:** O perfil predominante das mulheres que buscaram serviços de saúde por violência no Brasil foi composto por adultas, com ensino médio, autodeclaradas brancas, solteiras, residentes na Região Sudeste.

DESCRIPTORIOS: Violência Doméstica; Maus-Tratos Conjugais; Violência por Parceiro Íntimo; Violência Baseada em Gênero; Exposição à Violência.

ABSTRACT

Objective: To analyze the profile of violence in Brazil and the outcomes related to types of violence against women (VAW) from 2009 to 2021. **Method:** A cross-sectional study using public data from compulsory notifications of VAW over a 13-year period. The dependent variables were physical and psychological violence, and the independent variables included age group, education level, race/skin color, perpetrator, and referrals. **Results:** A total of 2,872,993 notifications of violence cases occurring between 2009 and 2021 were analyzed. Among the victims, 57.3% were adults, 46.9% had completed up to secondary education, 40.0% self-identified as White, 37.7% were single, 10.0% had some type of disability, and 46.0% resided in the Southeast Region of Brazil. **Conclusion:** The predominant profile of women who sought health services due to violence in Brazil consisted of adults with secondary education, self-identified as White, single, and residing in the Southeast Region.

DESCRIPTORS: Domestic Violence; Spouse Abuse; Intimate Partner Violence; Gender-Based Violence; Exposure to Violence

RESUMEN

Objetivo: Analizar el perfil de la violencia en Brasil y los desenlaces relacionados con los tipos de violencia contra la mujer (VCM) en el período de 2009 a 2021. **Método:** Estudio transversal con datos públicos provenientes de las notificaciones obligatorias de VCM a lo largo de 13 años. Las variables dependientes fueron la violencia física y psicológica, y las independientes incluyeron grupo etario, nivel educativo, raza/color de piel, agresor y derivaciones. **Resultados:** Se analizaron 2.872.993 notificaciones de casos de violencia ocurridos entre 2009 y 2021. Entre las víctimas, el 57,3% eran adultas, el 46,9% tenía hasta educación secundaria completa, el 40,0% se autodeclaró blanca, el 37,7% era soltera, el 10,0% presentaba algún tipo de discapacidad y el 46,0% residía en la Región Sudeste de Brasil. **Conclusión:** El perfil predominante de las mujeres que buscaron servicios de salud por violencia en Brasil estuvo compuesto por adultas, con educación secundaria, autodeclaradas blancas, solteras y residentes en la Región Sudeste.

DESCRIPTORIOS: Violencia Doméstica; Maltrato Conyugal; Violencia de Pareja Íntima; Violencia de Género; Exposición a la Violencia.

RECEIVED: 01/26/2026 APPROVED: 03/02/2026

How to cite this article: Assis Neto LA, Arato CVB, Cavalcante DFB, Raimundo ACS, Silva Junior MF, Probst LF, Guerra LM. Analysis of the Profile and Pattern of Violence Against Women in Brazil (2009–2021). *Saúde Coletiva (Brazilian Edition)* [Internet]. 2026 [cited year month day];17(106):19514–19543. Available from: DOI: 10.36489/saudecoletiva.2026v17i106p19514–19543

Original Article

Assis Neto LA, Arato CVB, Cavalcante DFB, Raimundo ACS, Silva Junior MF, Probst LF, Guerra LM
Analysis of the Profile and Pattern of Violence Against Women in Brazil (2009–2021)

ID **Lucídio Andrade de Assis Neto**
Master's Degree - State University of Campinas,
Piracicaba School of Dentistry.
ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0006-6727-8359>

ID **Caio Vieira de Barros Arato**
Master's Degree - State University of Campinas,
Piracicaba School of Dentistry.
ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4124-5728>

ID **Denise de Fátima Barros Cavalcante**
Ph.D. - State University of Campinas, Piracicaba
School of Dentistry.
ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9166-0367>

ID **Augusto Cesar Souza Raimundo**
Ph.D. - University of Campinas, Piracicaba School

of Dentistry.
ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7736-9189>

ID **Manoelito Ferreira Silva Junior**
Ph.D. - State University of Campinas, Piracicaba
School of Dentistry.
ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8837-5912>

ID **Livia Fernandes Probst**
Ph.D. - State University of Campinas, Piracicaba
School of Dentistry.
ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4696-0862>

ID **Luciane Miranda Guerra**
Ph.D. - State University of Campinas, Piracicaba
School of Dentistry.
ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7542-7717>

INTRODUCTION

Violence against women (VAW) constitutes a serious violation of human rights and a public health problem recognized by the World Health Organization¹. Global estimates indicate that 30% of women aged 15 or older have experienced physical or sexual violence by an intimate partner at least once in their lifetime, with repercussions that not only affect the health and well-being of the victims but also impose significant social and economic impacts on both the women themselves and society². Given this scenario, it is essential to characterize the profile of this issue in order to support monitoring efforts and contribute to the formulation of public policies.

In Brazil, the recording of violence within the health sector began in November 2003 with the enactment of Law No. 10,778, which established the mandatory reporting by health professionals of cases of violence involving patients treated in health services³. However, it was not until 2009 that the Domestic, Sexual, and/or Other Interpersonal Violence Notification/Investigation Form was instituted⁴.

Reporting highlights the scale and severity of this problem and serves as

a strategy for understanding the profile of violence in a given area, providing a foundation for the development of public health policies⁵. In the context of health services, it is the responsibility of professionals to identify the type of violence and provide responses within the Health Care Network, with a view to addressing the problem, including referral to specialized services, coordination of care pathways, and the promotion of comprehensive care for victims of violence^{6,7}. Thus, the objective of this study is to analyze the profile of domestic violence in Brazil, based on mandatory reporting forms, as well as associated outcomes, from 2009 to 2021.

METHODS

The design of this study complies with the guidelines established by Resolution No. 466/12 of the National Health Council. The project was submitted to the Research Ethics Committee of the Piracicaba School of Dentistry (State University of Campinas, CEP – FOP/UNICAMP) and was exempted from ethical review as it involved exclusively data in the public domain.

This is a cross-sectional study us-

ing secondary data, in accordance with the *Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology* (STROBE) guidelines⁸. The study addresses violence against women (VAW) in Brazil from January 2009 to December 2021, using data provided by the Notifiable Diseases Information System (SINAN) of the Ministry of Health (MS).

Information was collected regarding the location of the incident, type of violence, age group, educational level, ethnicity, relationship to the perpetrator, and referrals, based on the mandatory reporting forms completed by healthcare professionals while providing care to the victims. The 13-year period was selected because it corresponds to the mandatory reporting of GBV through mandatory reporting forms, established by Law No. 10,778 (2009), up to the start of this study (2022).

The study population consisted of all mandatory notifications (2,872,993 cases of violence) recorded by healthcare professionals while treating women who were victims of violence between January 2009 and December 2021. The variables analyzed and their respective categorizations followed the structure of the mandatory reporting form completed

by healthcare professionals. The variables used in the study were organized into two categories: outcome and independent variables. The outcome was categorized into two types of violence: physical (yes, no, unknown) and psychological/emotional (yes, no, unknown).

The independent variables related to the victims included age group (children up to 18 years old, adults, elderly over 60 years old), educational level (illiterate, elementary school, higher education), race/ethnicity (white, Black, Asian, mixed-race, Indigenous, unknown), marital status (single, married/in a stable relationship, widowed, separated, (not applicable, missing) and the presence of any type of disability or disorder (yes, no, not applicable, missing). Additionally, the victim's pregnancy status was assessed (yes, no).

The independent variables related to the likely perpetrator included the relationship or degree of kinship with the person assisted (father, mother, stepfather, stepmother, spouse, ex-spouse, partner, ex-partner, child, sibling, friends/acquaintances, strangers, caregiver, employer/boss, institutional relationship, police/law enforcement, the person themselves, or others) and the gender of the likely

perpetrator (female, male, both genders, unknown). Suspected alcohol use by the perpetrator was also considered (yes, no, unknown).

