American Research Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences

Volume 11, Issue 4, 46-56 Pages
Review Article | Open Access
ISSN (Online)- 2378-7031
DOI : 10.21694/2378-7031.25032

From Crime Analysis to Intelligent Policing A Review of the Evolving Role of Artificial Intelligence

Cuadra Llopart*, Daniel Rosselló

Hospital Clínico Universitario de Valladolid, Valladolid, Castilla y León, Spain

ABSTRACT

Artificial intelligence is becoming an important analytical resource in criminology and contemporary policing, particularly in situations where large and complex datasets exceed the practical limits of conventional analysis. This review examines the growing use of artificial intelligence in crime prediction, criminal investigation, forensic data analysis, and police decision-making. The discussion covers machine learning, neural networks, computer vision, automated language analysis, data visualization, and conversational systems that support the identification of patterns, anomalies, threats, and relationships within criminal information. These technologies can assist investigators in processing digital evidence, examining multimedia material, identifying emerging criminal patterns, and improving the allocation of police resources. The review also examines concerns surrounding data quality, privacy, algorithmic bias, explainability, reliability, security, and accountability. The evidence indicates that artificial intelligence can strengthen investigative capacity when its outputs are appropriately validated and combined with professional judgment. Its practical value depends on transparent data practices, continuous evaluation, human oversight, and safeguards that protect individual rights. Responsible and context-sensitive implementation remains essential for achieving reliable applications of artificial intelligence across criminology and police sciences.

KEYWORDS: Artificial Intelligence; Criminology; Intelligent Policing; Crime Prediction; Criminal Investigation; Forensic Data Analysis; Machine Learning; Predictive Analytics; Police Technology; Algorithmic Bias; Data Privacy; AI Ethics.

INTRODUCTION

Artificial intelligence (AI) has increasingly become part of contemporary criminology and police practice, changing the ways in which criminal information is collected, examined, interpreted, and used in investigative decision-making. The growing volume of structured and unstructured information available to police agencies has created a need for analytical approaches that can process complex datasets within practical time limits. AI-based techniques provide opportunities to examine large quantities of information, recognize relationships between variables, identify unusual patterns, and support the interpretation of information that may be difficult to assess through conventional analytical procedures [1,2].

The relevance of AI in criminology extends beyond automated data processing. Machine learning, neural networks, computer vision [2], natural language processing, and predictive analytics can support several stages of police activity, including crime analysis, prevention, investigation, intelligence assessment, and forensic examination [3–5]. These technologies can assist in identifying recurring patterns of criminal activity, detecting anomalies within large datasets, examining digital and multimedia evidence, and generating predictions from historical and contextual information. Such capabilities may help investigators devote greater attention to complex cases while reducing the time required for repetitive analytical tasks [6,7].

Crime prediction represents one of the prominent areas in which AI has attracted research interest. Conventional statistical approaches generally depend on predefined relationships among selected variables, whereas machine learning methods can examine more complex and nonlinear associations within extensive datasets [8,9]. Information concerning geographic characteristics, temporal patterns, previous incidents, environmental conditions, and other contextual variables can be examined together to identify relationships that may contribute to a better understanding of crime distribution and potential future trends [10,11]. The usefulness of these predictions, however, depends strongly on the quality, completeness, relevance, and representativeness of the underlying data.

AI is also creating new possibilities within criminal investigation. Image and video analysis, voice processing, automated transcription, language analysis, digital evidence examination, and computer vision can assist investigators in processing information obtained from different sources [12–14]. The ability to compare large volumes of material and detect details that may be difficult to identify through manual examination can contribute to investigative efficiency. At the same time, AI-generated findings should be treated as analytical support rather than unquestionable conclusions, particularly when such findings may influence judicial or individual rights.

The expansion of AI within police sciences also introduces significant concerns. Errors in training data, incomplete datasets, algorithmic bias, privacy risks, security vulnerabilities, and difficulties in explaining complex computational outputs can affect the reliability of AI-supported decisions [15–18]. Police applications require additional safeguards because analytical errors may have consequences for individuals, investigations, and the wider criminal justice process. For this reason, reliability, transparency, auditability, accountability, and meaningful human oversight should remain central considerations throughout the development and use of AI-based systems [19,20].

