PASK 2025-2026 Review

Topic #2: Bidirectional and Unidirectional Intimate Partner Violence

Alexandra Lysova, Kenzie Hanson, & Jennifer Mackay

Full article available in *Partner Abuse*, Volume 16, Issue 1, 2025

The question of whether intimate partner violence (IPV) is primarily unidirectional (typically conceptualized as male-perpetrated violence against women) or bidirectional (involving both partners as perpetrators and victims) has remained one of the most persistent and consequential debates in criminology and related disciplines. Historically, the field was dominated by the gender paradigm, which emphasized male violence and female victimization. However, large-scale survey research beginning in the 1970s introduced the concept of gender symmetry, suggesting that both men and women may engage in and experience IPV. This tension between competing paradigms has shaped research, policy, and intervention strategies for decades. The foundational systematic review by Langhinrichsen-Rohling et al. (2012) played a critical role in this debate by demonstrating that bidirectional violence was the most common pattern of IPV, accounting for approximately 57.5% of violent relationships across diverse samples. This finding challenged assumptions of unidirectional male violence and emphasized the importance of examining IPV as a relational and interactive phenomenon.

The present stud builds directly on this earlier work by updating the evidence base with 64 empirical studies published between 2012 and 2022. The primary purpose of this review, published in the journal *Partner Abuse*, is to reassess the prevalence of bidirectional and unidirectional IPV and to determine whether patterns identified in the 2012 review persist over time. In addition, the study examines how key methodological and contextual factors – such as sample type, measurement instrument, time frame, and country – shape the observed patterns of IPV.

Methodologically, the study employs a comprehensive review approach, closely mirroring the earlier review to ensure comparability. Studies were selected based on strict inclusion criteria, including the requirement to report empirical prevalence data on physical IPV within heterosexual relationships and to include participants over the age of 13. The review focuses on industrialized, English-speaking countries (primarily the United States, Canada, the United Kingdom, Australia, and New Zealand), while also incorporating a small number of comparable international studies. The search process was extensive, initially identifying over 200,000 articles across multiple databases. After removing duplicates and applying eligibility criteria, 64 studies were retained, yielding 72 distinct prevalence estimates. This represents a notable increase in the number of studies directly

examining bidirectionality compared to the 2012 review, which included 48 empirical studies over a longer time span. The growing number of studies reflects increased scholarly attention to the complexity of IPV dynamics. Below is a brief summary of the published article and a guide to the accompanying online tables, organized according to the type of sample, including general population (table 1), community (table 2), school/university (table 3), and clinical (table 4.)

The findings of the review provide strong and consistent support for the central conclusion of the 2012 study: bidirectional violence remains the dominant pattern of IPV. Across all samples, the average proportion of IPV that was bidirectional is 52.8%, only slightly lower than the 57.5% reported in the earlier review. Importantly, this consistency across time reinforces the robustness of the bidirectionality finding and suggests that it is not an artifact of specific samples or measurement approaches.

Bidirectional violence is prevalent across all sample types. It accounts for approximately 50.9% of IPV in large population samples and 49% in community samples, indicating that even in broadly representative populations, about half of violent relationships involve mutual violence. Even higher rates are observed in university (59.9%) and clinical samples (59.4%), suggesting that bidirectional violence may be particularly common in higher-risk or more intensively studied populations. Although rates are somewhat lower among adolescents (44.8%), bidirectional violence still represents the most common pattern.

A key strength of the current review is its examination of methodological influences. The findings indicate that bidirectional IPV rates are remarkably stable across different study characteristics. There are no statistically significant differences in bidirectional rates based on sample type, measurement time frame (past year vs. lifetime), or measurement instrument. This suggests that the prevalence of bidirectional violence is not driven by methodological artifacts but reflects a consistent empirical pattern.

In contrast, the analysis of unidirectional violence reveals important asymmetries. Although unidirectional IPV accounts for 47.2% of violent relationships, it is not evenly distributed by gender. Across all samples, female-to-male (F-to-M) unidirectional violence (31.4%) is nearly twice as common as male-to-female (M-to-F) unidirectional violence (16.9%). This pattern is consistent with the 2012 review and persists across all sample types, including large population, community, and adolescent samples. The largest disparity is observed among adolescents, where F-to-M violence is 2.5 times more common than M-to-F violence. These findings are particularly important because they challenge traditional assumptions about the directionality of IPV. While male-perpetrated violence

remains a critical concern, the evidence suggests that women's use of violence and men's victimization are substantial and persistent components of IPV dynamics.

Another major contribution of the study is the analysis of reporting concordance between partners. Contrary to earlier concerns about low agreement between male and female reports, the current review finds remarkably high levels of agreement in reporting both bidirectional and unidirectional violence. This consistency holds across different study characteristics, including measurement tools and time frames, suggesting that the observed patterns are both valid and reliable.

The study also situates its findings within broader theoretical frameworks, including Johnson's typology of IPV, which distinguishes between different forms of violence such as intimate terrorism, violent resistance, mutual violent control, and situational couple violence. Bidirectional violence may emerge from multiple pathways, including escalation, retaliation, and self-defense, highlighting the complexity of IPV as a relational process rather than a simple one-directional behavior. Importantly, the review also engages with research showing that bidirectional violence is often more severe and more likely to result in injury than unidirectional violence. This underscores the importance of not dismissing bidirectional IPV as less serious or less harmful. At the same time, public perceptions tend to minimize the severity of female-perpetrated violence and assign greater responsibility to victims in bidirectional cases, which may distort both policy and intervention responses. Overall, the findings strongly support the conclusion that IPV is a complex, interactive, and often reciprocal phenomenon, requiring theoretical and empirical frameworks that move beyond simplistic unidirectional models.

Implications for Intervention and Policy

The findings of this review have significant implications for intervention and policy. First, the high prevalence of bidirectional violence suggests that interventions focusing exclusively on male perpetrators and female victims may be insufficient. Instead, there is a need for more comprehensive and inclusive approaches that address the behaviors of both partners and the dynamics of interaction within relationships.

Second, the persistence of higher rates of female-perpetrated unidirectional violence highlights the importance of recognizing and addressing women's use of violence and men's victimization. This has direct implications for service provision, as support systems for male victims remain underdeveloped in many contexts. Third, the evidence that bidirectional violence is often more severe underscores the need for early identification and intervention in mutually violent relationships. Programs that address conflict escalation, communication, and emotional regulation may be particularly important in preventing the progression of violence. Finally, the findings suggest that

policy frameworks should move beyond ideologically driven models and instead adopt evidence-based approaches that reflect the complexity and diversity of IPV patterns.

Recommendations for Future Research

Future research should continue to refine the conceptualization and measurement of bidirectional IPV. Greater standardization in definitions and measurement tools is needed to improve comparability across studies and over time. There is also a need for more research on the context, motivations, and dynamics of bidirectional violence. Understanding whether violence is driven by self-defense, retaliation, control, or situational conflict is critical for developing effective interventions. Additionally, future studies should expand beyond heterosexual relationships to include LGBTQ+ populations, as well as more diverse cultural and social contexts. Longitudinal research designs would also be valuable in examining how bidirectional violence develops and evolves over time. Finally, research should continue to examine reporting patterns and potential biases, while building on the current finding of high concordance between partners to strengthen confidence in IPV data.

About the Authors

Alexandra Lysova, Ph.D., is a Professor in the School of Criminology at Simon Fraser University in Vancouver/Burnaby, Canada. Dr. Lysova earned her undergraduate degree in Psychology from Far Eastern State University in Vladivostok, Russia, her Doctor of Sciences degree in Sociology from the Russian Academy of Sciences in Saint Petersburg, and her Ph.D. in Criminology from the University of Toronto. Dr. Lysova has studied intimate partner violence and homicide, including violence against women and children, for over 20 years in Russia and currently in Canada. Recently, she has focused on men's experiences of intimate partner violence, including victimization, help-seeking behavior, and issues involving children. She draws on the results of international focus groups, the Canadian General Social Survey on Victimization, and the Homicide Survey. Dr. Lysova has also been serving as a member of the Working Groups for Statistics Canada, focusing on gender-based violence and homicide. Her research has been supported by prestigious foundations, including the Fulbright Foundation at New York University (2003-2004), the Alexander Humboldt Foundation at Max Planck Institute (2006-2007), the Carnegie Foundation at the University of New Hampshire (2009), and the Trudeau Foundation at the University of Toronto (2011-2015), as well as the U.S. Library of Congress (2003) and Max Planck Institute in Freiburg, Germany (2013, 2018). Dr. Lysova is the author or co-author of over 70 articles, book chapters, and books in Russian and English and has been the principal investigator on several major grants, focusing on partner violence victimization and spousal homicide. She regularly presents at international conferences and is often featured in the media. In 2022, Lysova

was awarded the Sterling Prize in Support of Controversy for her research on men's experiences of victimization. Contact: alysova@sfu.ca

Kenzie Hanson, MA, works as a Research Analyst for the British Columbia Corrections branch's research unit in Vancouver, Canada. She holds both a Bachelor of Arts (Honours) and a Master of Arts in Criminology from Simon Fraser University, where her research was supported by a grant from the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council (SSHRC). Though early in her career, Kenzie has published several articles on topics including intimate partner violence, homicide, and male victimization, presented at numerous conferences, and serves as a peer reviewer for top-ranked journals. Her research interests encompass help-seeking behaviors in intimate partner violence, masculinities, portrayals of intimate partner violence, policy and law, and male victimization. Kenzie plans to pursue her Ph.D. in the coming years while continuing her academic projects.
Contact: kenzieh@sfu.ca or kenzieh54@gmail.com

Jennifer MacKay, Ph.D. is a Principal Lecturer in Psychology at Nottingham Trent University, UK, and a Chartered Psychologist. Jenny completed her PhD at Coventry University, exploring the treatment needs of both women and men who perpetrate intimate partner violence, and continues to research intimate partner violence perpetration. She studies the evidence base of pathways to perpetration and how these might inform interventions. She is particularly interested in how women come to perpetrate IPV and the psychological mechanisms that underpin this, and also interested in how trauma experiences link with intimate partner violence perpetration. Jenny leads knowledge exchange projects with practitioners and professionals in the domestic violence and forensic mental health sectors, including working with the police, His Majesty's Prison and Probation Service, and with charitable organisations. Prior to working in academia, Jenny spent over 15 years in predominantly practitioner roles, working with vulnerable clients in a range of settings, both forensic and non-forensic. She has delivered substance misuse work, offending behaviour programmes and psychological one-to-one work in prisons with adults and young adults. She has worked in a Secure Children's Home with 10–17-year-olds who have offended and also worked as a Behavioural Clinical Specialist in the NHS with adults with learning disabilities and challenging behaviour. Jenny has also worked for the Probation Service, as a Project and Policy officer for an adult education research charity and has delivered workshops for expectant and new parents. Jenny is currently a Trustee for YMCA Leicestershire. Contact: jennifer.mackay@ntu.ac.uk

2025-2026 Review: Bidirectional and Unidirectional Intimate Partner Violence.
NOTE: References organized according to the most recent year published. Those published the same year are arranged alphabetically by author last name.

Table 1: The rate of bidirectional versus unidirectional violence in large population samples (n=14)

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Characteristics (large population samples)	Method/ Design	Results
Fanslow, J. L., Hashemi, L., Gulliver, P., & McIntosh, T. (2022). Gender patterns in the use of physical violence against a violent partner: results of a cross-sectional population-based study in New Zealand. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 37*(23-24), NP22890-NP22920.	*N*=2,887 (1,423 men and 1,464 women).	Data from a large, population-based sample of New Zealand adults was used to identify ever-partnered respondents who had experienced physical IPV (n = 398 women, and n = 389 men).	WHO Multi-Country Study on Violence Against Women (VAW) questionnaire was adapted to include men. For bidirectionality: "During the times that you were hit, did you ever fight back physically?"	**Bidirectional IPV within the IPV sample**: 53.4% of women and 22.3% of men reported fighting back at least once.
Courtain, A., & Glowacz, F. (2021). Exploration of dating violence and related attitudes among adolescents and emerging adults. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 36*(5-6), NP2975-NP2998.	*N*=3,496 in six European cities.	Adult men and women (n = 3,496), randomly selected from the general population of six European cities. non-institutionalized adult men and women (aged 18–65), national citizens or documented migrants, sampled from the general population of six cities	CTS was used to measure IPV over a lifetime, distinguishing it from Costa et al.'s (2015) study, which measured IPV within the past year.	**Bidirectional IPV**: Reported by males: 63%, Reported by females: 58.6% Calculated average: 60.8%. **M-to-F Unidirectional IPV**: Reported by males: 18.4%; Reported by females: 20.7% Calculated average: 19.6%

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Characteristics (large population samples)	Method/ Design	Results
		(Athens—Greece, Budapest—Hungary, London—United Kingdom, Östersund—Sweden, Porto—Portugal and Stuttgart—Germany)		**F-to-M Unidirectional IPV**: Reported by males: 18.6%, Reported by females: 20.7%, Calculated average: 19.7%.
Graham, K., Bernards, S., Laslett, A. M., Gmel, G., Kuntsche, S., Wilsnack, S., ... & Wells, S. (2021). Children, parental alcohol consumption, and intimate partner violence: A multicountry analysis by perpetration versus victimization and sex. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 36*(11-12), 5608-5634.	15 surveys of 13,716 men and 17,832 women in 14 countries. We used only the data for Canada: 11,437 people; NZ: 1,440 people ; UK: 1,592 people.	Part of the multinational GENACIS project (Gender, Alcohol, and Culture: An International Study) involving more than 40 countries.	Participants were asked to describe the most severe act of physical aggression by a partner toward the participant in the past 2 years. Responses were open-ended and later classified by the research team as no P-IPV, victim only (Vic-Only), perpetrator only (Perp-Only), or bidirectional (Bi-Dir)	**Bidirectional IPV w/n IPV sample**: In Canada, reported by males: 28%; Reported by females: 25.7%; Calculated average: 26.9% In New Zealand, reported by males: 47.9%; Reported by females: 40%; Calculated average: 43.9% In the UK, reported by males: 53.9%, Reported by females: 45.7%, Calculated average: 49.8%. **M-to-F Unidirectional IPV w/n IPV sample**: In Canada, Reported by males: 12.1%; Reported by females: 35.9%; Calculated average: 24% In New Zealand, reported by males: 16.5%, reported by females: Women: 16.3%; Calculated average: 16.4% In the UK, reported by males: 11.2%; Reported by females: 19.7%, Calculated average: 15.5% **F-to-M Unidirectional IPV w/n IPV sample**:

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Characteristics (large population samples)	Method/ Design	Results
				In Canada, reported by males: 59.9%; Reported by females: 38.4%; Calculated average: 49.2% In New Zealand, reported by males: 35.5%; Reported by females: 43.8%; Calculated average: 39.7% In the UK, reported by males: 34.9%; Reported by females: 34.6% Calculated average: 34.8%
Hines, D. A., Straus, M. A., & Douglas, E. M. (2020). Using dyadic concordance types to understand frequency of intimate partner violence. *Partner Abuse, 11*(1), 76-97.	A population-based sample of 1,601 men in the US.	Most of the men were White (76.5%), and their female partners were White (75.5%). The men's average age was 41.8 years (SD=11.4).	The CTS2 was used to measure the extent to which the men in the study perpetrated and sustained psychological, physical, and sexual aggression in their relationships.	**Bidirectional IPV**: reported by men: 54.8% **M-to-F Unidirectional IPV** as reported by men: 10.4% **F-to-M Unidirectional IPV** - as reported by men: 34.8%
Hines D. A., Douglas E. M. (2018). Influence of intimate terrorism, situational couple violence, and mutual violent control on male victims. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 19*(4), 612–623.	*N*=1,583 men from the US population	US. Combined sample of men from help-seeking sample (n=589) and a population-based sample of men (n=1,583).	CTS2, past year	**Bidirectional IPV**: 55.9% **M-to-F Unidirectional IPV**: 10.6% **F-to-M Unidirectional IPV**: 33.5%
Spencer, R. A., Renner, L. M., &	*N*=10,655; Data from	On average, the sample was 21.8 years old and	CTS2, past year	Among Non-Hispanic White, Non-Hispanic Black, and Hispanic males 194 were found

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Characteristics (large population samples)	Method/ Design	Results
Clark, C. J. (2016). Patterns of dating violence perpetration and victimization in US young adult males and females. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 31*(15), 2576-2597.	non-Hispanic White, non-Hispanic Black, and Hispanic participants in Wave 3 of the National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent to Adult Health.	50.4% female (n = 5,780). Of the 10,655 participants in the study, 72.3% (n = 6,484) were White, 15.6% (n = 2,335) were Black, and 12.1% (n = 1,846) were Hispanic. There were 1,337 Black females; 3,498 White females, and 4,885 White, Black and Hispanic Males.		to be moderate victims (17.2% F-to-M Unidirectional IPV) and 933 were involved in severe bidirectional IPV. Among Non-Hispanic White women, 667 were found to be moderate perpetrators, 124 severe victims, and 416 engaged in severe bidirectional IPV (total n=1,207). Among non-Hispanic Black women, 275 experienced severe and moderate bidirectional IPV, and 321 were moderate perpetrators (total n=596). **Bidirectional IPV:** White women reported: 34.5%; Black women reported: 46.1%; Males reported 82.8%. **M-to-F Unidirectional**: White women reported: 10.3%. **F-to-M Unidirectional**: White women reported: 55.3%; Black women reported: 53.9%; Males reported 17.2%.
Costa, D., Hatzidimitriadou, E., Ioannidi-Kapolou, E., Lindert, J., Soares, J., Sundin, Ö., ... & Barros, H. (2015). Intimate partner violence and health-related quality of life	*N*=3,496 in six European cities.	Adult men and women (n = 3,496), randomly selected from the general population of six European cities. non-institutionalized adult men and women (aged 18–65), national citizens or documented migrants,	CTS to measure IPV in the past year.	**Bidirectional IPV**: Reported by males: 60.4%; Reported by females: 56.6% Calculated average: 58.5% **M-to-F Unidirectional IPV**: Reported by males: 19.1%; Reported by females: 19.6% Calculated average:

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Characteristics (large population samples)	Method/ Design	Results
in European men and women: findings from the DOVE study. *Quality of Life Research, 24*, 463-471.		sampled from the general population of six cities (Athens—Greece, Budapest—Hungary, London—United Kingdom, Östersund—Sweden, Porto—Portugal and Stuttgart—Germany)		19.4% **F-to-M Unidirectional IPV**: Reported by males: 20.5%, Reported by females: 23.8%, Calculated average: 22.2%.
McMahon, K., Hoertel, N., Wall, M. M., Okuda, M., Limosin, F., & Blanco, C. (2015). Childhood maltreatment and risk of intimate partner violence: A national study. *Journal of Psychiatric Research, 69,* 42-49.	*N*=5,778	Data were drawn from a nationally representative survey of 34,653 US adults, the 2004-2005 National Epidemiologic Survey on Alcohol and Related Conditions (NESARC).	CTS2, past year, physical IPV	Prevalence of IPV victimization, perpetration and reciprocal violence in women were respectively 1.6%, 3.1% and 3.9% = 8.6%. In men, these prevalence rates were respectively 2.7%, 1.1% and 3.1%= 6.9%. **Bidirectional IPV**: - as reported by men: 44.9%; by women: 45.3% - calculated average: 45.1% **M-to-F Unidirectional IPV**: -as reported by men: 15.9%; by women: 18.6% - calculated average: 17.3% **F-to-M Unidirectional IPV**: -as reported by men: 39.1%; by women: 36% - calculated average: 37.6% .
Renner, L. M., Schwab Reese, L. M., Peek-Asa, C., & Ramirez, M. (2015). Reporting patterns of	*N*=1,034 individuals (517 couples)	Population-based, Iowa, US; Prospective cohort study. Random selection of households as part of	CTS2- based, past 12 months	Bidirectional physical IPV occurred in 15 couples, M-to-F in 15 couples and at least one partner reported F-to-M in 24 coupes. Total: 53 couples that experienced IPV.

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Characteristics (large population samples)	Method/ Design	Results
unidirectional and bidirectional verbal aggression and physical violence among rural couples. *Journal of Family Violence, 30*, 1069-1078.		'Keokuk County Rural Health Study; Round 2, 18+, 98% white. Sexuality is not reported.		**Bidirectional IPV**: 27.8% **M-to-F Unidirectional IPV**: 27.8% **F-to-M Unidirectional IPV**: 44.4%
Afifi T. O., Henriksen C. A., Asmundson G. J. G., Sareen J. (2012). Victimization and perpetration of intimate partner violence and substance use disorders in a nationally representative sample. *Journal of Nervous & Mental Disease, 200*(8), 684–691.	*N*= 25,778 individuals (11,850 men and 13,928 women)	Community. US. The second wave of the National Epidemiologic Survey on Alcohol and Related Conditions (NESARC) was conducted from 2004 to 2005 in the United States. US. Individuals who were married, dating, or involved in a romantic relationship in the past 12 months were included.	CTS2, past year	**Bidirectional IPV** - as reported by men: 44.9%, - by women: 57.4% - calculated average: 44.9% **M-to-F Unidirectional IPV**: - as reported by men: 15.9%; by women: 23.5% - calculated average: 19.7% **F-to-M Unidirectional IPV**: As reported by men: 39.1%; by women: 19.1% - calculated average: 29.1%
Chartier, & Caetano, R. (2012). Intimate Partner Violence and Alcohol Problems in Interethnic and Intraethnic Couples. *Journal of Interpersonal*	Total sample: 1,556. Interethnic couples (n = 116) included partners from different	Data were from a national survey of couples 18 years of age and older from the 48 contiguous states. Adult (18+) intraethnic and interethnic couples. sample taken from National Couples Alcohol	CTS, in the past year.	**Bidirectional IPV**: Interethnic couples reported: 71.8%; White couples reported: 44.6%; Black couples reported: 61.1%; Hispanic couples reported: 45.2%. **M-to-F Unidirectional IPV**: Interethnic couples reported: 8.75%;

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Characteristics (large population samples)	Method/ Design	Results
Violence, 27(9), 1780–1801. https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260511430392	ethnic backgrounds, including Black–White, Hispanic–White, and Black–Hispanic couples.	Survey. Black and Hispanic couples were oversampled.		White couples reported: 17%, Black couples reported: 8.1%, Hispanic couple reported: 19.4%. **F-to-M Unidirectional IPV**: Interethnic couples reported: 19.5%, White couples reported: 38.5%, Black couples reported: 30.8% , Hispanic couples reported: 35.5%.
Graham, K., Bernards, S., Flynn, A., Tremblay, P. F., & Wells, S. (2012). Does the relationship between depression and intimate partner aggression vary by gender, victim–perpetrator role, and aggression severity?. *Violence and Victims, 27*(5), 730-743.	*N*= 14,063 (6,009 men and 8054 women)	Large population study in Canada. Gender Alcohol and Culture: An International Study Canada survey; men and women, aged 18-76 between 2004-2005.	Harris (1992) scale; asked "the most aggressive thing that has ever been done to you" in the past 2 years	**Bidirectional IPV**: Males reported: 28.2%, Females reported: 25.6%, Calculated average: 26.9%. **M-to-F Unidirectional IPV**: Males reported: 59.5%, Females reported: 36%. Calculated average: 47.7%. **F-to-M Unidirectional IPV:** Males reported: 12.3%, Females reported: 38.4%. Calculated average: 25.35%.
Marcus, R. F. (2012). Patterns of intimate partner violence in young adult couples: Nonviolent, unilaterally violent, and mutually violent	*N*=1,294 respondents and their partners. 38% dating, 17% were engaged to	Large -scale study of 1,294 young adults, Add Health partners (AHP) and their non-Add Health partners (NAHP), in dating, engaged, or in marital relationships, who	The romantic pairs were interviewed. The CTS2-based questions were used. Both partners responded to four perpetrated and four	**Bidirectional**: Using both partner reports of IPV perpetration resulted in 25% of couples with a mutual violence (MV) pattern. If to rely on single partner reports, the proportion increased to 55% MV. This is

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Characteristics (large population samples)	Method/ Design	Results
couples. *Violence and Victims, 27*(3), 299-314.	be married, and 45% were married. The average duration of their relationships was 3.9 years (SD = 2.9). 70% of AHP indicated they and their partners were cohabiting.	were participants in Wave III of the National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health	victimization - in the past year - interview questions.	consistent with the manner of reporting in this project. **Unidirectional**: Using both partner reports of IPV perpetration resulted in 75% of couples with a unidirectional violence (UV) pattern. If to rely on single partner reports alone, the proportion UV increased to 45%.
Charles, D., Whitaker, D. J., Le, B., Swahn, M., & DiClemente, R. J. (2011). Differences between perpetrators of bidirectional and unidirectional physical intimate partner violence. *Partner Abuse, 2*(3), 344-364.	*N*= 14,322 Wave III respondents. Of them, 11,537 reported at least one heterosexual relationship; of those, 2,111 (18.3%) reported perpetrating IPV.	Wave III of the National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health (Add Health); Age range - 18-26,	A set of questions designed by the study authors (three questions to study perpetration and reversed are to measure victimization from IPV in the most recent relationships in the past 5 years	Among study participants, 18.3% reported IPV perpetration in their most recent important relationship, and 65.4% of that was bidirectional. **Bidirectional IPV**: Total: 65.4% Reported by males: 78.7% (n=487), Reported by females: 59.9% (n=894). "Only victims" was hidden in non-IPV group. **M-to-F Unidirectional IPV**: 21.3% as reported by males (n=132). **F-to-M Unidirectional IPV**: 40.1% as reported by females (n=598).

Table 2: The rate of bidirectional versus unidirectional violence in community or purposive samples (n=13)

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Characteristics (community samples)	Method/ Design	Results
Dailey, R. M., Hazlett, A. D., & Brass-Rosenfield, C. (2022). The role of psychological and physical aggression in relationship reconciliation. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 37*(23-24), NP22066-NP22091.	*N*=179, including females (n = 113, 63.1%).	A community sample of 179 individuals who recently have experienced a breakup.	Survey was conducted on MTurk, part of a larger, prospective investigation on post-dissolution relationships. The CTS was used to measure IPV in the past year.	**Bidirectional IPV**: 51.4% (n=94)
Pu, D. F., Rodriguez, C. M., & Dimperio, M. D. (2022). Factors distinguishing reciprocal versus nonreciprocal intimate partner violence across time and reporter. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 37*(15-16), NP13654-NP13684.	*N*=354 (including 203 women) first-time parents in the UK	Participants were enrolled in the larger longitudinal "Following First Families" (Triple-F) Study, which tracked at-risk parenting among first-time parents. 203 primiparous women and 151 male partners (86% of fathers available) were recruited in the last trimester of pregnancy.	Reports for Time 1 only	**Bidirectional IPV:** - as reported by men: 55%; -as reported by women: 56.3%, - calculated average: 63.1% **M-to-F Unidirectional IPV**: - as reported by men: 22.5%; -as reported by women: 14.1% - calculated average: 15.4% **F-to-M Unidirectional IPV**: -as reported by men: 22.5%; - as reported by women: 29.6% -calculated average: 21.5%
Mennicke, A. (2019). Expanding and validating a typology of intimate partner violence: Intersections of	*N*=714	The sample was recruited from several locations in Washington, DC, and Boston, MA, including community agencies involved with IPV victims and perpetrators,	CTS2	Excluding those who were marked in the no-IPV category, the distribution of categories of IPV was as follows: - 2.1% Bidirectional Violence, 2.1% Violent-Control, 6.5% Bidirectional

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Characteristics (community samples)	Method/ Design	Results
violence and control within relationships. *Violence against Women, 25*(4), 379-400.		agencies which provided non-IPV services to demographically similar clients, a community college, and public settings (e.g., fast food restaurants). The majority of the sample identified as female (59.9%), Black (50.6%), and earned less than US$20,000 (68.5%). The average age of the sample was 31 years (*SD* = 11.4). The largest percentage of respondents indicated their relationship was between 1 and 5 years old (45.0%). Regarding other races, 23.9% of the sample identified as White, 12.7% as Hispanic, and 12.7% were categorized as Other.		Control, 7.1% Violent Resistance, 10.3% Control Resistance, and 19.7% Mutual Violent Control. - 15.5% Unidirectional Violence, 16.9% Unidirectional Control, 19.9% Intimate Terrorism. **Bidirectional IPV**: 47.8%
Grest, C. V., Lee, J. O., Gilreath, T., & Unger, J. B. (2018). Latent class analysis of intimate partner violence perpetration and victimization among Latino emerging adults. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 47*, 575-585.	*N*=1,069	Latino emerging adults in the US. Adolescents in 9th and 10th grade from seven schools in the Los Angeles. Mean age: 22.7.	Longitudinal design. The CTS were used.	**Bidirectional IPV**: 51.7% (120 out of 232)

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Characteristics (community samples)	Method/ Design	Results
Sader, J., Roy, C., & Guay, S. (2018). Intimate partner violence and psychological distress among young couples: The role of the pattern of violence. *Violence and Victims, 33*(3), 547-562.	*N*=410 individuals (205 couples)	Small community sample: 205 heterosexual couples from the Quebec City and Montreal areas in Quebec, Canada.	CTS2-based	**Bidirectional IPV:** -as reported by men: 57.9%, -as reported by women: 64.9% - calculated average: 61.4% **M-to-F Unidirectional IPV**: -as reported by men: 28.9%, -as reported by women: 5.2% -calculated average: 17.1% **F-to-M Unidirectional IPV**: -as reported by men: 13.2%, -as reported by women: 29.9% - calculated average: 21.5%
Forster, M., Grigsby, T. J., Soto, D. W., Sussman, S. Y., & Unger, J. B. (2017). Perceived discrimination, cultural identity development, and intimate partner violence among a sample of Hispanic young adults. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology, 23*(4), 576.	*N*=1,267	Community sample of Hispanic Young Adults in southern California, U.S. Data from the third wave of Project RED EA, collected in 2013-14, a longitudinal study designed to investigate Acculturation Patterns and substance-use outcomes among Hispanic adolescents in Southern California. The average age of participants was 22 years old, 61% were women, the majority were U.S.-born (88%), and 26% reported that they had either been cohabiting with a partner or married at the time of the survey.	CTS- based survey; measured IPV in the past 12 months.	IPV-victim only: n=88, IPV-perpetrator only: n=94, IPV-bidirectional: n=345 (total = 527). **Bidirectional IPV**: 65.5% **Unidirectional IPV victimization** regardless of gender: 16.7% **Unidirectional IPV perpetration** regardless of gender: 17.8%

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Characteristics (community samples)	Method/ Design	Results
Hautala, D. S., Sittner Hartshorn, K. J., Armenta, B., & Whitbeck, L. (2017). Prevalence and correlates of physical dating violence among North American Indigenous Adolescents. *Youth & Society, 49(*3), 295-317.	*N*=551	A population sample of 551 reservation/reserve residing Indigenous (i.e., American Indian and Canadian First Nations) adolescents in the upper-Midwest of the United States and Canada. Community: Participants were ages 15 to 19 years (M = 17.24, SD = .88), and the sample was approximately evenly split by gender (48.9% male; 51.3% female).	The Safe Dates Physical Violence scales were used to measure IPV in the lifetime.	**Bidirectional IPV**: 49.8% (100/201) The respondents in the total sample reported that 35.5% were the only victims, and 14.9% were the only perpetrators.
Sommer J., Iyican S., Babcock J. (2016). The relation between contempt, anger, and intimate partner violence: A dyadic approach. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 34*(15), 3059–3079.	*N*=516 individuals (or 258 couples)	258 couples in Adolescent to Adult Health (Add Health)	CTS2, past year	Based on composite scores taking into account both men and women's responses, 78.7% of male participants and 81.8% of female participants perpetrated physical aggression (e.g., hitting, shoving, etc.) against their partner. Bidirectional violence was reported in 72.9% of the couples. **Bidirectional IPV**: 72.9%
Ulloa, E. C., & Hammett, J. F. (2016). The effect of gender and perpetrator–victim role on mental health outcomes and risk behaviors associated with intimate partner violence. *Journal of*	*N*=7,187 (2,876 men 4,311 women).	Large National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health (Add Health), US. Wave 3: n=7,187 (2,876 men 4,311 women). Age 18-28. And Wave 4: Age: 25-34. 74% White	CTS2-based, past year	**Bidirectional IPV** - as reported in Wave 3: 53.1% - as reported in Wave 4: 37.3%

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Characteristics (community samples)	Method/ Design	Results
Interpersonal Violence, 31(7), 1184-1207.				
Leonard, K. E., Winters, J. J., Kearns-Bodkin, J. N., Homish, G. G., & Kubiak, A. J. (2014). Dyadic patterns of intimate partner violence in early marriage. *Psychology of Violence, 4*(4), 384.	*N*=634	Participants were 634 couples recruited as part of the Adult Development Study (ADS) in Buffalo, NY. At the time of marriage, husbands had an average age of 28.7 (SD= 6.3) and wives had an average age of 26.7 (SD = 5.8) years. Nearly 60% of the husbands (59.2%) were European American and one third were African American. Similarly, 62% of the wives were European American, and about 32% were African American. Most of the husbands had completed high school (25%) or had college degrees (39%) with only 8% not having a high school diploma. Wives were similar with 6% not graduating high school, 25% with a high school diploma, and 40% with a college degree. About 70% of couples were living together before marriage.	CTS2, the physical violence subscale	The cluster analysis revealed 5 clusters. There are two clusters that are mostly husband to wife aggression (n=51) and two clusters that are mostly wife to husband aggression (n=131). One cluster indicates that both partners are aggressive (n=139). **Bidirectional IPV**: 43.2% **M-to-F Unidirectional IPV:** 15.9% **F-to-M Unidirectional IPV**: 40.8%

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Characteristics (community samples)	Method/ Design	Results
Tillyer M., Wright E. (2013). Intimate partner violence and the victim-offender overlap. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 51*(1), 29–55.	*N*=4,275	Public-use data from the fourth wave of the National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health. Age 24-33; in heterosexual relationships.	CTS2, past year	**Bidirectional IPV**: -as reported by men: 27.7%; by women: 38.8% - calculated average: 33.3% **M-to-F Unidirectional IPV**: -as reported by men: 5.3%, by women: 29.1% - calculated average: 17.3% **F-to-M Unidirectional IPV**: -as reported by men: 67%; by women: 32.1% - calculated average: 49.6%
Cunradi, C. B., Ames, G. M., & Duke, M. (2011). The relationship of alcohol problems to the risk for unidirectional and bidirectional intimate partner violence among a sample of blue-collar couples. *Violence and victims, 26*(2), 147-158.	*N*= 848 blue-color couples, comprising male construction workers with female spouses/partners	A community sample of a large union representing 35,000 construction industry workers in Northern California, 2006-2007.	The CTS was used to measure IPV in the past year.	Most couples (70.4%) reported no past-year physical aggression, and nearly 30% reported some partner physical aggression: 52 couples reported only MFPV (6.1%); 79 couples reported only FMPV (9.3%); and 120 couples reported bidirectional violence (14.2%). **Bidirectional IPV within IPV sample**: 47.9% **M-to-F Unidirectional IPV within IPV sample**: 20.6% **F-to-M Unidirectional IPV withing IPV sample**: 31.4%
Sunday, S., Kline, M., Labruna, V., Pelcovitz, D., Salzinger, S., & Kaplan, S. (2011).	*N*=84	Community sample, longitudinal data, US. Abuse group of 62 individuals matched with control group from same community when	CTS2-based; current or most recent relationship	**Bidirectional IPV**: 15.9%

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Characteristics (community samples)	Method/ Design	Results
The role of adolescent physical abuse in adult intimate partner violence. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 26*(18), 3773-3789.		adolescents White, middle- to lower-middle-class.		

Table 3: The rates of bidirectional versus unidirectional violence as reported in school and university samples (n=16)

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Characteristics (school and university samples)	Method/ Design	Results
De Vries, I., Abeyta, S., Lockwood, S., Cuevas, C. A., & Rothman, E. (2022). A network approach to examining co-occurring victimization and perpetration in dating abuse among a nationally representative sample of US adolescents. *Journal of Adolescent Health, 70*(6), 934-941.	*N*= 807	Cross-sectional study of adolescents ages 11-21 years in the United States. Of those 807, 57.4% (n = 463) identified as female, 41.3% (n = 333) identified as male, and the remaining 1.4% (n = 11) identified as transgender, nonbinary, intersex, gender-queer, or other.	Measure of Adolescent Relationship Harassment and Abuse (MARSHA).	**Bidirectional IPV**: 55.5% (n = 448) reported both victimization and perpetration, including 57.2% (n = 265) of females and 53.8% (n = 179) of males.
Norris, A. L., López, G., & Orchowski, L. M. (2022).	*N*= 1,439 (700 males and 739	Large high school sample of students in Northeastern US, who were in a dating	Three subscales from the Conflicts in Adolescent Dating	Results below are only for physical IPV reported by heterosexual boys and girls.

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Characteristics (school and university samples)	Method/ Design	Results
Directionality of dating violence among high school youth: Rates and correlates by gender and sexual orientation. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 37*(7-8), NP3954-NP3980.	females) who were in heterosexual relationships and reported on experiences of physical IPV.	relationship and reported on their sexual orientation. Of these 54% identified as a girl and 46% as a boy, and reported sexual orientation as follows: 89% heterosexual (n = 1,444), 2% gay/lesbian (n = 39), 8% as bisexual (n = 128), 1% queer (n = 11). The mean age of these 1,622 participants was 15.39 (SD = 0.55).	Relationships Inventory (CADRI) were used, to be filled out based on experiences in the past year. Responses were recorded in terms of frequency on a 4-point Likert Scale.	**Bidirectional IPV**: Male reported: 53.5%, Females reported: 55.6%. **M-to-F Unidirectional IPV**: Males reported: 6%, Females reported: 13.8%. **F-to-M Unidirectional IPV**: Males reported: 40.4%, Females reported: 30.6%.
Segundo, J., Cantos, A. L., Ontiveros, G., & O'Leary, K. D. (2022). Risk factors of female-perpetrated intimate partner violence among Hispanic young adults: attachment style, emotional dysregulation, and negative childhood experiences. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 19*(21), 13850.	*N*=360 US undergraduate female students	Female undergraduate students at Hispanic serving university, 18+	CTS2, past year	**Bidirectional IPV**: 54.2% **M-to-F Unidirectional IPV**: 12.7% **F-to-M Unidirectional IPV**: 33.1%
Messinger, A. M., Sessarego, S. N., Edwards, K. M., &	*N*= 2,687 (in heterosexu	In 25 high schools across three northern New England states, sexual minority (n =		Bidirectionality was only common for verbal IPV (which was bidirectional 42%-46% of the time), whereas all other forms

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Characteristics (school and university samples)	Method/ Design	Results
Banyard, V. L. (2021). Bidirectional IPV among adolescent sexual minorities. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 36*(11-12), NP5643-NP5662.	al relationships)	398) and heterosexual (n = 2,687) high school-aged adolescents aged 13 years to 19 years (where sexual orientation is defined indirectly via sexual attraction) completed a questionnaire as part of a broader evaluation study of a bystander-focused violence prevention curriculum (we utilized baseline data in this article).		of IPV—including, notably, physical IPV—were predominantly (80%-96%) unidirectional. Any IPV=46.2% (among sexual minorities dating couples); Any IPV=43.7% (among heterosexual respondents). **Bidirectional physical IPV**: 7.7% (among sexual minorities), 5.4% (among heterosexual respondents).
Carranza, A. B., Wallis, C. R., Jonnson, M. R., Klonsky, E. D., & Walsh, Z. (2020). Nonsuicidal self-injury and intimate partner violence: directionality of violence and motives for self-injury. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 37*(3-4), 1688-1707.	*N*=1,018 Canadian university students recruited through Sona systems, University of British Columbia research portal.	The mean age of participants was 19.84 (SD = 2.95) years, and they were predominantly female (70%) and heterosexual (95%). Relationship status at time of assessment was comprised of 53% dating, 41% single, 4% common-law, and 2% married.	The CTS was used to measure IPV in the past year.	Prevalence scores classified individuals into four groups: unidirectional perpetration of physical assault n = 59, unidirectional victimization resulted from physical assault n = 33, bidirectional physical assault n = 184, and no physical assault n = 742. Total within the IPV sample: 276. **Bidirectional IPV within IPV sample**: 66.7% **Unidirectional IPV perpetration** (gender is no specified): 21.4% **Unidirectional IPV victimization (**gender is not specified): 12.0%.

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Characteristics (school and university samples)	Method/ Design	Results
Paíno-Quesada, S. G., Aguilera-Jiménez, N., Rodríguez-Franco, L., Rodríguez-Díaz, F. J., & Alameda-Bailén, J. R. (2020). Adolescent conflict and young adult couple relationships: Directionality of violence. *International Journal of Psychological Research, 13*(2), 36-48.	*N*= 984 students aged 15-31, Spain	984 students from the Spanish provinces of Huelva, Seville, and Oviedo: 411 (41.8%) were men and 573 (58.2%) were women; all of them met the condition of having dated someone for at least 1 month. The ages were between 15 and 31 years.	Dating Violence Questionnaire revised (DVQ-R). 20-item instrument collects information on victimization and perpetration, abusive behaviors/situations that can occur in the relationship and indicates frequency Likert scale with five answer options: from 0 (never) to 4 (all of the time). The DVQ-R offers five differentiated forms of dating violence: alienation, humiliation, coercion, physical violence, and sexual violence.	While 20.4% of participants reported no IPV, the highest percentage was observed in bidirectional violence, that is, 65.2% of participants reported themselves as aggressors and victims at the same time in their couple relationships, while 14.30% affirmed that they were only victims or only aggressor. **Bidirectional IPV**: 81.9% **M-to-F Unidirectional IPV**: 10.5% **F-to-M Unidirectional IPV**: 15.4%
Sianko, N., Meçe, M. H., & Abazi-Morina, L. (2020). Family functioning among rural teens and caregivers: interactive influence on teen dating violence. *Family*	*N*=493	Participants were 493 adolescents from a rural southeastern community in the United States. Participants were in Grades 9–12 in public schools. Average age 15.9 years.	CTS2-based, lifetime	**Bidirectional IPV**: 32.8%

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Characteristics (school and university samples)	Method/ Design	Results
Process, 59(3), 1175-1190.				
Paradis, A., Hébert, M., & Fernet, M. (2017). Dyadic dynamics in young couples reporting dating violence: An actor–partner interdependence model. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 32*(1), 130-148.	*N*=78 students (39 couples) from the technical College in Montreal, Canada.	39 young heterosexual couples aged between 15 and 20 years (mean age = 17.8 years); Most respondents reported attending CEGEP (i.e., junior/technical College in Quebec; 69.2%) while 14.1% were not in school at the time of the study.	VIFFA assess the number of times respondents and their current partners have been the victim and/or the perpetrator of 40 specific violent acts, including psychological, sexual, and physical acts of DV.	For 55.2% of the 29 couples reporting DV, the violence perpetrated was self-reported by both partners and could be categorized as bidirectional. **Bidirectional IPV**: 55.2%
Richards T., Tillyer M., Wright E. (2017). Intimate partner violence and the overlap of perpetration and victimization: Considering the influence of physical, sexual, and emotional abuse in childhood. *Child Abuse & Neglect, 67*, 240–248.	*N*=12,379 (5715 males and 6664 females)	A sample of 52 middle schools and 80 high schools in the United States. Wave 4 of the National Longitudinal Study of Adolescents	CTS2, past year	**Bidirectional IPV**: - ss reported by men: 28.3%, by women: 39.5% - calculated average: 33.9% **M-to-F Unidirectional IPV:** - as reported by men: 5.2%; by women: 29.7% - calculated average: 17.5% **F-to-M Unidirectional IPV**: - as reported by males: 66.5%; by women: 30.8% -calculated average: 48.7%
Dixon, K. J., Edwards, K. M., & Gidycz, C. A. (2016).	*N*=887 undergraduate female	Participants were 18.82 (*SD* = 1.02) years old and ranged in age from 18 to 26 years. The	The combinations of dichotomized categories of the	The most common pattern of IPV reported was perpetration only (n = 111; 11.9%),

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Characteristics (school and university samples)	Method/ Design	Results
The association of investment model variables and dyadic patterns of physical partner violence: A study of college women. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 31(*16), 2751-2770.	students in the US	length of participants' relationships ranged from under a month to 8 years, with an average relationship length of 15.43 months (*SD* = 14.59). The majority of participants were in their first (71.3%) or second (18.1%) year of college. Most participants identified as Caucasian (87.4%), 5.0% identified as African American, 3.2% identified as Asian or Pacific Islander, and 1.3% identified as Latino or Hispanic. Approximately three quarters of the participants (71.7%) reported an annual family income greater than US$50,000	CTS2 items of victimization and perpetration were used to code participants into the following groups based on the dyadic pattern of IPV reported: no IPV (0), victim only (1), perpetrator only (2), and both victim and perpetrator (3). Participants who reported no perpetration and no victimization were coded into the no IPV category; during the past relationship.	followed by bidirectional (n = 99; 10.6%), and victimization only (n = 69; 7.4%). **Bidirectional IPV within IPV sample**: 35.5% **M-to-F Unidirectional IPV within IPV sample**: 24.7% **F-to-M Unidirectional IPV within IPV sample**: 39.8%
Taylor, B. G., & Mumford, E. A. (2016). A national descriptive portrait of adolescent relationship abuse: Results from the national survey on teen relationships and intimate violence. *Journal of*	*N*=758 (42% from the total sample of 1,804) - only boys and girls - aged 15-18	Data from the National Survey on Teen Relationships and Intimate Violence (STRiV) for 12- to 18-year-old youth (n = 1,804).	CADRI, past year	**Bidirectional IPV**: - as reported by men: 37%; by women: 65.4% -calculated average: 51.2% **M-to-F Unidirectional IPV**: - as reported by men: 4.4%; by women: 19.2% -calculated average: 11.8% **F-to-M Unidirectional IPV**:

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Characteristics (school and university samples)	Method/ Design	Results
Interpersonal Violence, 31(6), 963-988.				-as reported by men: 58.6%; by women: 15.4% -calculated average: 37%
Kaukinen, C., Buchanan, L., & Gover, A. R. (2015). Child abuse and the experience of violence in college dating relationships: Examining the moderating effect of gender and race. *Journal of Family Violence, 30,* 1079-1092.	*N*=2,541 (60% are female)	The data was drawn from the "Family and Relationship Experiences and Attitudes Among College Students" study. Sixty-eight percent of the participants were Caucasian; 15 % were African American; and the remaining 17 % were Hispanic, Asian, Pacific Islander, American Indian or Alaskan Native, and Other. Respondents were relatively young, and 70 % were less than 20 years old. The majority of students (61 %) lived off-campus, and 36 % were in exclusive relation-ships. Seventy-four percent were raised in two-parent homes, and 29 % had experienced at least one incident of child abuse.	CTS2. The following categories were included in the measure: (a) No violence, (b) Dating violence victim only, (c) Dating violence perpetrator only, and (d) Mutual dating violence (dating violence perpetrator and victim).	**Bidirectional IPV:** -as reported by men: 55.3%; - as reported by women: 58.3% - calculated average: 56.8% **M-to-F Unidirectional IPV**: -as reported by men: 24.7% ; - as reported by women: 6.1% - calculated average: 15.4% **F-to-M Unidirectional IPV**: -as reported by men: 19.9%; - as reported by women: 35.6% - calculated average: 27.8%
Straus, M. A., & Gozjolko, K. L. (2014). "Intimate	*N*=13,877 US and	Part of the International Dating Violence Study (IDVS), (3,886 males and	CTS2, past year	Bidirectional violence consisted of situational couple violence (SCV) and resisting to intimate terrorism IT).

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Characteristics (school and university samples)	Method/ Design	Results
terrorism" and gender differences in injury of dating partners by male and female university students. *Journal of Family Violence, 29,* 51-65.	internation al students	9,991 females) at 68 universities in 32 nations.		Unidirectional consisted of self-perpetrated SCV and self-perpetrated IT. **Bidirectional IPV**: -as reported by men: 75% - as reported by women: 69.5% - calculated average: 72.2% **M-to-F Unidirectional IPV:** -as reported by men: 9.8% -as reported by women: 7.9% - calculated average: 8.9% **F-to-M Unidirectional IPV**: - as reported by men: 15.1% - as reported by women: 22.7% - calculated average: 18.9%
Lamis, D. A., Leenaars, L. S., Jahn, D. R., & Lester, D. (2013). Intimate partner violence: Are perpetrators also victims and are they more likely to experience suicide ideation?. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 28*(16), 3109-3128.	*N*=994 undergradu ate students at a large university who volunteered to participate in the study in return for extra credit	The sample was 69.5% female (30.5% male). The racial breakdown of the sample was 78.2% European American/White, 12.8% African American, 3.9% Other race, 3.8% Asian American, 1.0% Hispanic, and 0.3% Native American. The average age was 19.3 years (*SD* = 1.3) and ages ranged from 18 to 24 years. The majority of the sample was in their freshman (48.2%)	CTS2 (analyzed the physical assault only). For participants who indicated that they were single, these scores were based on their most recent relationship.	**Bidirectional IPV**: 57%

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Characteristics (school and university samples)	Method/ Design	Results
		or sophomore year (28.0%), with 14.8% juniors and 9.1% seniors. A total of 64% of the students reported living on campus. In addition, 58% of the participants reported they were single, whereas 42% reported they were in a relationship.		
Renner, L. M., & Whitney, S. D. (2012). Risk factors for unidirectional and bidirectional intimate partner violence among young adults. *Child Abuse & Neglect, 36*(1), 40-52.	*N*=10,187 US school children	A sample of 80 high schools and 52 middle schools from the US was selected with unequal probability of selection. 10,187 young adults, ages 18-27, from the National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health. The respondents were drawn from Wave 3 and stated they had a romantic relationship during the time of the study.	CTS2-based	**Bidirectional IPV**: -as reported by men: 53.7%, -as reported by women: 54.6% - calculated average: 54.1% **M-to-F Unidirectional IPV**: -as reported by men: 21.1%; - as reported by women: 24.2% - calculated average: 22.7% **F-to-M Unidirectional IPV**: -as reported by men: 25.2%, - as reported by women: 21.3% - calculated average: 22.3%
Richards, T. N., & Branch, K. A. (2012). The relationship between social support and adolescent dating violence: A comparison across genders. *Journal of*	*N*=970 US school students	Wave 1 of Toledo Adolescent Relationship Study Stratified, random sample from all 7th, 9th and 11th grade youth in Lucas County.	CTS2, current or most recent relationships	Physical adolescent dating violence: 246 out of 970 (25.4%) said there had been dating violence. 121 boys and 59 girls reported both perpetrating dating violence and experiencing dating violence victimization. However, 37 girls and 5 boys reported only perpetrating dating violence whereas 7 girls and 17 boys reported only experiencing victimization.

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Characteristics (school and university samples)	Method/ Design	Results
Interpersonal Violence, 27(8), 1540-1561.				**Bidirectional IPV**: -as reported by men: 84.6%, - as reported by women: 57.3% - calculated average: 70.9% **M-to-F Unidirectional IPV**: -as reported by men: 3.5%; -as reported by women: 6.8% - calculated average: 5.2% **F-to-M Unidirectional IPV**: -as reported by men: 11.9%, -as reported by women: 35.9% -calculated average: 23.9%

Table 4: The rates of bidirectional versus unidirectional violence in samples drawn from clinical populations (n=21)

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Characteristics (clinical samples)	Method/ Design	Results
Kafka, J. M., Moracco, K. B. E., Taheri, C., Young, B. R., Graham, L. M., Macy, R. J., & Proescholdbell, S. (2022). Intimate partner violence victimization and perpetration as precursors to suicide. *SSM-Population Health, 18,* 101079.	*N*=439 IPV-related suicides	Most were males who had perpetrated nonfatal IPV (n = 319, 72.7%) prior to dying by suicide. Data from the NC Violent Death Reporting System (2010–2017, n= 9682 single suicides) and hand-reviewed textual data for a subset of cases (n = 2440) to document IPV circumstances.	Coding using CTS items; lifetime	**Bidirectional IPV**: -as reported by men: 1.2%; by women: 1.5% - calculated average: 1.4% **M-to-F Unidirectional IPV**: -as reported by men: 95.3%; by women: 33.8% - calculated average: 64.6% **F-to-M Unidirectional IPV**: - as reported by men: 3.6%; by women: 64.6% - calculated average: 34.1%.

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Characteristics (clinical samples)	Method/ Design	Results
Richards, T. N., & Gillespie, L. K. (2021). Intimate partner violence perpetration, victimization, and overlap among serious juvenile offenders: Trajectories of emerging adulthood. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 36(*21-22), 10054-10079.	*N*=909 male juvenile offenders	Data drawn from the Pathways to Desistance Study, a multisite study that followed 1,354 serious juvenile offenders from two sites in the US	CTS2, 4 years	Physical IPV: Overall, 40% (n = 363) of respondents in the study sample reported at least one instance of IPV perpetration and/or victimization over the 4-year follow-up period examined here: 36% reported victimization only, 5% reported perpetration only, and 59% reported both perpetration and victimization (i.e., overlap). **Bidirectional IPV**: 59% **M-to-F Unidirectional IPV**: 5% **F-to-M Unidirectional IPV**: 36%
Ridings, L. E., Beasley, L. O., Bohora, S., Espeleta, H. C., & Silovsky, J. F. (2021). The role of social support on depression among vulnerable caregivers reporting bidirectional physical violence. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 36*(5-6), NP2800-NP2822.	*N*=403 females in the US	A clinical sample of caregivers of at least one child 5 years of age or younger, and who reported of at least one of three high-risk factors for child maltreatment.	CTS2, past year	Physical assault scale. About 28% of the current study sample reported both initiating and experiencing IPV (bidirectional IPV), approximately 11% reported only experiencing IPV (unidirectional), about 9% reported initiating only, and 52% reported that they neither experienced nor initiated physical violence in IPV. **Bidirectional IPV**: 58.3% **M-to-F Unidirectional IPV**: 22.9% **F-to-M Unidirectional IPV**: 18.8%
Cunradi, C. B., Dellor, E., Alter, H. J., Caetano, R., & Mair, C. (2020).	*N* = 1,037 (55% of women)	Clinical sample of patients presenting at the emergency department on the issue with problem drinking and	It was an observational, cross-sectional survey among low- and	241/1037 (23%) of the sample reported either unidirectional or bidirectional IPV. 13% of whole sample reporting bidirectional IPV, 16.2% reported

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Characteristics (clinical samples)	Method/ Design	Results
Problem drinking and marijuana use as risks for unidirectional and bidirectional partner violence. *Partner Abuse, 11*(1), 57-75.		marijuana use in the US; 53% female; married, cohabiting or in dating relationship for past 12 months; 50% Hispanic, 29% Afro-American; mean age 35.2 years.... 53% of the participants were female.	moderate-acuity patients at a Northern California safety-net ED. The CTS were used to measure IPV in the past year.	perpetration, 26.5% reported victimization, and 57.3% reported bidirectional IPV. **Bidirectional IPV**: 57.3% of the IPV sample. **Unidirectional IPV victimization** regardless of gender: 26.5% **Unidirectional IPV perpetration** regardless of gender: 16.2%.
Fernández-Montalvo, J., López-Goñi, J. J., Arteaga, A., & Haro, B. (2020). Gender differences in unidirectional and bidirectional intimate partner violence in addictions. *The American Journal of Drug and Alcohol Abuse, 46*(2), 194-202.	A clinical sample of 122 Spanish patients (91 male and 31 female) who sought treatment in an addiction treatment center in Spain between June 2016 and December 2017.	Among 72 patients who experienced physical and/or sexual IPV, there were 23 women and 49 men.	The CTS 2 was used to measure IPV in the lifetime. Cross-sectional self-reported data on violent behaviors (physical, sexual and psychological violence) was collected. We analysed the data for physical and/or sexual IPV only.	Bidirectional physical and /or sexual violence was observed in 39 cases (20 men and 19 women) out of 72 cases of IPV sample, with significantly more women than men belonging to this category (82.6% of women and 40.8% for men). Among men, four male patients were only IPV perpetrators, and 25 male patients were only victims of IPV. Among women, four women reported being only victims of IPV, and none reported perpetrating IPV. **Bidirectional IPV within IPV sample** - as reported by men: 40.8% - as reported by females: 82.6% - calculated average average: 54.2% **M-to-F Unidirectional IPV within IPV sample**: -as reported by males: 0.82% -as reported by females: 17.4%

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Characteristics (clinical samples)	Method/ Design	Results
				F-to-M Unidirectional IPV within IPV sample: -as reported by males: 51% -as reported by females: 0%
Kamody, R. C., Howell, K. H., Schwartz, L. E., Schaefer, L. M., & Thurston, I. B. (2020). A cross-sectional examination of intimate partner violence and mother-child communication. *Journal of Child and Family Studies, 29*, 1363-1373.	*N*=165 mothers	Participants (M age = 34.62 years; SD = 7.95) were mothers of youth between the ages of 6 - 14 who endorsed experiencing IPV within the last six months. 69.1% self-identified as Black, 14.5% as Multiethnic, 10.3% as White, 3.0% as Latina, 0.6% as Asian, and 2.4% as "Other." Most participants (73.9%) reported a yearly income of $20,000 or less. Regarding subjective SES, 7.9% reported living very well, 30.3% living comfortably, 45.5% living paycheck to paycheck, 12.7% not having a steady income, and 3.6% reported having no current income. The average number of children in the home was 2.78 (SD = 1.72; range = 1-9).	Mothers reported on their experiences with IPV victimization (CTS 2) and perpetration (History of Violence Perpetration Measure, which was adapted from the CTS2).	**Bidirectional IPV:** 85%, as reported by women
Katz, C. C., Courtney, M. E., & Sapiro, B. (2020). Emancipated foster	*N* = 551 youth in the foster care	Data was drawn from the Midwest Evaluation of the Adult Functioning of Former Foster Youth (the Midwest	CTS2, past year	**Bidirectional IPV**: reported by men: 48%; by women: 61.9% - calculated average: 54.9% **M-to-F Unidirectional IPV**:

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Characteristics (clinical samples)	Method/ Design	Results
youth and intimate partner violence: An exploration of risk and protective factors. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 35*(23-24), 5469-5499.	system in the US, 23/24 years of age (Wave 4).	Study) was used to explore the risks and protective factors for IPV involvement for emancipated foster youth in young adulthood. The Midwest Study is a longitudinal, biannual, five-wave study of youth making the transition from foster care to independent living in Illinois, Iowa, and Wisconsin.		-as reported by men: 8%; - as reported by women: 15.4% - calculated average: 11.7% **F-to-M Unidirectional IPV**: -as reported by men: 44%, -as reported by women: 24.6% -calculated average: 34.3%
Bryan N., Davidov D., Dick T., Bassler J., Fisher M. (2019). Intimate partner violence experiences among men living with HIV in Rural Appalachia. *AIDS and Behavior, 23*(11), 3002–3014.	*N*=86 clients with HIV in the US	From June 2015 to June 2016, 110 surveys were distributed to individuals living with HIV receiving care in the Ryan White clinic.	CTS2, past year, only physical IPV	For physical assault: Among these individuals, 11 (57.9%) reported they were both a victim and a perpetrator, compared to 6 (31.6%) who were victims only and 2 (10.5%) who were perpetrators only. **Bidirectional IPV**: 57.9%
Suomi, A., Dowling, N. A., Thomas, S., Abbott, M., Bellringer, M., Battersby, M., ... & Jackson, A. C. (2019). Patterns of family and intimate partner violence in problem gamblers.	*N*=212 (51% of females)	Help-seeking gambling population in Australia	HITS Scale (4 items); the four types of violence were (1) physically hurt; (2) insulted or talked down; (3) threatened with harm; and (4) screamed at, and response options for the four types of violence were	Table 2 shows that nearly all IPV was bi-directional (32.6% of the whole sample); relatively small proportions reported IPV perpetration only (1.9%) or IPV victimisation only (3.3%). **Bidirectional IPV**: 86.2%

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Characteristics (clinical samples)	Method/ Design	Results
Journal of Gambling Studies, 35, 465-484.			'never', 'sometimes', 'most of the time', and 'almost always'.	
Behnken, M. P., Duan, Y., Temple, J. R., & Wu, Z. H. (2018). Injury and psychiatric disorder in low-income women experiencing bidirectional intimate partner violence. *Violence and Victims, 33*(2), 259-274.	*N*=763 low-income women from community-based family planning clinics.	A community sample of women in the US, who used illicit drugs in the 12 months before study screening. A part of a longitudinal study of stress and substance use among young women and included 763 low-income women aged 18–30 years.	Trained research staff with a Bachelor's or Master's degree administered all measurements during interviews at the clinics.	**In the whole sample**: All (N = 763); Bidirectional IPV (n = 313); Unidirectional IPV Perpetrator-Only (n = 134); Unidirectional IPV Victim-Only (n = 38); No IPV (n = 278). **Bidirectional IPV within IPV sample**: 64.5% **M-to-F Unidirectional IPV within IPV sample** : 7.84% **F-to-M Unidirectional IPV within IPV sample**: 27.6%
Hines D. A., Douglas E. M. (2018). Influence of intimate terrorism, situational couple violence, and mutual violent control on male victims. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 19(*4), 612–623.	*N*=589 help-seeking men	US. Combined sample of men from help-seeking sample (n=589) and a population-based sample of men (n=1,583).	CTS2, past year	**Bidirectional IPV**: 44.8% **F-to-M Unidirectional IPV**: 55.2%
Palmer du Preez, K., Bellringer, M., Pearson, J., Dowling,	*N*=370 of gambling help-	370 participants were recruited from three national New Zealand gambling	The HITS scale comprises 4 items which assess family	**Bidirectional IPV** -as reported by men: 60.9% - as reported by women: 59.2%

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Characteristics (clinical samples)	Method/ Design	Results
N., Suomi, A., Koziol-Mclain, J., ... & Jackson, A. (2018). Family violence in gambling help-seeking populations. *International Gambling Studies, 18*(3), 477-494.	seeking clients in New Zealand	treatment services between June 2013 and March 2015. 75% of the help-seeking gamblers were categorized as current problem gamblers (PGSI score 8+), 12% were moderate-risk gamblers (PGSI 3–7), 7% were low-risk gamblers (PGSI 1–2) and 6% were non-problem gamblers. IPV was the most prevalent relational context for violence among both gamblers (34% reported IPV victimization, 31% IPV perpetration).	violence (physical and emotional abuse) in a past-12-month time frame from a victim's perspective	-calculated average: 60.1% **M-to-F Unidirectional IPV** - as reported by men: 14.1% -as reported by women: 25.3% -calculated average: 19.7% **F-to-M Unidirectional IPV** -as reported by men: 25% -as reported by women: 15.6% - calculated average: 20.3%
Petering, R., Rhoades, H., Rice, E., & Yoshioka-Maxwell, A. (2017). Bidirectional intimate partner violence and drug use among homeless youth. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 32*(14), 2209-2217.	*N*=238 homeless youth seeking drop-in service	As part of a longitudinal study of Los Angeles area HY, drop-in service seeking youth completed a self-administered questionnaire. The sample was limited to youth who had engaged in a sexual relationship in the previous year (*N* = 238).	CTS2	Approximately 38% of the sample experienced some form of IPV in the previous year. The majority of the violence experience was bidirectional (26%); 7% reported being solely a perpetrator and 5% reported being solely a victim. **Bidirectional IPV**: -as reported by men: 64.9, - as reported by women: 78.1% - calculated average: 71.5% **M-to-F Unidirectional IPV**: - as reported by men: 17.5%, -as reported by women: 3.1% - calculated average: 10.3% **F-to-M Unidirectional IPV**: -as reported by men: 17.5%, - as reported by women: 18.8%

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Characteristics (clinical samples)	Method/ Design	Results
				- calculated average: 18.5%
Arteaga, A., Fernández-Montalvo, J., & López-Goñi, J. J. (2015). Prevalence and differential profile of patients with drug addiction problems who commit intimate partner violence. *The American Journal on Addictions, 24*(8), 756-764.	*N*=162	A clinical sample of 162 patients (119 men and 43 women) among patients in the Proyecto Hombre of Navarra (Spain) addiction treatment programme was assessed.	The CTS was used to measure IPV in the lifetime.	The results showed that 33.6% of people in treatment for addiction had committed violence against their partners. This prevalence was significantly higher in women (63.3%) than in men (24.2%). **Bidirectional IPV:** In the 98.4% of the cases the IPV was bidirectional.
Muftić L.R, Finn M.A, Marsh E. A. (2015). The victim-offender overlap, intimate partner violence, and sex: assessing differences among victims, offenders, and victims-offenders. *Crime & Delinquency, 61*(7), 899–926.	*N*=1,256 of the police recorded incidents of DV, 50% men and 50% women, as victims or offenders	Official police data of the recorded incidents of IPV. Part of an evaluation of a domestic violence (DV) police unit in North Carolina. US.	Coding of the police data. Lifetime.	**Bidirectional IPV**: 33%
Crane, C. A., Hawes, S. W., Mandel, D. L., & Easton, C. J. (2014). The occurrence of female-	*N*=77	Clinical sample of 77 male participants recruited from the sample of IPV offenders - reported on bidirectional IPV with female partners using	CTS2 in the past month.	**Bidirectional IPV**: Among (male) participants who endorsed violence on individual subscales of the CTS2, 12 (54.54%) indicated co-occurring physical violence perpetrated by the female partner.

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Characteristics (clinical samples)	Method/ Design	Results
to-male partner violence among male intimate partner violence offenders mandated to treatment: A brief research report. *Violence and Victims, 29*(6), 940-951.		the CTS2; New Haven, Connecticut, Jan. 2007-2008.		Additionally, 8 (66.67%) reported co-occurring injury, 40 (80%) endorsed co-occurring psychological aggression, and 4 (50%) reported co-occurring sexual abuse.
Shneyderman, Y., & Kiely, M. (2013). Intimate partner violence during pregnancy: victim or perpetrator? Does it make a difference?. *BJOG: An International Journal of Obstetrics & Gynaecology, 120*(11), 1375-1385.	*N*=1070; High risk African American pregnant women aged 17-51 age. Part of National Institutes of Health - District of Columbia Initiative. Women recruited from six prenatal care clinics in DC from July 2001 to October 2003.	Clinical sample. Pregnant women who participated in a randomized controlled trial to address IPV, depression, smoking, and environmental tobacco smoke exposure. Self-identifying as black, African-American or Latina, 18 years old or older, ≤28 weeks gestation, DC resident and English speaking.	CTS2, past year; this study used the physical assault and sexual coercion subscales.	5% of women were victims only, 12% were perpetrators only, 27% participated in reciprocal violence, and 55% reported no IPV. **Bidirectional IPV within the IPV sample:** 61.4% **Male to-Female Unidirectional IPV:** 11.4% **Female-to-Male Unidirectional IPV:** 27.3%, as reported by women.

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Characteristics (clinical samples)	Method/ Design	Results
Sullivan, T. P., McPartland, T., Price, C., Cruza-Guet, M. C., & Swan, S. C. (2013). Relationship self-efficacy protects against mental health problems among women in bidirectionally aggressive intimate relationships with men. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 60*(4), 641.	*N*=412 women	Clinical sample of women, US; one of the eligibility criteria was a woman's commission of at least one act of physical aggression against her male partner within the previous 6 months.	CTS2, past 6 months. We focused on the subsample of women (n =369) who experienced physical victimization and used physical aggression.	**Bidirectional IPV** as reported by women: 89.6%
Quinlivan, J. A., Collier, R. R., & Petersen, R. W. (2012). Prevalence and associations of domestic violence at an Australian colposcopy clinic. *Journal of Lower Genital Tract Disease, 16*(4), 372-376.	*N*=566 female patients at colposcopy clinics in major Australian metropoli-tan hospital			Overall, 14.5% of the total cohort reported being the sole recipient of violence. A further 16.6% of the total cohort reported that they had been both the recipient and perpetrator of violence. Only 1.9% of the total cohort reported being the sole perpetrator of violence. **Bidirectional IPV**: 50.3% **M-to-F Unidirectional IPV**: 43.9% **F-to-M Unidirectional IPV**: 5.8%
Messinger, A. M., Davidson, L. L., & Rickert, V. I. (2011).	*N*=618 women aged 15 to	Data is drawn from a 2004 survey of 618 women aged 15 to 24 seeking care at an	IPV was assessed with the Conflict in Adolescent Dating	Most physical relationship violence in this sample is bidirectionally used by both partners (n= 120) rather than

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Characteristics (clinical samples)	Method/ Design	Results
IPV among adolescent reproductive health patients: The role of relationship communication. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 26*(9), 1851-1867.	24 seeking care at an urban reproductive health facility in the US.	urban reproductive health facility in the US. Approximately equal proportions of the sample were aged 15 to 18, 19 to 21, and 22 to 24 (M = 20). Approximately, 22% of respondents were non-Hispanic White, 28% non-Hispanic Black, 14% Asian American, 9% Black Hispanic, 4% non-Black Hispanic, 7% mixed race, and 16% Other. Forty-five percent of the sample reported at least one pregnancy, 31% witnessed parental IPV, and 22% experienced child sexual abuse. The length of their relationships ranged between less than 1 month (5%), 1 month to less than 6 months (30%), 6 months to 12 months (22%), and more than a year (42%).	Relationships Inventory (CADRI), which asks about behavior and communication in response to "arguments" or conflicts in the past year with the respondent's most recent romantic partner (Wolfe et al., 2001). Within the CADRI, four pairs of reciprocal questions measure how often the respondent and the respondent's partner have thrown something at; pushed, shoved, or shook; slapped or pulled the hair of; and kicked, hit, or punched the other partner.	unidirectionally used by the male partner (n= 16) or the female partner (n= 76). **Bidirectional IPV**: 56.6% **M-to-F Unidirectional IPV**: 7.5% **F-to-M Unidirectional IPV**: 35.8%
Sunday, S., Kline, M., Labruna, V., Pelcovitz, D., Salzinger, S., & Kaplan, S. (2011). The role of adolescent physical	*N*=62 of abused individuals	Clinical sample of abused individuals in the US. Abuse group matched with control group from same community when adolescents White, middle- to lower-middle-class	CTS2-based, current or most recent relationships	**Bidirectional IPV**: 52.8%

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Characteristics (clinical samples)	Method/ Design	Results
abuse in adult intimate partner violence. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 26*(18), 3773-3789.				