In addition, variables related to the municipality where the incident occurred were analyzed, including referrals to different support networks, such as health, social assistance, education, women's services, child protection services, specialized police stations, and others (yes, no, unknown). Finally, the location of the incident was coded according to the Brazilian Institute of Geography and Statistics (IBGE).

All secondary data were organized into spreadsheets using Microsoft Excel. Descriptive analysis of the data was performed, presenting absolute (n) and relative (%) frequencies. Subsequently, Poisson regression analyses with robust variances were conducted to investigate the association between the outcomes (physical or psychological violence) and each independent variable, as well as the outcomes related to the location of the incident.

Variables with $p < 0.20$ in the bivariate analyses were included in the multiple Poisson regression models with robust variances. In the final model, only variables with $p \leq 0.05$ remained after adjusting for the oth-

er variables. The models were fitted using the *Quasi-likelihood under the Independence Criterion* (QIC). The analyses were performed using R software, with a significance level of 5%.

RESULTS

Between 2009 and 2021, 2,872,993 mandatory violence reporting forms were analyzed in Brazil. Violence was most prevalent among adult women (57.3%), individuals with an educational level up to high school (46.9%), and those who self-identified as white (40.0%). Pregnant victims accounted for 3.8%, and 37.3% were unmarried, while 10.0% had some form of disability. Violence was most frequent in the Southeast Region (46.1%) and in cases of self-inflicted violence (21.2%), with 23.0% showing suspected alcohol use. Physical violence accounted for 36.3% of all cases. Physical violence was more common among adults (PR=1.24), indigenous individuals (PR=1.33), in cases where the perpetrator was a sibling (OR=1.29) and in the Southeast Region (OR=1.12), with prevalences of 45.1%, 47.7%, 50.1%, and 42.3%, respectively (Table 1).

Table 1. Results of crude and adjusted analyses of association with physical violence from 2009 to 2021.

Variable	Category	Total	Physical Violence Only		Individual Models		Adjusted Model	
			No	*Yes	OR (95% CI)	p-value	OR (95% CI)	p-value
General	-	2.872.993 (100,0%)	1.830.694 (63,7%)	1.042.299 (36,3%)	-	-	-	-
Age	Child	957.571 (33,3%)	744.032 (77,7%)	213.539 (22,3%)	Ref	-	Ref	-
	Adult	1.646.234 (57,3%)	904.003 (54,9%)	742.231 (45,1%)	2,02 (2,01 - 2,03)	<0,0001	1,24 (1,21 - 1,27)	<0,0001
	Elderly	167.049 (5,8%)	105.604 (63,2%)	61.445 (36,8%)	1,65 (1,64 - 1,66)	<0,0001	1,04 (0,98 - 1,10)	0,1956
	Unknown	102.139 (3,6%)	77.055 (75,4%)	25.084 (24,6%)	-	-	-	-
Educational Level	Illiterate	195.729 (6,8%)	132.294 (67,6%)	63.435 (32,4%)	Ref	-	Ref	-
	High School	1.347.761 (46,9%)	830.615 (61,6%)	517.146 (38,4%)	1,18 (1,18 - 1,19)	<0,0001	0,97 (0,95 - 1,00)	0,0277

Original Article

Assis Neto LA, Arato CVB, Cavalcante DFB, Raimundo ACS, Silva Junior MF, Probst LF, Guerra LM
Analysis of the Profile and Pattern of Violence Against Women in Brazil (2009–2021)

Educational Level	Higher Education	789.033 (27,5%)	447.572 (56,7%)	341.461 (43,3%)	1,34 (1,33 - 1,34)	<0,0001	1,08 (1,05 - 1,11)	<0,0001
	Unknown	540.470 (18,8%)	420.213 (77,7%)	120.257 (22,3%)	-	-	-	-
Race	White	1.148.803 (40,0%)	747.010 (65,0%)	401.793 (35,0%)	Ref	-	Ref	-
	Black	227.434 (7,9%)	142.822 (62,8%)	84.612 (37,2%)	1,06 (1,06 - 1,07)	<0,0001	0,97 (0,94 - 0,99)	0,0111
	Asian	19.546 (0,7%)	12.171 (62,3%)	7.375 (37,7%)	1,08 (1,06 - 1,10)	<0,0001	0,94 (0,87 - 1,03)	0,1672
	Brown (Mixed)	1.092.805 (38,0%)	689.106 (63,1%)	403.699 (36,9%)	1,06 (1,05 - 1,06)	<0,0001	1,02 (1,00 - 1,03)	0,0520
	Indigenous	25.276 (0,9%)	13.229 (52,3%)	12.047 (47,7%)	1,36 (1,34 - 1,38)	<0,0001	1,33 (1,25 - 1,41)	<0,0001
	Unknown	359.129 (12,5%)	226.356 (63,0%)	132.773 (37,0%)	-	-	-	-
Pregnancy	No	1.110.821 (38,7%)	681.252 (61,3%)	429.569 (38,7%)	1,36 (1,35 - 1,37)	<0,0001	1,24 (1,20 - 1,28)	<0,0001
	Yes	109.890 (3,8%)	78.599 (71,5%)	31.291 (28,5%)	Ref	-	Ref	-
	Unknown	1.652.282 (57,5%)	1.070.843 (64,8%)	581.439 (35,2%)	-	-	-	-
Marital status	Single	1.072.329 (37,3%)	644.626 (60,1%)	427.703 (39,9%)	1,27 (1,26 - 1,29)	<0,0001	1,13 (1,07 - 1,19)	<0,0001
	Married	659.432 (23,0%)	369.021 (56,0%)	290.411 (44,0%)	1,41 (1,39 - 1,43)	<0,0001	1,12 (1,06 - 1,19)	<0,0001
	Widowed	52.115 (1,8%)	35.799 (68,7%)	16.316 (31,3%)	Ref	-	Ref	-
	Separated	129.742 (4,5%)	78.917 (60,8%)	50.825 (39,2%)	1,25 (1,23 - 1,27)	<0,0001	1,08 (1,02 - 1,15)	0,0070
	Unknown	959.375 (33,4%)	702.331 (73,2%)	257.044 (26,8%)	-	-	-	-
Do you have any disability/ disorder?	No	1.973.780 (68,7%)	1.218.204 (61,7%)	755.576 (38,3%)	1,46 (1,45 - 1,47)	<0,0001	1,33 (1,29 - 1,37)	<0,0001
	Yes	287.739 (10,0%)	212.443 (73,8%)	75.296 (26,2%)	Ref	-	Ref	-
	Unknown	611.474 (21,3%)	400.047 (65,4%)	211.427 (34,6%)	-	-	-	-
Relationship – Unknown	No	2.253.285 (78,4%)	1.451.688 (64,4%)	801.597 (35,6%)	Ref	-	-	-
	Yes	255.582 (8,9%)	126.836 (49,6%)	128.746 (50,4%)	1,42 (1,41 - 1,42)	<0,0001	-	-
	Unknown	364.126 (12,7%)	252.170 (69,3%)	111.956 (30,7%)	-	-	-	-
Relationship – Father	No	2.292.779 (79,8%)	1.391.217 (60,7%)	901.562 (39,3%)	2,86 (2,83 - 2,89)	<0,0001	1,19 (1,12 - 1,26)	<0,0001
	Yes	213.566 (7,4%)	184.185 (86,2%)	29.381 (13,8%)	Ref	-	Ref	-
	Unknown	366.648 (12,8%)	255.292 (69,6%)	111.356 (30,4%)	-	-	-	-
Relationship – Mother	No	2.231.809 (77,7%)	1.326.200 (59,4%)	905.609 (40,6%)	4,50 (4,45 - 4,56)	<0,0001	1,32 (1,23 - 1,43)	<0,0001
	Yes	285.288 (9,9%)	259.587 (91,0%)	25.701 (9,0%)	Ref	-	Ref	-
	Unknown	355.896 (12,4%)	244.907 (68,8%)	110.989 (31,2%)	-	-	-	-

Relationship – Stepfather	No	2.440.741 (85,0%)	1.521.373 (62,3%)	919.368 (37,7%)	1,90 (1,87 – 1,93)	<0,0001	1,25 (1,15 – 1,36)	<0,0001
	Yes	58.494 (2,0%)	46.904 (80,2%)	11.590 (19,8%)	Ref	-	Ref	-
	Unknown	373.758 (13,0%)	262.417 (70,2%)	111.341 (29,8%)	-	-	-	-
Relationship – Spouse	No	2.128.400 (74,1%)	1.382.254 (64,9%)	746.146 (35,1%)	Ref	-	-	-
	Yes	393.106 (13,7%)	207.760 (52,9%)	185.346 (47,1%)	1,34 (1,34 – 1,35)	<0,0001	-	-
	Unknown	351.487 (12,2%)	240.680 (68,5%)	110.807 (31,5%)	-	-	-	-
Relationship – Ex-spouse	No	2.362.265 (82,2%)	1.489.608 (63,1%)	872.657 (36,9%)	Ref	-	-	-
	Yes	147.227 (5,1%)	89.079 (60,5%)	58.148 (39,5%)	1,07 (1,06 – 1,08)	<0,0001	-	-
	Unknown	363.501 (12,7%)	252.007 (69,3%)	111.494 (30,7%)	-	-	-	-
Relationship – Partner	No	2.424.184 (84,4%)	1.525.672 (62,9%)	898.512 (37,1%)	Ref	-	-	-
	Yes	79.541 (2,8%)	47.862 (60,2%)	31.679 (39,8%)	1,07 (1,07 – 1,08)	<0,0001	-	-
	Unknown	369.268 (12,9%)	257.160 (69,6%)	112.108 (30,4%)	-	-	-	-
Relationship – Ex-partner	No	2.459.016 (85,6%)	1.546.649 (62,9%)	912.367 (37,1%)	Ref	-	-	-
	Yes	43.359 (1,5%)	25.613 (59,1%)	17.746 (40,9%)	1,10 (1,09 – 1,12)	<0,0001	-	-
	Unknown	370.618 (12,9%)	258.432 (69,7%)	112.186 (30,3%)	-	-	-	-
Relationship – Child	No	2.418.229 (84,2%)	1.513.857 (62,6%)	904.372 (37,4%)	1,20 (1,19 – 1,21)	<0,0001	-	-
	Yes	88.538 (3,1%)	61.009 (68,9%)	27.529 (31,1%)	Ref	-	-	-
	Unknown	366.226 (12,7%)	255.828 (69,9%)	110.398 (30,1%)	-	-	-	-
Relationship – Nephew/ Niece	No	2.419.387 (84,2%)	1.529.567 (63,2%)	889.820 (36,8%)	Ref	-	Ref	-
	Yes	79.678 (2,8%)	39.752 (49,9%)	39.926 (50,1%)	1,36 (1,35 – 1,37)	<0,0001	1,29 (1,24 – 1,33)	<0,0001
	Unknown	373.928 (13,0%)	261.375 (69,9%)	112.553 (30,1%)	-	-	-	-
Relationship – Caregiver	No	2.486.225 (86,5%)	1.556.339 (62,6%)	929.886 (37,4%)	2,93 (2,80 – 3,06)	<0,0001	1,74 (1,30 – 2,33)	0,0002
	Yes	12.898 (0,4%)	11.250 (87,2%)	1.648 (12,8%)	Ref	-	Ref	-
	Unknown	373.870 (13,0%)	263.105 (70,4%)	110.765 (29,6%)	-	-	-	-
Relationship – Employer	No	2.498.230 (87,0%)	1.567.364 (62,7%)	930.866 (37,3%)	1,69 (1,60 – 1,77)	<0,0001	1,73 (1,40 – 2,14)	<0,0001
	Yes	5.422 (0,2%)	4.224 (77,9%)	1.198 (22,1%)	Ref	-	Ref	-
	Unknown	369.341 (12,9%)	259.106 (70,2%)	110.235 (29,8%)	-	-	-	-
Relationship – Institutional	No	2.485.383 (86,5%)	1.559.213 (62,7%)	926.170 (37,3%)	1,15 (1,12 – 1,18)	<0,0001	-	-
	Yes	16.352 (0,6%)	11.053 (67,6%)	5.299 (32,4%)	Ref	-	-	-
	Unknown	371.258 (12,9%)	260.428 (70,1%)	110.830 (29,9%)	-	-	-	-

Original Article

Assis Neto LA, Arato CVB, Cavalcante DFB, Raimundo ACS, Silva Junior MF, Probst LF, Guerra LM
Analysis of the Profile and Pattern of Violence Against Women in Brazil (2009–2021)

Relationship – Police officer	No	2.484.542 (86,5%)	1.563.729 (62,9%)	920.813 (37,1%)	Ref	-	-	-
	Yes	20.181 (0,7%)	9.437 (46,8%)	10.744 (53,2%)	1,44 (1,42 - 1,46)	<0,0001		
	Unknown	368.270 (12,8%)	257.528 (69,9%)	110.742 (30,1%)	-	-	-	-
Relationship – Self-inflicted	No	1.947.642 (67,8%)	1.156.784 (59,4%)	790.858 (40,6%)	1,50 (1,49 - 1,50)	<0,0001	1,35 (1,32 - 1,39)	<0,0001
	Yes	608.564 (21,2%)	443.471 (72,9%)	165.093 (27,1%)	Ref	-	Ref	-
	Unknown	316.787 (11,0%)	230.439 (72,7%)	86.348 (27,3%)	-	-	-	-
Relationship – Acquaintance	No	2.205.563 (76,8%)	1.413.199 (64,1%)	792.364 (35,9%)	Ref	-	-	-
	Yes	301.393 (10,5%)	164.654 (54,6%)	136.739 (45,4%)	1,26 (1,26 - 1,27)	<0,0001		
	Unknown	366.037 (12,7%)	252.841 (69,1%)	113.196 (30,9%)	-	-	-	-
Relationship – Other	No	2.284.285 (79,5%)	1.422.025 (62,3%)	862.260 (37,7%)	1,12 (1,11 - 1,13)	<0,0001	-	-
	Yes	202.116 (7,0%)	134.022 (66,3%)	68.094 (33,7%)	Ref	-	-	-
	Unknown	386.592 (13,5%)	274.647 (71,0%)	111.945 (29,0%)	-	-	-	-
Sex of the alleged perpetrator	Female	1.576.773 (54,9%)	952.715 (60,4%)	624.058 (39,6%)	Ref	-	-	-
	Male	759.041 (26,4%)	516.966 (68,1%)	242.075 (31,9%)	0,81 (0,80 - 0,81)	<0,0001		
	Both	181.740 (6,3%)	158.738 (87,3%)	23.002 (12,7%)	0,32 (0,32 - 0,32)	<0,0001		
	Unknown	355.439 (12,4%)	202.275 (56,9%)	153.164 (43,1%)	-	-	-	-
Suspected alcohol use by the alleged perpetrator	No	1.171.837 (40,8%)	789.349 (67,4%)	382.488 (32,6%)	Ref	-	-	-
	Yes	660.729 (23,0%)	377.405 (57,1%)	283.324 (42,9%)	1,31 (1,31 - 1,32)	<0,0001		
	Unknown	1.040.427 (36,2%)	663.940 (63,8%)	376.487 (36,2%)	-	-	-	-
Referral – Health unit	No	106.275 (3,7%)	59.336 (55,8%)	46.939 (44,2%)	1,28 (1,27 - 1,29)	<0,0001	1,17 (1,15 - 1,19)	<0,0001
	Yes	338.743 (11,8%)	222.233 (65,6%)	116.510 (34,4%)	Ref	-	Ref	-
	Unknown	2.427.975 (84,5%)	1.549.125 (63,8%)	878.850 (36,2%)	-	-	-	-
Referral – Guardianship Council	No	412.776 (14,4%)	227.094 (55,0%)	185.682 (45,0%)	2,99 (2,95 - 3,03)	<0,0001	1,63 (1,57 - 1,70)	<0,0001
	Yes	146.178 (5,1%)	124.175 (84,9%)	22.003 (15,1%)	Ref	-	Ref	-
	Unknown	2.314.039 (80,5%)	1.479.425 (63,9%)	834.614 (36,1%)	-	-	-	-
Referral – Juvenile Court	No	531.326 (18,5%)	324.889 (61,1%)	206.437 (38,9%)	3,30 (3,14 - 3,48)	<0,0001	1,31 (1,11 - 1,54)	0,0014
	Yes	10.733 (0,4%)	9.471 (88,2%)	1.262 (11,8%)	Ref	-	Ref	-
	Unknown	2.330.934 (81,1%)	1.496.334 (64,2%)	834.600 (35,8%)	-	-	-	-