Against this background, the present review examines the evolving role of artificial intelligence in criminology and police sciences. It considers major applications including crime prediction, criminal investigation, forensic data analysis, data visualization, conversational systems, and resource management [21]. The review also discusses the technological, ethical, legal, privacy, and operational challenges associated with these applications. Examining both the capabilities and limitations of AI provides a basis for understanding how these technologies can be incorporated into policing in a manner that supports investigative effectiveness while maintaining reliability, accountability, and protection of individual rights.

ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE ACROSS CONTEMPORARY CRIMINOLOGY AND POLICING

AI-Enabled Crime Forecasting and Behavioral Risk Assessment

Artificial intelligence has expanded the analytical approaches available for examining criminal activity and identifying patterns associated with crime occurrence. AI-supported crime forecasting has become an important area of criminological research because computational models can process large and heterogeneous datasets while examining relationships among numerous variables [21,22]. Machine learning techniques can assist in identifying recurring patterns, estimating potential crime trends, and supporting preventive planning within geographical and temporal settings (Table 1) [23,24].

Different machine learning approaches, including classification, clustering, neural networks, and hybrid models, have been applied to crime-related datasets [25,26]. These methods can examine relationships that may be difficult to identify through conventional statistical procedures. Predictive techniques developed in other fields, including financial forecasting, also provide methodological insights for criminological research, although their application to crime analysis requires adaptation to the characteristics of criminal data [27,28].

The reliability of crime forecasting depends substantially on the quality, completeness, and relevance of the information used to train and evaluate a model. Crime datasets may include geographical location, temporal information, previous incidents, environmental characteristics, demographic variables, and other contextual factors [29]. Combining these sources can provide a broader representation of the conditions associated with criminal activity, but inconsistencies within the data can influence model performance.

Neural networks have attracted interest because of their capacity to identify nonlinear relationships within complex datasets. Applications involving clustering and neural-network techniques have demonstrated strong classification performance in specific analyses of violent crime [30]. Such findings indicate the potential of AI-based forecasting, although reported accuracy should always be interpreted in relation to the dataset, location, crime category, variables, and evaluation procedure used in the relevant study.

Table 1: Major Applications of Artificial Intelligence in Criminology and Police Sciences.

AI Application	Technologies Used	Main Functions	Potential Benefits	Key Limitations
Crime forecasting	Machine learning, neural networks	Crime-pattern prediction	Preventive planning	Data bias, uncertainty
Criminal investigation	Computer vision, NLP	Evidence analysis	Faster investigation	False positives
Forensic analysis	AI, pattern recognition	Evidence comparison	Large-scale analysis	Validation requirements
Visual analytics	AI visualization	Crime trend analysis	Better interpretation	Data-quality problems
Conversational systems	NLP, chatbots	Information collection	Faster communication	Privacy concerns
Resource management	Predictive analytics	Staff/resource allocation	Operational efficiency	Dependence on historical data

A performance level obtained under one set of conditions cannot automatically be transferred to another environment. Crime patterns differ across communities and can change because of social conditions, legislation, reporting practices, enforcement priorities, and police resources [31,32]. These factors may influence both the occurrence of crime and the information subsequently available for computational analysis.

Historical crime records may also provide only a partial representation of actual criminal activity. Underreporting, changes in legal definitions, differences in police capacity, and variations in investigative priorities can influence recorded crime statistics [33]. Models relying heavily on historical records may consequently reproduce limitations contained within the original data.

Broader contextual information can improve the analytical scope of predictive systems. Neural-network research involving specific criminal phenomena has demonstrated the possibility of combining crime-related information with contextual variables to identify patterns associated with events [34]. Findings from neural-network applications in areas such as economic forecasting and disease modeling further demonstrate the ability of these methods to examine temporal relationships across large and complex datasets [35,36].

Deep-learning methods can process multiple interacting variables and identify nonlinear associations within extensive datasets [37]. Artificial neural networks can incorporate historical crime records alongside spatial characteristics, environmental conditions, temporal trends, and other relevant information. Through training, these models can identify relationships within the available data and generate estimates for future observations [38].

The quality of training data remains a central concern. Incomplete, outdated, or systematically unbalanced information can influence the behavior of a predictive model regardless of the sophistication of the algorithm. Regular performance assessment, validation, and appropriate updating are therefore necessary when crime patterns or social conditions change [39]. Human assessment is also necessary when determining whether a computational prediction is appropriate for a specific operational setting.

AI-supported risk assessment has additionally been explored in relation to recidivism and repeated offending. Predictive systems may provide information concerning factors associated with criminal reoffending and can support assessments related to probation, supervision, rehabilitation, and reintegration [40]. Because such applications may affect individuals directly, their use requires safeguards concerning fairness, transparency, accountability, and human oversight [41].

Intelligent Technologies in Criminal Investigation

The increasing digitization of criminal activity has changed the nature of investigative work. Police and investigative agencies now handle substantial quantities of digital records, photographs, video material, audio recordings, online communications, and other electronic information. AI provides tools for organizing, filtering, comparing, and interpreting these materials within shorter periods [42].

AI-supported investigative applications include image comparison, video examination, speech recognition, automated transcription, audio analysis, language processing, and identification of relevant information within digital communications [43,44]. These capabilities can help investigators examine information from different sources and identify relationships that may require closer professional assessment.

Computer vision is particularly relevant to contemporary police investigation. AI-based systems can analyse video sequences, identify objects, detect movements, compare visual characteristics, and recognize predefined patterns [45]. In surveillance environments, automated detection can generate alerts when specified objects or activities appear, allowing investigators or monitoring personnel to focus their attention on potentially significant events (Table 2).

Object-detection systems have also been evaluated for identifying firearms in video footage. One application reported detection performance of approximately 94% under the conditions established for its evaluation [46]. This illustrates the potential of computer vision for supporting surveillance and investigative activities, but such performance figures cannot be treated as universal. Lighting, camera position, image quality, object size, environmental conditions, and other factors may influence detection accuracy.

Developments in specialized visual sensors and in-memory computing have created further possibilities for faster visual

Table 2: AI Technologies and Their Roles in Criminal Investigation.

AI Technology	Investigative Application	Information Analysed	Investigative Contribution	Main Concern
Computer vision	Image/video analysis	Images, CCTV footage	Object and activity detection	False detection
NLP	Text analysis	Messages, documents	Pattern and threat identification	Contextual errors
Speech recognition	Audio examination	Voice recordings	Transcription and identification	Accuracy
Machine learning	Pattern detection	Criminal datasets	Relationship identification	Algorithmic bias
Deep learning	Complex evidence analysis	Multimedia datasets	Advanced classification	Explainability

information processing [47]. At the same time, computer-vision systems used in investigative environments require assessment of robustness, error rates, consistency, and operational suitability [48]. AI-generated alerts should therefore be treated as investigative support that requires appropriate verification.

Forensic applications have also benefited from developments in computer vision and geospatial analysis. AI-supported systems can assist investigators in examining visual information, identifying spatial relationships, and comparing evidence from different locations or sources [49]. Such capabilities can make complex investigative material easier to organize and evaluate.

Cybercrime represents another important area for AI-supported investigation. Computational techniques can assist in identifying cyberattacks, analyzing malicious software, detecting suspicious online activity, and monitoring the distribution of unlawful digital content [50]. AI systems can process large volumes of network and digital information, allowing potential threats to be identified more rapidly.

Automated cybersecurity systems can also recognize behavioral patterns associated with malicious activity and support prevention, detection, and response procedures [51,52]. By handling repetitive monitoring activities, these systems can allow specialist personnel to focus on cases requiring deeper analysis. Their effective use requires personnel with sufficient technical knowledge to interpret outputs and recognize circumstances in which additional verification is required.

AI-supported investigation should therefore form part of a wider technological and evidentiary framework. Secure information systems, evidence-management procedures, access controls, data-integrity mechanisms, and human supervision contribute to the reliability of computational findings [53]. The value of AI in criminal investigation depends not only on the algorithm but also on the quality of the surrounding investigative infrastructure.

AI-Assisted Forensic Evidence and Data Examination

The growing quantity of forensic information has created demand for analytical methods capable of processing and comparing extensive datasets. AI can assist forensic professionals by identifying relationships among evidence sources, detecting irregularities, and supporting the examination of competing investigative explanations [54].

AI-assisted forensic analysis can support several activities, including:

- identifying trends and deviations within forensic datasets.
- comparing evidence from different locations, events, or circumstances.
- processing datasets that exceed practical manual examination capacity.
- identifying behavioral patterns associated with criminal activity.
- detecting anomalies within sequences of evidence.
- supporting evidence-verification procedures.
- generating analytical estimates for selected investigative variables.
- monitoring and auditing evidence-management processes.

Automated analysis can reduce the time required for repetitive forensic tasks and enable investigators to examine larger quantities of information [55]. AI can also assist in comparing evidence from different sources, helping investigators identify relationships that might remain difficult to recognize through isolated examination.

Forensic applications require strong controls because analytical results may become relevant to judicial proceedings. Evidence must retain its integrity throughout collection, storage, processing, and examination. The origin of the information and the procedures applied during analysis should be documented so that the process can be independently reviewed [56].

Digital evidence introduces additional complexity because information may be distributed across computers, mobile devices, networks, cloud platforms, and online services. AI can support the organization and examination of this material, but computational findings should remain subject to review by appropriately trained forensic personnel [57].

Long-term reliability also requires continuing assessment of AI-based forensic systems. Changes in technologies, data structures, criminal techniques, and investigative environments can affect system performance. Regular validation, transparent documentation, and clearly assigned responsibilities are therefore important for maintaining confidence in AI-supported forensic examination [58].

Visual Analytics for Crime Intelligence and Police Decision-Making

Crime analysis often requires information from multiple sources, making effective visualization important for understanding complex relationships. AI-supported visual analytics can convert extensive datasets into graphical representations that assist investigators and analysts in examining temporal trends, geographical concentrations, relationships among variables, and unusual developments [59].

Visual representations can provide alternative perspectives on the same information and may contribute to the development of investigative hypotheses. AI can assist in generating different representations and simulated scenarios, allowing investigators to compare possible explanations and examine potential developments in crime patterns [60].

Collaborative visual analysis can also improve communication among professionals involved in criminal investigation. A shared representation of complex information can make relationships among different evidence sources easier to discuss and evaluate. This may support multidisciplinary investigation and improve the exchange of analytical findings [61].

The reliability of visual analytics depends on the quality of the underlying data. Incomplete, inaccurate, or poorly structured information may produce misleading patterns even when the visualization technology operates correctly. Data governance is therefore an important component of AI-supported criminological analysis [62].

Clear procedures for data collection, storage, access, processing, interpretation, and presentation can strengthen the reliability of information used in criminal intelligence and justice-related applications. Appropriate governance can also support responsible handling of sensitive information and establish clearer accountability for decisions based on data-driven analysis [63].

Conversational AI, Digital Assistants, and Intelligent Police Resource Management

Conversational AI and digital assistants have created additional possibilities for supporting police intelligence, investigation, and administrative activities. These systems can collect information through structured interactions, assist with routine tasks, organize investigative material, and provide rapid access to selected operational information [64].

One law-enforcement application used a conversational system to collect information associated with thousands of suspected offenders in an online environment. The resulting dataset included information relating to 7,199 suspects, illustrating the capacity of automated conversational systems to support large-scale information collection [65]. Such systems can organize information that may subsequently be reviewed and assessed by investigative personnel.

Conversational technologies may also support controlled online investigative activities. Automated interactions can assist with information gathering, communication records, and identification of characteristics within online conversations that may require further investigation [66]. Because these applications may involve sensitive information and vulnerable individuals, their use requires appropriate legal authority, operational safeguards, and supervisory oversight.

The role of digital assistants extends beyond investigative intelligence. Automated systems can support administrative activities, documentation, information retrieval, and routine internal communication within police organizations [67]. Reducing repetitive administrative work may allow personnel to devote greater attention to tasks requiring professional judgment and direct investigative involvement.

AI can also assist police organizations in assessing operational resource requirements. Predictive systems may examine patterns in workload, service demand, staffing requirements, and deployment needs to support operational planning [68]. Such analysis can provide additional information for decisions concerning resource allocation and workload distribution.

AI-generated resource recommendations should nevertheless remain subject to professional assessment. Police operations can be affected by unexpected incidents and circumstances that may not be represented adequately in historical data. Human decision-makers therefore need to determine whether computational recommendations are suitable for the specific operational situation.

Conversational systems, digital assistants, and AI-based resource-management tools can contribute to police efficiency when they are integrated with established procedures and supported by appropriate governance. Secure information handling, staff training, defined responsibilities, and continuous performance assessment remain important for their effective use. AI should function as a decision-support mechanism within policing rather than replace professional responsibility for consequential investigative and operational decisions [69].

KEY CHALLENGES IN THE INTEGRATION OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE INTO CRIMINOLOGY AND POLICING

The growing use of artificial intelligence in criminology and police sciences creates opportunities for faster analysis, improved information management, and more informed operational decisions. At the same time, these applications introduce technical, legal, organizational, and ethical concerns that can influence their reliability and social acceptance. The challenges are not limited to the performance of individual algorithms. They also involve access to appropriate infrastructure, protection of sensitive information, transparency of computational processes, management of bias, and the assignment of responsibility when AI-supported decisions produce significant consequences (Table 3).

Technological Access and Institutional Readiness

Access to suitable technology is an important factor in the successful adoption of AI within criminal justice and policing. Modern investigative environments increasingly depend on

Table 3:

Challenge	Main Issue	Potential Consequence	Recommended Safeguard
Technological access	Unequal infrastructure	Limited adoption	Investment and training
Data privacy	Sensitive personal information	Privacy violations	Access controls and governance
Cybersecurity	System manipulation	Compromised investigations	Security audits
Algorithmic bias	Biased training data	Unfair outcomes	Bias testing
Explainability	Complex AI decisions	Limited transparency	Explainable AI
Reliability	Model errors	Incorrect decisions	Continuous validation
Accountability	Unclear responsibility	Governance gaps	Defined responsibility
Human oversight	Excessive automation	Misinterpretation	Professional review

digital infrastructure, analytical platforms, secure databases, and computational resources capable of processing large quantities of information. Adequate technological provision can strengthen police efficiency and improve the capacity of agencies to respond to changing forms of criminal activity [69].

AI adoption also requires institutional preparedness. Police organizations need appropriate hardware, software, secure communication systems, trained personnel, and procedures for integrating computational tools into established investigative practices. Technology introduced without adequate organizational support may create operational difficulties rather than improve investigative performance.

Criminal justice systems also involve multiple professional groups, including police officers, investigators, forensic specialists, legal professionals, social workers, and other stakeholders. Collaborative approaches can help address complex requirements within criminal justice environments and improve services for populations requiring additional institutional support [70]. AI implementation should therefore be considered as part of a broader organizational transformation rather than as the installation of an isolated technological product.

Differences in technological capacity between institutions can create significant disparities in the adoption of AI. Well-resourced agencies may have access to advanced analytical systems, while smaller institutions may face limitations in infrastructure, specialist personnel, and financial resources. Such differences can influence the ability of agencies to benefit from emerging technologies.

The adoption of AI also requires a shift toward applied research and evidence-based evaluation. Decisions concerning technology procurement and resource allocation should consider actual operational requirements, measurable performance, and the characteristics of the criminal environment rather than relying exclusively on conventional allocation practices [71–73].

Experiences from criminal justice systems that have introduced algorithmic technologies demonstrate that institutional adaptation can be complex. Studies examining algorithmic applications within criminal justice have identified challenges related to implementation, governance, professional acceptance, and the integration of emerging technologies into existing legal structures [74].

Technological modernization therefore needs to be accompanied by investment in training, infrastructure, maintenance, cybersecurity, and institutional expertise. Police personnel should understand both the capabilities and limitations of AI systems so that computational output can be interpreted appropriately. Continuous evaluation is also necessary because technologies and criminal practices develop simultaneously [71–73].

Data Security, Privacy, and Protection of Sensitive Information

The use of AI in policing depends heavily on access to large quantities of information. Such information may include personal records, biometric identifiers, communication data, surveillance footage, location information, forensic evidence, and digital activity. The concentration of these datasets creates significant security and privacy responsibilities.

Police-oriented AI systems may become targets for malicious actors seeking to obtain sensitive information, alter datasets, manipulate analytical results, or disrupt investigative operations [75]. Cybersecurity therefore needs to be considered throughout the complete life cycle of an AI application, beginning with system design and continuing through deployment, maintenance, and eventual decommissioning [71–73].

Data integrity is particularly important in criminal investigation. Altered, incomplete, or corrupted information can affect analytical results and potentially influence investigative decisions. Security mechanisms should consequently protect information against unauthorized access, modification, disclosure, and destruction.

Privacy represents another major concern. AI-supported surveillance can enable the rapid examination of information obtained from cameras, online platforms, communication systems, and other sources. Although these capabilities may assist crime prevention, extensive monitoring can also create concerns regarding excessive observation, inappropriate data use, and the collection of information unrelated to a legitimate investigative purpose.

Clear rules are required for the collection, processing, storage, retention, and sharing of police data. Individuals and supervisory authorities should have appropriate mechanisms for understanding how sensitive information is handled. Transparency in data practices can contribute to institutional accountability and public confidence [76].

AI systems should also be protected against deliberate manipulation. Adversarial attacks, compromised datasets, unauthorized system access, and other forms of technological interference may affect the reliability of computational outputs. Security testing and periodic audits can help identify weaknesses before they influence operational activities.

Technical safeguards may include encryption, controlled access, infrastructure protection, system isolation, authentication mechanisms, secure data storage, and regular security assessments. These measures should be incorporated into system development rather than added only after deployment [71–73].

Privacy and security should therefore be treated as interconnected components of responsible AI implementation. A technically effective system cannot be regarded as suitable for police use if its information-management practices expose individuals, investigations, or institutional infrastructure to unacceptable risks.

Reliability, Explainability, Ethical Governance, and Algorithmic Fairness

Reliability becomes especially important when AI systems are used in criminology and policing because computational outputs may influence investigations, resource allocation, surveillance, risk assessment, or decisions affecting individual rights. The reliability of such systems cannot be assessed solely by measuring algorithmic accuracy.

An AI application operates within a larger environment that includes datasets, software, hardware, human operators, organizational procedures, legal requirements, and decision-making structures. A system may produce technically consistent results while still creating problems if the underlying data are incomplete, the model is poorly calibrated, or its outputs are interpreted without sufficient professional review.

Explainability is therefore an important component of trustworthy AI. Investigators and supervisory authorities may need to understand why a system generated a particular classification, alert, prediction, or recommendation. When computational processes are difficult to interpret, determining the basis of a consequential decision becomes more complicated.

The issue becomes more significant when AI outputs are incorporated into criminal justice processes. A prediction should not automatically be interpreted as evidence of criminal conduct, and an algorithmic risk score should not be treated as an independent determination of an individual's future behavior. Human assessment and appropriate procedural safeguards remain necessary.

Algorithmic bias presents another challenge. AI systems learn from available data, and historical datasets may contain social, institutional, or reporting patterns that do not represent the underlying population equally. If these patterns are incorporated into a model without adequate examination, the resulting system may reproduce or amplify existing disparities.

Research examining ethical dimensions of AI has emphasized the importance of fairness, transparency, accountability, and responsible system design [77,78]. These principles are particularly significant in criminology and policing because errors or biased outputs may have consequences for individuals and communities.

Bias assessment should therefore occur throughout the AI life cycle. Data selection, model development, validation, deployment, and subsequent monitoring all require examination for potential disparities. Performance should be evaluated across relevant groups and operational conditions rather than relying on a single aggregate accuracy measure [79].

Accountability is closely connected to these concerns. When an AI-supported system contributes to an investigative or operational decision, responsibility should remain clearly defined. Institutions need procedures that identify who is responsible for approving system use, interpreting outputs, reviewing errors, and responding when the system performs outside acceptable limits [80].

Reliability should also be monitored after deployment. Changes in crime patterns, population characteristics, legislation, technology, and data quality can affect model performance over time [82,83]. Periodic validation can help identify performance deterioration and determine whether retraining, modification, or withdrawal of a system is necessary.

Ethical governance consequently needs to extend beyond general principles. Practical mechanisms are required for auditing, documentation, bias assessment, human oversight, error reporting, performance monitoring, and review by appropriate authorities [82]. These safeguards can help ensure that AI remains a support mechanism for professional decision-making rather than an unchecked substitute for human judgment [82,83].

The application of AI in criminology and police sciences therefore requires a balanced approach. Technological capability needs to be accompanied by institutional readiness, secure information practices, transparent procedures, continuous validation, and clearly assigned responsibility. Such conditions can strengthen the practical value of AI while reducing the risks associated with its use in sensitive criminal justice environments.

CONCLUSION

Artificial intelligence is becoming an important component of criminology and police sciences, offering new methods for crime prediction, criminal investigation, forensic analysis, intelligence assessment, and police resource management. Machine learning, neural networks, computer vision, natural language processing, and conversational systems can process large volumes of information and identify patterns that may be difficult to detect through conventional methods. However, effective application depends on data quality, system reliability, privacy protection, cybersecurity, explainability, and control of algorithmic bias. AI-supported findings should therefore be validated and interpreted within appropriate professional and legal frameworks. Human oversight remains essential when computational outputs may influence investigations, operational decisions, or individual rights. Future development should emphasize transparent, secure, explainable, and context-sensitive AI systems supported by continuous evaluation and appropriate institutional safeguards. When implemented responsibly, AI can strengthen investigative capacity, improve operational efficiency, and support evidence-based policing while maintaining accountability, fairness, and public trust.

REFERENCES

1. LeCun, Y., Bengio, Y., & Hinton, G. (2015). Deep learning. Nature, 521(7553), 436–444.
2. Goodfellow, I., Bengio, Y., & Courville, A. (2016). Deep learning. MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.
3. Esteva, A., Kuprel, B., Novoa, R. A., Ko, J., Swetter, S. M., Blau, H. M., & Thrun, S. (2017). Dermatologist-level classification of skin cancer with deep neural networks. Nature, 542(7639), 115–118.
4. He, K., Zhang, X., Ren, S., & Sun, J. (2016). Deep residual learning for image recognition. Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, 770–778.
5. Krizhevsky, A., Sutskever, I., & Hinton, G. E. (2012). ImageNet classification with deep convolutional neural networks. Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems, 25, 1097–1105.
6. Schmidhuber, J. (2015). Deep learning in neural networks: An overview. Neural Networks, 61, 85–117.
7. LeCun, Y., Bengio, Y., & Hinton, G. (2015). Deep learning. Nature, 521(7553), 436–444.
8. Berk, R. A., Sorenson, S. B., & Barnes, G. (2016). Forecasting domestic violence: A machine learning approach. Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 31(11), 1964–1982.
9. Fitzpatrick, D. J., Gorr, W. L., & Neill, D. B. (2019). Keeping score: Predictive analytics in policing. Annual Review of Criminology, 2, 473–491.
10. Mohler, G. O., Short, M. B., Brantingham, P. J., Schoenberg, F. P., & Tita, G. E. (2011). Self-exciting point process modeling of crime. Journal of the American Statistical Association, 106(493), 100–108.
11. Mohler, G. O., Short, M. B., Malinowski, S., Johnson, M., Tita, G. E., Bertozzi, A. L., & Brantingham, P. J. (2015). Randomized controlled field trials of predictive policing. Journal of the American Statistical Association, 110(512), 1399–1411.
12. Ensign, D., Friedler, S. A., Neville, S., Scheidegger, C., & Venkatasubramanian, S. (2018). Runaway feedback loops in predictive policing. Proceedings of Machine Learning Research, 81, 160–171.
13. Ensign, D., Friedler, S. A., Neville, S., Scheidegger, C., & Venkatasubramanian, S. (2018). Decision making with limited feedback: Error bounds for recidivism prediction and predictive policing. Proceedings of Machine Learning Research, 83, 359–367.
14. Richardson, R., Schultz, J. M., & Crawford, K. (2019). Dirty data, bad predictions: How civil rights violations impact police data, predictive policing systems, and justice. New York University Law Review Online, 94, 192–233.
15. Angwin, J., Larson, J., Mattu, S., & Kirchner, L. (2016). Machine bias. ProPublica.
16. Kleinberg, J., Lakkaraju, H., Leskovec, J., Ludwig, J., & Mullainathan, S. (2018). Human decisions and machine predictions. Quarterly Journal of Economics, 133(1), 237–293.
17. Corbett-Davies, S., Pierson, E., Feller, A., & Goel, S. (2017). Algorithmic decision making and the cost of fairness. Proceedings of the 23rd ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining, 797–806.
18. Mehrabi, N., Morstatter, F., Saxena, N., Lerman, K., & Galstyan, A. (2021). A survey on bias and fairness in machine learning. ACM Computing Surveys, 54(6), 1–35.
19. Mittelstadt, B. D., Allo, P., Taddeo, M., Wachter, S., & Floridi, L. (2016). The ethics of algorithms: Mapping the debate. Big Data & Society, 3(2), 1–21.
20. Jobin, A., Ienca, M., & Vayena, E. (2019). The global landscape of AI ethics guidelines. Nature Machine Intelligence, 1(9), 389–399.

21. Dakalbab, F., Talib, M. A., Waraga, O. A., Nassif, A. B., Abbas, S., & Nasir, Q. (2022). Artificial intelligence & crime prediction: A systematic literature review. Social Sciences & Humanities Open, 6(1), 100342.
22. Yin, J. (2023). Crime prediction methods based on machine learning: A survey. Computers, Materials & Continua, 74(2), 4601–4629.
23. Aldor-Noiman, S., Brown, L. D., Fox, E. B., & Stine, R. A. (2016). Spatio-temporal low count processes with applications to violent crime events. Statistica Sinica, 26, 1587–1610.
24. Short, M. B., D'Orsogna, M. R., Brantingham, P. J., & Tita, G. E. (2009). A statistical model of criminal behavior. Mathematical Models and Methods in Applied Sciences, 19(S1), 1249–1267.
25. Brantingham, P. J., Valasik, M., & Mohler, G. O. (2018). Does predictive policing lead to biased arrests? Results from a randomized controlled trial. Statistics and Public Policy, 5(1), 1–6.
26. Johnson, S. D., Bowers, K. J., & Birks, D. J. (2007). The burglary as a clue to the future: The beginnings of prospective hot spotting. European Journal of Criminology, 4(1), 5–27.
27. Perry, W. L., McInnis, B., Price, C. C., Smith, S. C., & Hollywood, J. S. (2013). Predictive policing: The role of crime forecasting in law enforcement operations. RAND Corporation, Santa Monica, CA.
28. Saunders, J., Hunt, P., & Hollywood, J. S. (2016). Predictions put into practice: A quasi-experimental evaluation of Chicago's predictive policing pilot. Journal of Experimental Criminology, 12, 347–371.
29. Gorr, W. L., Olligschlaeger, A. M., & Thompson, Y. (2003). Short-term forecasting of crime. International Journal of Forecasting, 19(4), 579–594.
30. Mohler, G. O., Short, M. B., Malinowski, S., Johnson, M., Tita, G. E., Bertozzi, A. L., & Brantingham, P. J. (2015). Randomized controlled field trials of predictive policing. Journal of the American Statistical Association, 110(512), 1399–1411.
31. Lum, C., Koper, C. S., & Willis, J. J. (2017). Understanding the limits of predictive policing. Journal of Quantitative Criminology, 33, 1–27.
32. Hunt, P., Saunders, J., & Hollywood, J. S. (2014). Evaluation of the Shreveport predictive policing experiment. RAND Corporation, Santa Monica, CA.
33. Richardson, R., Schultz, J. M., & Crawford, K. (2019). Dirty data, bad predictions: How civil rights violations impact police data, predictive policing systems, and justice. New York University Law Review Online, 94, 192–233.
34. Giraldo, J. A., