ADVANCES IN KNOWLEDGE ORGANIZATION
Proceedings of International ISKO Conference - ISSN: 0938-5495 - 2026 - São Paulo

A Triangulated Categorization Framework for Monitoring Sustainable Legislative Responses to Violence Against Women in Brazil: A Maria da Penha Law-Based Analysis

Carla Maria Martellote Viola

Brazilian Institute of Information in Science and Technology, Brazil

Carla Beatriz Marques Felipe

Federal University of Rio de Janeiro, Brazil

Luana Farias Sales Marques

Brazilian Institute of Information in Science and Technology, Brazil

Abstract

Violence against women remains a structural governance problem in Brazil, affecting public security and health systems and revealing territorial inequalities. This study developed a Triangulated Categorization Framework for monitoring sustainable legislative responses to violence against women in Brazil, grounded in the Maria da Penha Law domain. Methodologically, it combines bibliographic and document-based research with a qualitative, exploratory, and replicable workflow applied to metadata extracted from the Chamber of Deputies' Legislative Information System. The framework is organized around three macroclasses derived from the legal prescriptions of the Maria da Penha Law: Prevention, Protection, and Punishment. Sixteen subclasses were induced from an empirical corpus of 1,492 legislative propositions under consideration, using official legislative summaries and institutional indexing terms as evidence. The framework shows categorization as a Knowledge Organization process rather than as ad hoc tagging: categories, scope notes, inclusion and exclusion triggers, and recorded evidence transform dispersed legislative metadata into auditable and reusable analytical units. The study argues that Knowledge Organization systems, processes, and instruments can operate critically, monitoring transparency policy evaluation, sustainable governance, and the implementation of the 2030 Agenda, especially Sustainable Development Goal 5 on gender equality. Although grounded in the Brazilian legal domain, the framework can be adapted to other jurisdictions by revising the legal framework, metadata sources, and culturally specific categories.

Keywords: Knowledge Organization. Categorization. Legislative information. Violence against women. Maria da Penha Law.

1.0 Introduction

Violence against women remains a persistent governance problem in Brazil, affecting public security and health systems and revealing territorial inequalities. Recent evidence highlights both escalation and continuity. The Brazilian Public Security Yearbook 2025 reports 1,492 victims of femicide and 87,545 victims of rape in 2024 (Fórum Brasileiro de Segurança Pública 2025). Public health research adds a territorial perspective by showing that excess risk is concentrated in specific areas, reinforcing that domestic violence is structural and patterned rather than a set of isolated events (Azevedo et al. 2025; Vasconcelos et al. 2021; Oliveira et al. 2024). Within the 2030 Agenda, these facts are directly connected to Sustainable Development Goal 5 (SDG 5), especially Target 5.2, which calls for the elimination of all forms of violence against women and girls (United Nations 2015).

From a legal and political standpoint, the Maria da Penha Law organizes mechanisms to curb domestic and family violence against women through protective measures, service networks, and accountability pathways (Brazil 2006). However, a decisive part of policy formation occurs before implementation, within the legislative process itself. Legislative propositions are drafted, named, delimited, indexed, and processed within information systems that encompass heterogeneous legislative materials. In practice, therefore, monitoring what is being proposed to address violence against women depends not only on legal content but also on whether the legislative information system, its metadata practices, and its Knowledge Organization (KO) systems make propositions findable, comparable, and measurable.

Legislative databases rely on official summaries and institutional indexing terms that are not always sufficiently specific for public scrutiny. As a result, propositions with different political and legal consequences may appear equivalent when topical representation is superficial, while substantively similar propositions may become difficult to retrieve because of terminological variation and uneven indexing conventions. The central challenge is representational opacity because descriptors that are legible to insiders may remain difficult for the public, researchers, and civil society actors to decode, weakening transparency and longitudinal monitoring.

This problem leads to the following research question: How can legislative propositions be categorized to support the monitoring of public responses to violence against women in Brazil? To answer this question, the study developed a Triangulated Categorization Framework anchored in the Maria da Penha Law domain and applied to legislative propositions under consideration in the Chamber of Deputies.

The study is justified by the fact that, once violence against women enters the legislative process, effective monitoring requires more than counting propositions. It requires categories capable of representing intervention mechanisms, distinguishing overlapping scopes, avoiding false equivalence, and supporting multiple assignments when propositions combine preventive, protective, and punitive instruments. The contribution is therefore both methodological and critical, because it shifts the debate from isolated

legislative content to the capacity to compare, audit, and reuse legislative information as evidence for gender-responsive and sustainability-oriented governance.

2.0 The Triangulated Categorization Framework as Knowledge Organization Infrastructure

In this article, Knowledge Organization is not understood as an institution or as an organizational actor. It refers to a field of study and to a set of processes, principles, instruments, and products through which knowledge is organized, represented, structured, named, related, retrieved, and used. This clarification responds to a terminological risk in the expression "Knowledge Organizations". The appropriate emphasis here is on Knowledge Organization Systems (KOS), categorization processes, indexing practices, classification schemes, and metadata infrastructures.

The creation of a Triangulated Categorization Framework within the Maria da Penha Law domain operates as KO infrastructure because it translates a complex legal domain into representational structures that support consistent communication, retrieval, comparison, and reuse of information. KO helps establish and order conceptual domains while addressing core practices such as document description, indexing, classification, and the design of KOSs, all of which connect language, concepts, documents, and access needs (Dahlberg 2006; Lancaster 2004). From the classical theoretical tradition, classification is not merely an act of arranging content but a communicative device that enables knowledge to circulate within institutional and social systems (Ranganathan 1951). KO theory also shows that classification choices embed assumptions about knowledge, cognition, language, and social organization, making it necessary to state criteria, rationales, and limits explicitly when designing a framework (Hjørland 2008).

Categorization is therefore a core KO operation. It is the process through which concepts are selected, named, delimited, related, and made operational for retrieval and interpretation. In legal and policy domains, categorization determines what becomes visible, comparable, and measurable in institutional monitoring. It shapes which interventions can be retrieved, counted, grouped, compared, and debated. For this reason, the proposed framework treats categories not as neutral labels but as rule-governed analytical units supported by scope notes, inclusion triggers, exclusion triggers, examples, and evidence fields (Zhang *et al.* 2014). In this study, categories are understood as cognitive and pragmatic constructions that support inference, communication, and decision-making, rather than reflections of fixed or natural divisions of the world. Categories emerge from observed patterns, practical goals, and contexts of use and may assume flexible, function-oriented structures. This perspective emphasizes that category boundaries are defined by operational criteria and by their usefulness for organizing knowledge and experience, rather than by intrinsic essences (Smith and Medin 1981).

Critical KO strengthens this argument by showing that representation is never socially neutral. Olson (1998, 2002, 2007) challenges universalist and supposedly neutral models of classification and argues for approaches attentive to context, power, plurality, and the representation of women's issues. Her work is especially relevant here because legislative

information about violence against women is mediated by institutional vocabularies that may reproduce silences, flatten differences, or make specific forms of vulnerability less visible. In turn, Spivak (2010) further warns that speaking for subaltern subjects does not necessarily create conditions for them to be heard. In the present study, this insight reinforces the need to treat legislative propositions' metadata as evidence to be examined and governed, not as an unquestioned authority.

The organization and representation of legislative action is therefore not neutral. Official summaries and institutional indexing terms function as state-centered grammar optimized for legislative processing, but not necessarily for public readability, social accountability, or women's issues. The same organizational and representational layers that enable large-scale retrieval may also produce opacity, making interventions with different consequences appear equivalent, while relevant propositions become difficult to locate because of terminological variation and indexing conventions. A Triangulated Categorization Framework is therefore also an accountability device because it makes the organizational and representational layers explicit, auditable, and open to criticism. Terminological work, scope notes, synonym control, and explicit decision rules are central to sustaining longitudinal comparability and reducing organizational and representational drifts (Barité 2025). An evaluative framework should also function as reusable research infrastructure. A limited FAIR-informed approach strengthens this by requiring stable identifiers, explicit provenance, documented rules, and machine-actionable representation whenever possible (Wilkinson *et al.* 2016).

The framework created also acknowledges epistemic and political limits. Dependence on institutional metadata can privilege already legitimized descriptors and obscure plural epistemologies, lived categories, and intersectional experiences. From a feminist perspective on data classification, risks include intersectional underspecification, reduced visibility of violence outside the domestic and family sphere, and unequal representation of historically excluded subjects (Olson 2002). According to Novellino (2002) and Olson (2002), the bias cannot be fully eliminated. For that reason, the framework should commit to four principles: transparency; non-reductionism through multiple assignments; pluralism through the treatment of metadata as evidence rather than authority; and harm-sensitive monitoring through scope limits, disclosure of out-of-scope zones, future intersectional extensions, and periodic bias audits.

3.0 Methodology

This study adopts a bibliographic, document-based, qualitative, and exploratory design supported by a reproducible workflow for collecting, extracting, and classifying legislative metadata. KO is treated as a critical intervention rather than a neutral technical step because institutional descriptors in legislative databases often function as state-centered vocabulary that is difficult to interpret outside the legislative apparatus. The framework is termed "triangulated" because it anchors legislative propositions in three interconnected operational vertices derived from the Maria da Penha Law (Brazil 2006): Prevention, Protection, and Punishment. This law establishes mechanisms to prevent and combat domestic and family violence against women, to ensure protection and assistance for women in situations of violence, and to hold perpetrators accountable through civil, administrative, and criminal measures (Viola and Silva 2024).

In the Triangulated Categorization Framework, these three legal prescriptions operate as macro classes. More specific policy intentions are organized and represented as subclasses induced empirically from two metadata layers available at scale that are official legislative summaries and institutional indexing terms or subjects. Scope notes function as governance devices used to stabilize meaning, surface institutional assumptions, and reduce invisibility produced by opaque cataloging conventions. The unit of analysis is each individual legislative proposition under consideration and related to violence against women. The corpus comprises records extracted from the Legislative Information System of the Chamber of Deputies (Câmara dos Deputados n.d.) on January 30, 2026, after manual filtering. The extracted records include proposition identifiers, such as type, number, year, and status, and the textual fields used for classification, official summary, and indexing terms/subjects. The final corpus totaled 1,492 propositions, which were deposited in Zenodo (Viola 2026a). Textual metadata preparation followed three steps: (1) concatenation of the summary and indexing terms into a single analytical field (Text = official summary + indexing terms/subjects); (2) light normalization, including lowercase conversion and standardization of whitespace, without rewriting institutional content; and (3) creation of evidence fields that store inclusion and exclusion triggers to document and audit classification decisions.

The categorization workflow proceeded in five stages. First, the macro classes Prevention, Protection, and Punishment were defined from the legal prescriptions of the Maria da Penha Law. Second, an exploratory reading of an initial subset identified recurring verbs, objects of intervention, policy instruments, and legal effects. Third, recurrent semantic patterns were grouped into candidate subclasses within each macroclass. Fourth, each subclass received a scope note, inclusion triggers, exclusion triggers, and typical examples. Fifth, the resulting structure was reviewed through human validation, with special attention to ambiguous cases, synonym control, terminological variation, and possible overlaps among classes.

Multiple assignments were allowed when a proposition combined more than one intervention logic, for example, when a bill simultaneously created a prevention campaign, expanded service networks, and modified criminal sanctions. This decision is

methodologically important because forcing a single category would reproduce false exclusivity and reduce the explanatory capacity of the framework. When a dominant legal prescription was evident, it was recorded as the main class, while additional mechanisms could be retained as secondary evidence for future computational or comparative analyses.

AI-assisted tools were used only as auxiliary instruments. NotebookLM (Google 2026) supported exploratory grouping of patterns within each main class, and ChatGPT (OpenAI 2026) supported terminological iteration and language revision. These tools did not autonomously define categories, assign final classifications, collect data, or produce unverified analytical conclusions. All subclass definitions, scope limits, inclusion and exclusion triggers, and interpretive decisions were validated by the researchers to mitigate bias and avoid hallucinated results.

To operationalize the categorization process, the dataset was structured into explicit columns, each corresponding to a specific analytical and governance function: (1) Class, which records the macro-level intervention logic, namely Prevention (PREV), Protection (PROT), or Punishment (PUN); (2) Subclass, which specifies the more granular intervention mechanism within each class, such as economic protection, criminal procedure, education, or service provision; (3) Scope note, which defines the semantic boundaries of each subclass and provides interpretive stability across different legislative formulations; (4) Inclusion triggers, which list mechanisms, policy instruments, or semantic patterns that qualify a proposition for inclusion in a subclass; (5) Exclusion triggers, which document superficially related mechanisms that belong to a different intervention logic; and (6) Typical examples, which provide representative legislative actions or policy instruments that illustrate the subclass in practice and promote transparency and reproducibility.

4.0 Results and discussion

The workflow produced a Triangulated Categorization Framework for monitoring sustainable legislative responses to violence against women in Brazil under the Maria da Penha Law domain. The framework is structured around three main intervention-logic classes, Prevention (PREV), Protection (PROT), and Punishment (PUN), and sixteen empirically induced subclasses derived from official legislative summaries and institutional indexing terms (Figure 1).

Class	Code	Sub Classes
PREVENTION (PREV)	PREV.01	Education, curriculum and campaigns
	PREV.02	Capacity-building and protocols for agents and service networks
	PREV.03	Re-education programs and recidivism prevention
	PREV.04	Data, indicators, monitoring and transparency
	PREV.05	Prevention and alert channels and technologies
PROTECTION (PROT)	PROT.01	Urgent protective measures and safeguards
	PROT.02	Service networks, services and sheltering
	PROT.03	Health, social assistance and psychosocial support
	PROT.04	Economic, property-related protection and autonomy
	PROT.05	Confidentiality, data protection and digital protection of the victim
	PROT.06	Access to justice and institutional specialization
PUNISHMENT (PUN)	PUN.01	Typification/criminalization of conduct
	PUN.02	Sentencing increase and qualifiers
	PUN.03	Criminal procedure and proceedings
	PUN.04	Penal execution and restrictions on the perpetrator
	PUN.05	Associated administrative/civil sanctions

Figure 1. The Triangulated Categorization Framework

Operationally, the Triangulated Categorization Framework was implemented through a structured categorization table in which each subclass is governed by explicit semantic and procedural elements: scope notes, inclusion triggers, exclusion triggers, and typical examples. Scope notes provide interpretive boundaries and clarify how institutional descriptors should be interpreted in relation to intervention mechanisms, while inclusion and exclusion triggers enable systematic identification of subclass-specific semantic patterns within the combined text field (official summary + indexing terms/subjects). This structure makes categorization decisions reproducible and auditable because each decision can be linked to recorded evidence excerpts (Viola 2026b).

Table 1 Worked example aligned with the Triangulated Categorization Framework

Column	Value
Proposition ID	PL 7203/2025
Status	In progress / presented
Year	2025
Text (Summary +	Adds Article 473-A to the Consolidation of Labour Laws (CLT) to

Column	Value
Indexing terms)	establish temporary job stability and priority for rehire for female employees who are victims of domestic and family violence. Indexing terms: Amendment; Consolidation of Labour Laws (CLT); granting; woman; victim; domestic violence; job stability.
Main Class	PROT – Protection
Subclass	PROT.04 - Economic, property-related protection and autonomy
Scope note	Covers legislative measures that provide economic safeguards, employment protection, income security, or material autonomy mechanisms for women subjected to violence. These measures reduce structural vulnerability and support long-term independence.
Inclusion triggers	Job stability guarantees; employment protection; income continuity; labor rights tied to victim status; economic safeguards linked to violence protection.
Exclusion triggers	General labor regulation unrelated to violence; employer administrative procedures without victim-protection intent; generic employment policy.
Typical examples	Job stability for victims; paid leave for women subjected to violence; employment reintegration guarantees; income protection programs.

Table 1 gives a worked example showing how scope-note governance and inclusion/exclusion triggers transform opaque institutional descriptors into auditable classifications with recorded evidence.

The example illustrates the methodological role of categorization in KO. The proposition is not classified only because it contains the words "woman," "victim" or "domestic violence". It is assigned to Protection, and more specifically to economic, property-related protection and autonomy, because the legal mechanism establishes employment safeguards and rehire priority for women subjected to domestic and family violence. The scope note prevents confusion with generic labor regulation and makes the intervention mechanism explicit (Table 1).

Epistemologically, the framework makes it explicit that classification encodes a position about what counts as an intervention mechanism and, consequently, about what can become comparable and measurable over time. Applied to legislative monitoring, it improves representational adequacy in a domain where propositions frequently combine different instruments. The approach also makes punitive drift measurable while keeping preventive and protective infrastructures visible, reducing the risk that standardized penal vocabulary will dominate monitoring outputs.

The use of a limited FAIR-informed approach strengthens the framework as research infrastructure by associating persistent identifiers, documented provenance, machine-actionable representations, and rule sets that support auditability, replication, and longitudinal reuse in observatories and comparative monitoring (Wilkinson *et al*. 2016). In this sense, KO contributes to a more sustainable information future for women by transforming dispersed legislative production into cumulative and traceable evidence. This evidence can support long-term policy learning, strengthen preventive and protective infrastructures, reveal structural gaps in gender-responsive governance, and contribute to the achievement of SDG 5 of the 2030 Agenda (United Nations 2015).

5.0 Conclusion

This study developed a Triangulated Categorization Framework to support the classification and comparative monitoring of Brazilian legislative propositions related to violence against women. Anchored in the Maria da Penha Law domain and organized by the Prevention-Protection-Punishment triad, the framework offers a stable semantic backbone that is intelligible within the Brazilian policy context while remaining adaptable as a KO framework for legislative analysis. The main contribution is methodological, based on representation and knowledge organization. Rather than treating classification as an ad hoc tagging exercise, the study uses legislative metadata as structured evidence to build subclasses, define their conceptual boundaries, and make the categorization process transparent, justifiable, and reproducible. Official summaries and institutional indexing terms were mobilized as the most stable descriptive layer available at scale and then stabilized through normalization, scope notes, inclusion and exclusion triggers, and explicit assignment rules. This responds to a recurring monitoring failure in legislative environments: interventions with distinct consequences may appear equivalent under shallow representation, while substantively similar propositions become difficult to retrieve and compare because of terminological drift and uneven indexing conventions.

Critically, the framework makes visible the representational politics of legislative information systems. Classification is not neutral infrastructure. Institutional vocabularies encode priorities, segment meaning, and can make mechanisms socially illegible. Scope notes are therefore not mere definitions; they are the core critical instrument of the method. They translate opaque, state-centered descriptors into governable interpretive boundaries, constrain drift, and turn classifications into auditable claims. At the same time, the study acknowledges its limits. Reliance on institutional legislative metadata ensures scale and reproducibility, but it also inherits institutional viewpoints and silences. Treating metadata as evidence rather than authority positions the framework as baseline infrastructure for critique and cumulative refinement, not as a final map of the domain.

In applied terms, the Triangulated Categorization Framework provides an analytical interface for policy verification. It supports reading the legislative agenda through intervention logics, preventive infrastructures, protective regimes, and punitive pathways, while preserving the fact that propositions often combine mechanisms. Multiple assignments are not a convenience but an organizational and representational necessity

for avoiding false exclusivity and tracing hybrid policy designs. In alignment with the 2030 Agenda, especially SDG 5, this contribution positions KO as part of sustainability-oriented governance. By making legislative interventions findable, comparable, and reusable over time, it strengthens the evidence base for tracking commitments, identifying gaps, and supporting cumulative and transparent policy learning.

The framework can also inform contexts beyond Brazil. Its international applicability should be understood as methodological portability, not as the export of a fixed Brazilian taxonomy. In other countries or regions, the Prevention-Protection-Punishment triad may be retained, adapted, or replaced according to domestic legal frameworks, regional human rights instruments, and local policy architectures. Subclasses should be induced from local legislative metadata, translated into multilingual labels when necessary, and validated with legal experts, KO specialists, and, whenever possible, communities affected by gender-based violence. This makes the approach useful for comparative monitoring while avoiding the imposition of a single universal vocabulary.

Future research can extend this agenda by adding intersectional and territorial qualifier facets, such as race, disability, age, migration, and Indigenous and *quilombola* contexts, to measure erasures and improve harm-sensitive monitoring. The framework can also be tested in adjacent domains of violence, such as digital, political, obstetric, and institutional or state violence, to examine border management, portability, and interoperability. Further developments may include KO mappings, multilingual labels, SKOS representation, and integration with observatories and linked data environments. Overall, the results function not only as a classification scheme but also as reusable monitoring infrastructure that improves comparability, auditability, and accountability in a domain where visibility is a form of protection.

Declaration of AI use: The authors used NotebookLM (Google) to support the exploratory grouping of semantic patterns within the main classes of the categorization framework and ChatGPT (OpenAI) to assist with terminological refinement and language revision. These tools were used solely as auxiliary resources; they did not autonomously define categories, assign final classifications, collect data, or produce unverified analytical conclusions. All subclass definitions, scope limits, inclusion and exclusion triggers, and interpretive decisions were reviewed and validated by the authors. The authors take full responsibility for the content, accuracy, and integrity of this article.

References

Azevedo, Lays Silva de, Natan Nascimento de Oliveira, and Rosana Rosseto de Oliveira. 2025. “Reports, Excess Risk and Spatial Distribution of Domestic Violence against Women, Brazil, 2015–2020.” Epidemiologia e Serviços de Saúde 34: e20240277. https://doi.org/10.1590/S2237-96222025v34e20240277.en.

Barité, Mario. 2025. "Knowledge Organization and Terminology: Intersections, Interlocutions and Projections." Informatio 30, no. 1: e209. https://doi.org/10.35643/Info.30.1.14.

Brazil. 2006. Lei nº 11.340, de 7 de agosto de 2006 (Lei Maria da Penha). Brasília: Presidência da República.

Câmara dos Deputados. n.d. "Sistema de Informação Legislativa." Accessed January 30, 2026. https://www.camara.leg.br.

Dahlberg, Ingetraut. 2006. "Knowledge Organization: A New Science?" Knowledge Organization 33: 11–19. https://www.nomos-elibrary.de/10.5771/0943-7444-2006-1-11.pdf.

Fórum Brasileiro de Segurança Pública. 2025. 19º Anuário Brasileiro de Segurança Pública: 2025. São Paulo: Fórum Brasileiro de Segurança Pública. https://publicacoes.forumseguranca.org.br/handle/123456789/279.

Google. 2026. NotebookLM [AI-assisted research and note-taking tool]. https://notebooklm.google.com/.

Hjørland, Birger. 2008. "What Is Knowledge Organization (KO)?" Knowledge Organization 35: 86–101.

Lancaster, F. W. 2004. Indexação e resumos: teoria e prática. 2nd ed., rev. and updated. Brasília, DF: Briquet de Lemos/Livros.

Novellino, Maria Salet Ferreira. 2002. "Information Sources for a Diverse Audience: The Case of HIV/AIDS." In Information Sources in Women's Studies and Feminism, edited by Hope A. Olson, 117–127. München: K. G. Saur.

Oliveira, M. R., A. P. Madeiro, F. F. Nascimento, J. X. Andrade, M. T. P. Rodrigues, and M. D. M. Mascarenhas. 2024. "Trend and Spatial Pattern of Intimate Partner Rape Notifications against Women in Northeast Brazil (2013–2022)." Revista Brasileira de Epidemiologia 27: e240030. https://doi.org/10.1590/1980-549720240030.

Olson, Hope A. 1998. "Education for Cataloging Is/As Women's Studies." The Serials Librarian 35, nos. 1–2: 153–166.

Olson, Hope A. 2002. "If It's There, Can You Find It? Bibliographic Control of Women's Studies." In Information Sources in Women's Studies and Feminism, edited by Hope A. Olson, 100–116. München: K. G. Saur.

Olson, Hope A. 2007. "How We Construct Subjects: A Feminist Analysis." Library Trends 56: 509–541.

OpenAI. 2026. ChatGPT [large language model]. https://chat.openai.com/.

Ranganathan, S. R. 1951. Classification and Communication. Delhi, India: University of Delhi.

Smith, Edward E., and Douglas L. Medin. 1981. Categories and Concepts. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty. 2010. “Can the Subaltern Speak?” In Can the Subaltern Speak? Reflections on the History of an Idea, edited by Rosalind C. Morris, 21–78. New York: Columbia University Press.

United Nations. 2015. Transforming Our World: The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. General Assembly Resolution A/RES/70/1. https://www.un.org/en/development/desa/population/migration/generalassembly/docs/globalcompact/A_RES_70_1_E.pdf.

Vasconcelos, Nádia Machado de, Fabiana Martins Dias de Andrade, Crizian Saar Gomes, Isabella Vitral Pinto, and Deborah Carvalho Malta. 2021. “Prevalence and Factors Associated with Intimate Partner Violence against Adult Women in Brazil: National Survey of Health, 2019.” Revista Brasileira de Epidemiologia 24, suppl. 2: e210020. https://doi.org/10.1590/1980-549720210020.supl.2.

Viola, Carla Maria Martellote. 2026a. “Legislative Information of the Violence against Women Propositions.” Zenodo, May 11, 2026. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.20128335.

Viola, Carla Maria Martellote. 2026b. “Rule Set and Categorized Dataset for the Triangulated Categorization Framework on Legislative Responses to Violence Against Women in Brazil.” Zenodo, May 11, 2026. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.20128581.

Viola, Carla Maria Martellote, and Bruna Nascimento Rodrigues da Silva. 2024. “Classificação das informações legislativas sobre a violência contra as mulheres: organização do conhecimento e representação com vista à Agenda 2030.” In Anais do XXIV Encontro Nacional de Pesquisa e Pós-Graduação em Ciência da Informação (XXIV ENANCIB). Vitória, Brazil.

Wilkinson, Mark D., Michel Dumontier, IJsbrand Jan Aalbersberg, Gabrielle Appleton, Myles Axton, Arie Baak, Niklas Blomberg, et al. 2016. “The FAIR Guiding Principles for Scientific Data Management and Stewardship.” Scientific Data 3: 160018. https://doi.org/10.1038/sdata.2016.18.

Zhang, Kailun, Mingyin Wang, Xiaoyue Cong, Fang Huang, Hongfa Xue, Lei Li, and Zhiqiao Gao. 2014. “Personal Attributes Extraction Based on the Combination of Trigger Words, Dictionary and Rules.” In Proceedings of the Third CIPS-SIGHAN Joint Conference on Chinese Language Processing, edited by Le Sun, Chengqing Zong, Min Zhang, and Gina-Anne Levow, 114–119. Wuhan, China: Association for Computational Linguistics.