Referral – Shelter	No	540.532 (18,8%)	330.415 (61,1%)	210.117 (38,9%)	3,52 (3,25 - 3,81)	<0,0001	1,94 (1,58 - 2,37)	<0,0001
	Yes	4.902 (0,2%)	4.360 (88,9%)	542 (11,1%)	Ref	-	Ref	-
	Unknown	2.327.559 (81,0%)	1.495.919 (64,3%)	831.640 (35,7%)	-	-	-	-
Referral – Women’s Care Network	No	540.086 (18,8%)	330.244 (61,1%)	209.842 (38,9%)	3,97 (3,68 - 4,28)	<0,0001	1,91 (1,59 - 2,30)	<0,0001
	Yes	6.345 (0,2%)	5.724 (90,2%)	621 (9,8%)	Ref	-	Ref	-
	Unknown	2.326.562 (81,0%)	1.494.726 (64,2%)	831.836 (35,8%)	-	-	-	-
Referral – Specialized Police Station for Women (DEAM)	No	455.278 (15,8%)	276.351 (60,7%)	178.927 (39,3%)	1,45 (1,43 - 1,46)	<0,0001	1,15 (1,12 - 1,17)	<0,0001
	Yes	96.389 (3,4%)	70.210 (72,8%)	26.179 (27,2%)	Ref	-	Ref	-
	Unknown	2.321.326 (80,8%)	1.484.133 (63,9%)	837.193 (36,1%)	-	-	-	-
Referral – Police Station for the Protection of Children and Adolescents (DPCA)	No	516.311 (18,0%)	313.227 (60,7%)	203.084 (39,3%)	2,60 (2,52 - 2,67)	<0,0001	1,62 (1,49 - 1,77)	<0,0001
	Yes	25.820 (0,9%)	21.909 (84,9%)	3.911 (15,1%)	Ref	-	Ref	-
	Unknown	2.330.862 (81,1%)	1.495.558 (64,2%)	835.304 (35,8%)	-	-	-	-
Referral – Other police stations	No	400.529 (13,9%)	269.261 (67,2%)	131.268 (32,8%)	Ref	-	Ref	-
	Yes	147.212 (5,1%)	77.638 (52,7%)	69.574 (47,3%)	1,44 (1,43 - 1,45)	<0,0001	1,04 (1,02 - 1,06)	<0,0001
	Unknown	2.325.252 (80,9%)	1.483.795 (63,8%)	841.457 (36,2%)	-	-	-	-
Referral – Public Prosecutor’s Office (MPU)	No	521.095 (18,1%)	320.141 (61,4%)	200.954 (38,6%)	3,47 (3,32 - 3,63)	<0,0001	1,58 (1,43 - 1,74)	<0,0001
	Yes	14.724 (0,5%)	13.088 (88,9%)	1.636 (11,1%)	Ref	-	Ref	-
	Unknown	2.337.174 (81,3%)	1.497.465 (64,1%)	839.709 (35,9%)	-	-	-	-
Referral – Reference Center for Women in Situations of Violence	No	515.940 (18,0%)	314.850 (61,0%)	201.090 (39,0%)	2,29 (2,22 - 2,35)	<0,0001	1,55 (1,49 - 1,62)	<0,0001
	Yes	24.876 (0,9%)	20.636 (83,0%)	4.240 (17,0%)	Ref	-	Ref	-
	Unknown	2.332.177 (81,2%)	1.495.208 (64,1%)	836.969 (35,9%)	-	-	-	-
Referral – Specialized Social Assistance Reference Center (CREAS)	No	495.397 (17,2%)	294.800 (59,5%)	200.597 (40,5%)	2,51 (2,46 - 2,57)	<0,0001	1,39 (1,34 - 1,45)	<0,0001
	Yes	49.416 (1,7%)	41.459 (83,9%)	7.957 (16,1%)	Ref	-	Ref	-
	Unknown	2.328.180 (81,0%)	1.494.435 (64,2%)	833.745 (35,8%)	-	-	-	-
Referral – Forensic Medical Institute (IML)	North	496.890 (17,3%)	296.128 (59,6%)	200.762 (40,4%)	2,33 (2,28 - 2,37)	<0,0001	2,90 (2,74 - 3,08)	<0,0001
	Northeast	49.744 (1,7%)	41.110 (82,6%)	8.634 (17,4%)	Ref	-	Ref	-
	Southeast	2.326.359 (81,0%)	1.493.456 (64,2%)	832.903 (35,8%)	-	-	-	-

Original Article

Assis Neto LA, Arato CVB, Cavalcante DFB, Raimundo ACS, Silva Junior MF, Probst LF, Guerra LM
Analysis of the Profile and Pattern of Violence Against Women in Brazil (2009–2021)

Referral – Others	South	457.040 (15,9%)	266.951 (58,4%)	190.089 (41,6%)	2,00 (1,97 - 2,02)	<0,0001	1,40 (1,37 - 1,44)	<0,0001
	Central-West	81.369 (2,8%)	64.418 (79,2%)	16.951 (20,8%)	Ref	-	Ref	-
	Unknown	2.334.584 (81,3%)	1.499.325 (64,2%)	835.259 (35,8%)	-	-	-	-
Region of occurrence within the municipality	Norte	172.698 (6,0%)	119.731 (69,3%)	52.967 (30,7%)	1,06 (1,05 - 1,07)	<0,0001	0,82 (0,79 - 0,85)	<0,0001
	Nordeste	441.798 (15,4%)	290.695 (65,8%)	151.103 (34,2%)	1,18 (1,17 - 1,19)	<0,0001	1,01 (0,98 - 1,04)	0,5342
	Sudeste	1.325.246 (46,1%)	764.756 (57,7%)	560.490 (42,3%)	1,46 (1,45 - 1,47)	<0,0001	1,12 (1,10 - 1,14)	<0,0001
	Sul	571.746 (19,9%)	406.236 (71,1%)	165.510 (28,9%)	Ref	-	Ref	-
	Centro-oeste	218.183 (7,6%)	147.416 (67,6%)	70.767 (32,4%)	1,12 (1,11 - 1,13)	<0,0001	1,07 (1,04 - 1,10)	<0,0001
	Ignorado	143.322 (5,0%)	101.860 (71,1%)	41.462 (28,9%)	-	-	-	-

*Reference category of the dependent variable;

PR: Prevalence Ratio; 95% CI: 95% Confidence Interval; Ref: Reference category of the independent variables. QIC (empty model) = 664,163.2. QIC (final model) = 150,499.0.

Psychological violence accounted for 3.9% of cases. It was more prevalent among adults (PR=1.25), older women (PR=1.89), married women

(PR=1.20), and separated women (PR=1.21), as well as in cases involving former spouses (PR=1.56), children (PR=1.38), employers (PR=7.45), or institutional relationships (PR=2.24). These cases were more likely to be referred to health services (PR=1.46), the Public Pros-

ecutor's Office (PR=2.00), women's support services (PR=2.51), and CREAS (PR=1.59), with $p < 0.05$. Psychological violence was less frequent in the Midwest Region compared to the other regions ($p < 0.05$) (Table 2).

Table 2. Results of crude and adjusted analyses of association with psychological violence from 2009 to 2021.

Variable	Category	Total	Physical Violence Only		Individual Models		Adjusted Model	
			No	*Yes	OR (95% CI)	p-value	OR (95% CI)	p-value
General	-	2.872.993 (100,0%)	2.659.700 (96,1%)	113.293 (3,9%)	-	-	-	-
Age	Child	957.571 (33,3%)	936.361 (97,8%)	21.210 (2,2%)	Ref		Ref	
	Adult	1.646.234 (57,3%)	1.566.209 (95,1%)	80.025 (4,9%)	2,19 (2,16 - 2,23)	<0,0001	1,25 (1,09 - 1,43)	0,0010
	Elderly	167.049 (5,8%)	157.805 (94,5%)	9.244 (5,5%)	2,50 (2,44 - 2,56)	<0,0001	1,89 (1,50 - 2,38)	<0,0001
	Unknown	102.139 (3,6%)	99.325 (97,2%)	2.814 (2,8%)	-	-	-	-
Educational Level	Illiterate	195.729 (6,8%)	187.306 (95,7%)	8.423 (4,3%)	1,74 (1,70 - 1,79)	<0,0001	-	-
	High School	1.347.761 (46,9%)	1.274.942 (94,6%)	72.819 (5,4%)	2,19 (2,16 - 2,23)	<0,0001	-	-
Educational Level	Higher Education	789.033 (27,5%)	769.574 (97,5%)	19.459 (2,5%)	Ref		-	-
	Unknown	540.470 (18,8%)	527.878 (97,7%)	12.592 (2,3%)	-	-	-	-

Race	White	1.148.803 (40,0%)	1.096.096 (95,4%)	52.707 (4,6%)	2,00 (1,84 - 2,16)	<0,0001	-	-
	Black	227.434 (7,9%)	217.740 (95,7%)	9.694 (4,3%)	1,85 (1,71 - 2,01)	<0,0001	-	-
	Asian	19.546 (0,7%)	18.927 (96,8%)	619 (3,2%)	1,38 (1,23 - 1,54)	<0,0001	-	-
	Brown (Mixed)	1.092.805 (38,0%)	1.052.298 (96,3%)	40.507 (3,7%)	1,61 (1,49 - 1,75)	<0,0001	-	-
	Indigenous	25.276 (0,9%)	24.695 (97,7%)	581 (2,3%)	Ref		-	-
	Unknown	359.129 (12,5%)	349.944 (97,4%)	9.185 (2,6%)	-	-	-	-
Pregnancy	No	1.110.821 (38,7%)	1.046.161 (94,2%)	64.660 (5,8%)	2,02 (1,95 - 2,09)	<0,0001	1,41 (1,19 - 1,67)	<0,0001
	Yes	109.890 (3,8%)	106.718 (97,1%)	3.172 (2,9%)	Ref		Ref	
	Unknown	1.652.282 (57,5%)	1.606.821 (97,2%)	45.461 (2,8%)	-	-	-	-
Marital status	Single	1.072.329 (37,3%)	1.034.063 (96,4%)	38.266 (3,6%)	Ref		Ref	
	Married	659.432 (23,0%)	621.113 (94,2%)	38.319 (5,8%)	1,63 (1,61 - 1,65)	<0,0001	1,20 (1,09 - 1,33)	0,0002
	Widowed	52.115 (1,8%)	48.443 (93,0%)	3.672 (7,0%)	1,97 (1,91 - 2,04)	<0,0001	0,97 (0,75 - 1,25)	0,8276
	Separated	129.742 (4,5%)	117.732 (90,7%)	12.010 (9,3%)	2,59 (2,54 - 2,65)	<0,0001	1,21 (1,04 - 1,39)	0,0109
	Unknown	959.375 (33,4%)	938.349 (97,8%)	21.026 (2,2%)	-	-	-	-
Do you have any disability/disorder?	No	1.973.780 (68,7%)	1.883.603 (95,4%)	90.177 (4,6%)	1,69 (1,65 - 1,73)	<0,0001	-	-
	Yes	287.739 (10,0%)	279.958 (97,3%)	7.781 (2,7%)	Ref		-	-
	Unknown	611.474 (21,3%)	596.139 (97,5%)	15.335 (2,5%)	-	-	-	-
Relationship – Unknown	No	2.253.285 (78,4%)	2.146.203 (95,2%)	107.082 (4,8%)	3,26 (3,16 - 3,37)	<0,0001	4,06 (3,10 - 5,31)	<0,0001
	Yes	255.582 (8,9%)	251.858 (98,5%)	3.724 (1,5%)	Ref		Ref	
	Unknown	364.126 (12,7%)	361.639 (99,3%)	2.487 (0,7%)	-	-	-	-
Relationship – Father	No	2.292.779 (79,8%)	2.191.319 (95,6%)	101.460 (4,4%)	1,01 (0,99 - 1,03)	0,3107	-	-
	Yes	213.566 (7,4%)	204.216 (95,6%)	9.350 (4,4%)	Ref		-	-
	Unknown	366.648 (12,8%)	364.165 (99,3%)	2.483 (0,7%)	-	-	-	-
Relationship – Mother	No	2.231.809 (77,7%)	2.127.792 (95,3%)	104.017 (4,7%)	1,95 (1,91 - 2,00)	<0,0001	-	-
	Yes	285.288 (9,9%)	278.484 (97,6%)	6.804 (2,4%)	Ref		-	-
	Unknown	355.896 (12,4%)	353.424 (99,3%)	2.472 (0,7%)	-	-	-	-
Relationship – Stepfather	No	2.440.741 (85,0%)	2.331.870 (95,5%)	108.871 (4,5%)	1,35 (1,29 - 1,41)	<0,0001	-	-
	Yes	58.494 (2,0%)	56.556 (96,7%)	1.938 (3,3%)	Ref		-	-
	Unknown	373.758 (13,0%)	371.274 (99,3%)	2.484 (0,7%)	-	-	-	-

Original Article

Assis Neto LA, Arato CVB, Cavalcante DFB, Raimundo ACS, Silva Junior MF, Probst LF, Guerra LM
Analysis of the Profile and Pattern of Violence Against Women in Brazil (2009–2021)

Relationship – Spouse	No	2.128.400 (74,1%)	2.042.174 (95,9%)	86.226 (4,1%)	Ref	-	-	-
	Yes	393.106 (13,7%)	368.226 (93,7%)	24.880 (6,3%)	1,56 (1,54 - 1,58)	<0,0001	-	-
	Unknown	351.487 (12,2%)	349.300 (99,4%)	2.187 (0,6%)	-	-	-	-
Relationship – Ex-spouse	No	2.362.265 (82,2%)	2.274.387 (96,3%)	87.878 (3,7%)	Ref	-	Ref	-
	Yes	147.227 (5,1%)	124.035 (84,2%)	23.192 (15,8%)	4,23 (4,18 - 4,29)	<0,0001	1,56 (1,36 - 1,78)	<0,0001
	Unknown	363.501 (12,7%)	361.278 (99,4%)	2.223 (0,6%)	-	-	-	-
Relationship – Partner	No	2.424.184 (84,4%)	2.315.066 (95,5%)	109.118 (4,5%)	2,12 (2,02 - 2,22)	<0,0001	2,82 (2,04 - 3,90)	<0,0001
	Yes	79.541 (2,8%)	77.850 (97,9%)	1.691 (2,1%)	Ref	-	Ref	-
	Unknown	369.268 (12,9%)	366.784 (99,3%)	2.484 (0,7%)	-	-	-	-
Relationship – Ex-partner	No	2.459.016 (85,6%)	2.353.143 (95,7%)	105.873 (4,3%)	Ref	-	-	-
	Yes	43.359 (1,5%)	38.378 (88,5%)	4.981 (11,5%)	2,67 (2,60 - 2,74)	<0,0001	-	-
	Unknown	370.618 (12,9%)	368.179 (99,3%)	2.439 (0,7%)	-	-	-	-
Relationship – Child	No	2.418.229 (84,2%)	2.314.156 (95,7%)	104.073 (4,3%)	Ref	-	Ref	-
	Yes	88.538 (3,1%)	81.787 (92,4%)	6.751 (7,6%)	1,77 (1,73 - 1,81)	<0,0001	1,38 (1,12 - 1,68)	0,0019
	Unknown	366.226 (12,7%)	363.757 (99,3%)	2.469 (0,7%)	-	-	-	-
Relationship – Nephew/ Niece	No	2.419.387 (84,2%)	2.312.026 (95,6%)	107.361 (4,4%)	1,04 (1,01 - 1,08)	0,0165	1,87 (1,36 - 2,57)	0,0001
	Yes	79.678 (2,8%)	76.284 (95,7%)	3.394 (4,3%)	Ref	-	Ref	-
	Unknown	373.928 (13,0%)	371.390 (99,3%)	2.538 (0,7%)	-	-	-	-
Relationship – Caregiver	No	2.486.225 (86,5%)	2.375.690 (95,6%)	110.535 (4,4%)	2,27 (2,01 - 2,56)	<0,0001	-	-
	Yes	12.898 (0,4%)	12.645 (98,0%)	253 (2,0%)	Ref	-	-	-
	Unknown	373.870 (13,0%)	371.365 (99,3%)	2.505 (0,7%)	-	-	-	-
Relationship – Employer	No	2.498.230 (87,0%)	2.388.519 (95,6%)	109.711 (4,4%)	Ref	-	Ref	-
	Yes	5.422 (0,2%)	4.336 (80,0%)	1.086 (20,0%)	4,56 (4,32 - 4,81)	<0,0001	7,45 (5,88 - 9,44)	<0,0001
	Unknown	369.341 (12,9%)	366.845 (99,3%)	2.496 (0,7%)	-	-	-	-
Relationship – Institutional	No	2.485.383 (86,5%)	2.376.128 (95,6%)	109.255 (4,4%)	Ref	-	Ref	-
	Yes	16.352 (0,6%)	14.895 (91,1%)	1.457 (8,9%)	2,03 (1,93 - 2,13)	<0,0001	2,24 (1,61 - 3,12)	<0,0001
	Unknown	371.258 (12,9%)	368.677 (99,3%)	2.581 (0,7%)	-	-	-	-
Relationship – Police officer	No	2.484.542 (86,5%)	2.374.014 (95,6%)	110.528 (4,4%)	3,71 (3,27 - 4,21)	<0,0001	-	-
	Yes	20.181 (0,7%)	19.939 (98,8%)	242 (1,2%)	Ref	-	-	-
	Unknown	368.270 (12,8%)	365.747 (99,3%)	2.523 (0,7%)	-	-	-	-

Relationship – Self-inflicted	No	1.947.642 (67,8%)	1.845.967 (94,8%)	101.675 (5,2%)	3,43 (3,35 - 3,50)	<0,0001	1,49 (1,30 - 1,70)	<0,0001
	Yes	608.564 (21,2%)	599.291 (98,5%)	9.273 (1,5%)	Ref		Ref	
	Unknown	316.787 (11,0%)	314.442 (99,3%)	2.345 (0,7%)	-	-	-	-
Relationship – Acquaintance	No	2.205.563 (76,8%)	2.103.664 (95,4%)	101.899 (4,6%)	1,56 (1,53 - 1,59)	<0,0001	1,60 (1,36 - 1,87)	<0,0001
	Yes	301.393 (10,5%)	292.455 (97,0%)	8.938 (3,0%)	Ref		Ref	
	Unknown	366.037 (12,7%)	363.581 (99,3%)	2.456 (0,7%)	-	-	-	-
Relationship – Other	No	2.284.285 (79,5%)	2.185.108 (95,7%)	99.177 (4,3%)	Ref		-	-
	Yes	202.116 (7,0%)	190.649 (94,3%)	11.467 (5,7%)	1,31 (1,28 - 1,33)	<0,0001	-	-
	Unknown	386.592 (13,5%)	383.943 (99,3%)	2.649 (0,7%)	-	-	-	-
Sex of the alleged perpetrator	Female	1.576.773 (54,9%)	1.492.334 (94,6%)	84.439 (5,4%)	2,17 (2,14 - 2,20)	<0,0001	-	-
	Male	759.041 (26,4%)	740.297 (97,5%)	18.744 (2,5%)	Ref		-	-
	Both	181.740 (6,3%)	175.106 (96,3%)	6.634 (3,7%)	1,48 (1,44 - 1,52)	<0,0001	-	-
	Unknown	355.439 (12,4%)	351.963 (99,0%)	3.476 (1,0%)	-	-	-	-
Suspected alcohol use by the alleged perpetrator	No	1.171.837 (40,8%)	1.117.049 (95,3%)	54.788 (4,7%)	1,04 (1,02 - 1,05)	<0,0001	1,28 (1,18 - 1,40)	<0,0001
	Yes	660.729 (23,0%)	631.001 (95,5%)	29.728 (4,5%)	Ref		Ref	
	Unknown	1.040.427 (36,2%)	1.011.650 (97,2%)	28.777 (2,8%)	-	-	-	-
Referral – Health unit	No	106.275 (3,7%)	105.427 (99,2%)	848 (0,8%)	Ref		Ref	
	Yes	338.743 (11,8%)	333.332 (98,4%)	5.411 (1,6%)	2,00 (1,86 - 2,15)	<0,0001	1,46 (1,29 - 1,65)	<0,0001
	Unknown	2.427.975 (84,5%)	2.320.941 (95,6%)	107.034 (4,4%)	-	-	-	-
Referral – Guardianship Council	No	412.776 (14,4%)	391.160 (94,8%)	21.616 (5,2%)	2,79 (2,69 - 2,91)	<0,0001	-	-
	Yes	146.178 (5,1%)	143.438 (98,1%)	2.740 (1,9%)	Ref		-	-
	Unknown	2.314.039 (80,5%)	2.225.102 (96,2%)	88.937 (3,8%)	-	-	-	-
Referral – Juvenile Court	No	531.326 (18,5%)	507.307 (95,5%)	24.019 (4,5%)	1,66 (1,48 - 1,86)	<0,0001	-	-
	Yes	10.733 (0,4%)	10.441 (97,3%)	292 (2,7%)	Ref		-	-
	Unknown	2.330.934 (81,1%)	2.241.952 (96,2%)	88.982 (3,8%)	-	-	-	-
Referral – Shelter	No	540.532 (18,8%)	516.405 (95,5%)	24.127 (4,5%)	1,08 (0,95 - 1,24)	0,2481	-	-
	Yes	4.902 (0,2%)	4.700 (95,9%)	202 (4,1%)	Ref		-	-
	Unknown	2.327.559 (81,0%)	2.238.595 (96,2%)	88.964 (3,8%)	-	-	-	-

Original Article

Assis Neto LA, Arato CVB, Cavalcante DFB, Raimundo ACS, Silva Junior MF, Probst LF, Guerra LM
Analysis of the Profile and Pattern of Violence Against Women in Brazil (2009–2021)

Referral – Women’s Care Network	No	540.086 (18,8%)	515.938 (95,5%)	24.148 (4,5%)	1,93 (1,64 - 2,27)	<0,0001	-	-
	Yes	6.345 (0,2%)	6.198 (97,7%)	147 (2,3%)	Ref		-	-
	Unknown	2.326.562 (81,0%)	2.237.564 (96,2%)	88.998 (3,8%)	-	-	-	-
Referral – Specialized Police Station for Women (DEAM)	No	455.278 (15,8%)	440.506 (96,8%)	14.772 (3,2%)	Ref		-	-
	Yes	96.389 (3,4%)	86.265 (89,5%)	10.124 (10,5%)	3,24 (3,16 - 3,32)	<0,0001	-	-
	Unknown	2.321.326 (80,8%)	2.232.929 (96,2%)	88.397 (3,8%)	-	-	-	-
Referral – Police Station for the Protection of Children and Adolescents (DPCA)	No	516.311 (18,0%)	492.267 (95,3%)	24.044 (4,7%)	4,49 (3,98 - 5,06)	<0,0001	-	-
	Yes	25.820 (0,9%)	25.552 (99,0%)	268 (1,0%)	Ref		-	-
	Unknown	2.330.862 (81,1%)	2.241.881 (96,2%)	88.981 (3,8%)	-	-	-	-
Referral – Other police stations	No	400.529 (13,9%)	380.220 (94,9%)	20.309 (5,1%)	1,86 (1,80 - 1,93)	<0,0001	1,88 (1,69 - 2,08)	<0,0001
	Yes	147.212 (5,1%)	143.209 (97,3%)	4.003 (2,7%)	Ref		Ref	
	Unknown	2.325.252 (80,9%)	2.236.271 (96,2%)	88.981 (3,8%)	-	-	-	-
Referral – Public Prosecutor’s Office (MPU)	No	521.095 (18,1%)	497.818 (95,5%)	23.277 (4,5%)	Ref		Ref	
	Yes	14.724 (0,5%)	13.721 (93,2%)	1.003 (6,8%)	1,52 (1,43 - 1,62)	<0,0001	2,00 (1,66 - 2,42)	<0,0001
	Unknown	2.337.174 (81,3%)	2.248.161 (96,2%)	89.013 (3,8%)	-	-	-	-
Referral – Reference Center for Women in Situations of Violence	No	515.940 (18,0%)	494.356 (95,8%)	21.584 (4,2%)	Ref		Ref	
	Yes	24.876 (0,9%)	22.472 (90,3%)	2.404 (9,7%)	2,31 (2,22 - 2,40)	<0,0001	2,51 (2,26 - 2,79)	<0,0001
	Unknown	2.332.177 (81,2%)	2.242.872 (96,2%)	89.305 (3,8%)	-	-	-	-
Referral – Specialized Social Assistance Reference Center (CREAS)	No	495.397 (17,2%)	474.223 (95,7%)	21.174 (4,3%)	Ref		Ref	
	Yes	49.416 (1,7%)	46.598 (94,3%)	2.818 (5,7%)	1,33 (1,28 - 1,39)	<0,0001	1,59 (1,41 - 1,79)	<0,0001
	Unknown	2.328.180 (81,0%)	2.238.879 (96,2%)	89.301 (3,8%)	-	-	-	-
Referral – Forensic Medical Institute (IML)	North	496.890 (17,3%)	472.878 (95,2%)	24.012 (4,8%)	8,09 (7,22 - 9,07)	<0,0001	7,20 (4,88 - 10,62)	<0,0001
	Northeast	49.744 (1,7%)	49.447 (99,4%)	297 (0,6%)	Ref		Ref	
	Southeast	2.326.359 (81,0%)	2.237.375 (96,2%)	88.984 (3,8%)	-	-	-	-
Referral – Others	South	457.040 (15,9%)	437.719 (95,8%)	19.321 (4,2%)	Ref		Ref	
	Central-West	81.369 (2,8%)	76.187 (93,6%)	5.182 (6,4%)	1,51 (1,46 - 1,55)	<0,0001	1,36 (1,22 - 1,52)	<0,0001
	Unknown	2.334.584 (81,3%)	2.245.794 (96,2%)	88.790 (3,8%)	-	-	-	-

Region of occurrence within the municipality	Norte	172.698 (6,0%)	162.942 (94,4%)	9.756 (5,6%)	2,85 (2,75 - 2,96)	<0,0001	1,62 (1,27 - 2,07)	0,0001
	Nordeste	441.798 (15,4%)	423.806 (95,9%)	17.992 (4,1%)	2,06 (1,99 - 2,13)	<0,0001	2,03 (1,64 - 2,51)	<0,0001
	Sudeste	1.325.246 (46,1%)	1.272.849 (96,0%)	52.397 (4,0%)	2,00 (1,94 - 2,06)	<0,0001	1,49 (1,24 - 1,79)	<0,0001
	Sul	571.746 (19,9%)	544.635 (95,3%)	27.111 (4,7%)	2,40 (2,32 - 2,47)	<0,0001	2,45 (2,04 - 2,94)	<0,0001
	Centro-oeste	218.183 (7,6%)	213.864 (98,0%)	4.319 (2,0%)	Ref		Ref	
	Ignorado	143.322 (5,0%)	141.604 (98,8%)	1.718 (1,2%)	-	-	-	-

*Reference category of the dependent variable;

PR: Prevalence Ratio; 95% CI: 95% Confidence Interval; Ref: Reference category of the independent variables. QIC (empty model) = 108,827.4. QIC (final model) = 20,458.1.

DISCUSSION

The reporting of nearly 3 million cases of violence occurring in Brazil between 2009 and 2021, based on mandatory reporting forms, revealed that the majority of victims were adult women with an educational level up to high school and who self-identified as white. The significant prevalence of violence among adult women may reflect the complex social and economic dynamics that influence the perpetrator's behavior in this age group⁹. Furthermore, the considerable proportion of victims with education limited to high school suggests a possible association between violence and socioeconomic and educational factors¹⁰. Racial disparities are also evident, with a significant portion of cases reported by individuals who self-identified as white, which may indicate underreporting of violence among groups that self-identified as "non-white" or reflect differences in vulnerability or exposure to violence^{10,11}.

Regarding the victims' educational level, the results corroborate previous studies that associated violence with lower educational levels among women^{12,13}. A study conducted with primary care users⁽¹³⁾ noted that partners with up to eight years of schooling and who were unemployed exhibited

a higher frequency of psychological violence. The same study highlighted the importance of considering partners' educational level and occupational profile as relevant factors for understanding the dynamics of intimate partner violence. Furthermore, characteristics such as drug use, alcohol consumption, and refusal to use condoms were associated with a significant increase in the prevalence of psychological aggression. Regarding physical and sexual violence, unemployment and alcohol consumption by the partner were identified as risk factors¹⁴.

Contrary to what is reported in the literature regarding race/skin color, the results of this study indicated a higher prevalence among women who self-identified as white. In studies examining the lethality of domestic violence against women, the highest rates were observed among Black and Brown women in the North, Northeast, and Central-West regions, and among white women in the South and parts of the Southeast¹³. The data demonstrate that domestic and family violence against Black women constitutes a multifactorial phenomenon, involving family conflicts, social vulnerability, racism, and socioeconomic and gender inequalities, among other factors¹⁵. The prevalence of this type of violence against Black women is alarmingly high, reflecting the need for differentiated attention and effective public policies that address the specific challenges faced by

these women¹⁶. The results related to reports of violence against pregnant women highlight the severity of this problem and the need for interventions targeting this vulnerable group, corroborating data from the Ministry of Health¹⁷ and other studies^{18–19}, which indicated that this percentage ranged from 1% to 20%. This variation resulted from methodological differences between the studies or from the specific characteristics of the contexts studied. This type of violence can have consequences for maternal and neonatal health, ranging from preterm birth to maternal or fetal death¹⁹.

The marital status of the victims—which is most prevalent among unmarried women—may indicate patterns of violence related to marital status, consistent with data from the Brazilian Forum on Public Safety, which also notes that this marital status does not rule out the existence of an intimate partner nor does it include separated or divorced women, situations in which women are more vulnerable²⁰. Violence perpetrated by intimate partners reflects a culture marked by gender inequalities, in which practices of oppression against women, such as the use of physical force and aggression, are expressions of humiliation and demonstrations of power. Alcohol consumption is often socially accepted as a justification for violent behavior²¹.

With regard to women with disabilities, the data suggest that disabil-

ity can intensify these women's social invisibility. In these circumstances, victims, who generally face greater difficulties in achieving autonomy, often depend financially on their aggressors²². Regarding the geographic region of occurrence, a higher prevalence was observed in the Southeast, followed by the South, Northeast, Midwest, and North. Comparison of these findings with other studies is limited by the scarcity of national references, since research generally includes municipal, state, or regional data. Considering the inequalities in access observed in Brazil, it is plausible that women residing in more privileged regions have greater access to services, resulting in higher reporting rates.

With regard to psychological violence, this study identified an average rate of 3.9% over the 13 years analyzed. A study using data from the National Health Survey²³ investigated the outcome "having suffered psychological violence in the past 12 months" and found a rate of 17.3% in 2019. Thus, the present study, by showing a lower prevalence of this type of violence, suggests two possibilities: either there has been a real reduction in this type of aggression, or its normalization may have discouraged women from reporting cases.

In this regard, it is essential to highlight that the delegitimization of various forms of psychological violence against women remains a persistent reality in society, discouraging women from reporting their suffering. The power imbalance between men and women is socially legitimized in Brazilian society, contributing to the normalization of violence. Reporting abuse implies challenging this established power structure. Thus, the discouragement of victims from filing formal complaints constitutes yet another patriarchal strategy aimed at maintaining socially accepted power inequalities.

It is worth noting the impact of the strengthening of public policies beginning in 2003 as a significant milestone, achieved through the expansion of integrated initiatives, such as the improvement of legislation, the creation of care protocols, the promotion of service networks, support for educational and cultural initiatives aimed at preventing violence, and the expansion of women's access to justice and public safety services. This evolution reflects a continuous effort to comprehensively address VAW, promoting women's autonomy and holding perpetrators accountable²⁴.

However, the effectiveness of the network combating VCM in Brazil faces significant obstacles. One of the main challenges relates to the difficulty of establishing a clear and efficient flow of information between services, which results in inappropriate referrals due to a lack of knowledge regarding the specific responsibilities of each institution involved. Furthermore, the lack of communication regarding the progress of cases among different agencies contributes to the fragmentation of care, creating gaps in the support offered to victims²⁵. Another critical issue concerns the quality of care provided by some professionals who, due to insufficient training in handling situations of violence, may blame victims, demonstrate a lack of empathy, and fail to provide humane care. There are even reports of professionals adopting an inappropriate investigative stance, with excessive and invasive questioning, disrespecting the victims' privacy and, at times, justifying the violence based on the woman's own behavior²⁵.

Although the sample for this study was constructed using statistically significant parameters, limitations such as underreporting must be taken into account; this stems both from the fact that not all victims seek services and from those who, when they do seek services, omit or deny the assault. An-

other limitation relates to human factors, such as errors in filling out the notification forms and in the subsequent data entry, given the large number of fields to be completed, which increases the likelihood of mistakes and loss of information. Nevertheless, the structural inequality that characterizes Brazilian society hinders access and discriminates against the most vulnerable populations, such as Black women and those with little or no formal education, which may prevent or limit these women's access to reporting and assistance services.

This scenario contributes to the mistaken perception that these groups are less affected by violence. To address these challenges, monitoring the effectiveness of the network to combat violence must prioritize expanding access, coordinating services, prevention, and the protection of victims.

CONCLUSION

The predominant profile of victims of violence against women (VAW) reported in Brazil between 2009 and 2021, based on mandatory reporting forms, consisted of adult women, predominantly white, with an educational level up to high school, and single. Most reports were concentrated in the Southeast Region.

REFERENCES

- World Health Organization. Addressing violence against women in health and multisectoral policies: a global status report. ISBN 978-92-4-004045-8 (electronic version). Geneva, 2021.
- Sardinha L, Giroux M, Stockl H, Meyer SR, Moreno CG. Global, regional, and national prevalence estimates of physical or sexual, or both, intimate partner violence against women in 2018. *Lancet*. 2022;399:803-13.
- Brasil. Lei nº 10778, de 24 de novembro de 2003. Estabelece a notificação compulsória, no território nacional, do caso de violência contra a mulher que for atendida em serviços de saúde públicos ou privados. *Diário Oficial da República Federativa do Brasil, Brasília (DF)*, 2003 nov 25; Seção 1:11.
- Silva LEL, Oliveira MLC. Características epidemiológicas da violência contra a mulher no Distrito Federal, 2009 a 2012. *Epidemiol Serv Saude*. 2016 Jun;25(2):331-42.
- Vasconcelos NM, Bernal RTI, Souza JB, Bordoni PHC, Stein C, Coll CVN, Murray J, Malta DC. Subnotificação de violência contra as mulheres: uma análise de duas fontes de dados. *Ciência & Saúde Coletiva*, 29(10):1-10, 2024.
- Rodríguez-Blanes GM, Vives-Cases C, Miralles-Bueno JJ, Sebastián MS, Goicolea S. Detección de violencia del compañero íntimo en atención primaria de salud y sus factores asociados. *Gac Sanit*. 2017;31:410-5.
- Arboit J, Padoin SMM, Vieira LB. Violence against women in Primary Health Care: Potentialities and limitations to identification. *Aten Primaria*. 2020 Jan;52(1):14-21.
- Von Elm E, Altman DG, Egger M, Pocock SJ, Gøtzsche PC, Vandenbroucke JP; STROBE Initiative. The Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (STROBE) statement: guidelines for reporting observational studies. *Lancet*. 2007 Oct 20;370(9596):1453-7.
- Oliveira CAB, Alencar LN, Cardena RR, Moreira KFA, Pereira PPS, Fernandes DER. Perfil da vítima e características da violência contra a mulher no estado de Rondônia - Brasil. *Rev Cuid*. 2019 Apr;10(1):e573.
- da Silva GCB, Nóbrega WFS, Neto ODMM, Soares RDSC, de Olinda RA, Cavalcanti SDALB, Cavalcanti AL. Distribuição espacial e perfil epidemiológico das notificações da violência contra a mulher em uma cidade do nordeste brasileiro. *Arch Health Invest*. 2020;8(10).
- Pestana SJT, et al. Epidemia invisível: perfil epidemiológico de mulheres vítimas de violência doméstica no Estado de Pernambuco entre 2015 e 2019. *Braz J Dev*. 2021;7(6):64290-64308.
- Jennings WG, Powers RA, Perez NM. A Review of the Effects of the Violence Against Women Act on Law Enforcement. *Violence Against Women*. 2021 Jan;27(1):69-83.
- Bueno S, Martins J, Pimentel A, Lagreca et al. Visível e Invisível: A vitimização de mulheres no Brasil- 3a Edição-2021.
- Leite FM, Marabotti Costa F, et al. Violência contra a mulher e sua associação com o perfil do parceiro íntimo: estudo com usuárias da atenção primária. *Rev Bras Epidemiol*. 2024;22:e190056.
- Octaviani JV, de Lima Gomes S, Cortellazzi KL, Gondinho BVC, Lino CM, Guerra LM, et al. Violência doméstica: perfil e distribuição espacial em Piracicaba-SP. *Saude Rev*. 2020;21(1):53-64.
- Carrizo C, Martins PA. A violência doméstica e racismo contra mulheres negras. *Rev Estud Fem*. 2020;28(2).
- Brasil. Ministério da Saúde. Secretaria de Atenção à Saúde. Atenção ao pré-natal de baixo risco. Brasília: Ministério da Saúde; 2013.
- Colonese CF, Liana WP. Análise das notificações de violência contra gestantes no Brasil no período de 2011 até 2018. *Texto Contexto Enferm*. 2022;31.
- Barbosa HJC, et al. Caracterização de casos notificados de violência contra a gestante no Estado do Espírito Santo, no período de 2011 a 2016. *Rev Bras Pesquisa Saude*. 2019;21(4):38-48.
- Moroskoski M, Brito FAM, Oliveira RR. Time trend and spatial distribution of the cases of lethal violence against women in Brazil. *Rev Latino-Am Enfermagem*. 2022;30:e3547.
- Meneghel SN, Rosa BARD, Ceccon RF, Hirakata VN, Danilevicz IM. Femicídios: estudo em capitais e municípios brasileiros de grande porte populacional. *Cien Saude Colet*. 2017;22:2963-2970.
- Passos RL, Telles FSP, Oliveira MHB. Da violência sexual e outras ofensas contra a mulher com deficiência. *Saude Debate*. 2019;43(154):154-164.
- Minayo MCS, Pinto LW, Silva CMFP. A violência nossa de cada dia, segundo dados da Pesquisa Nacional de Saúde 2019. *Cien Saude Colet*. 2022;27(9):3701-3714.
- Santos CM. Curto-circuito, falta de linha ou na linha? Redes de enfrentamento à violência contra mulheres em São Paulo. *Ver Estud Fem*. 2015;23(2):577-600.
- Aguiar JM, D'Oliveira AFPLS, Lilia B. Mudanças históricas na rede intersectorial de serviços voltados à violência contra a mulher - São Paulo, Brasil. *Interface - Comunicação, Saúde, Educação*. 2024;24:e190486.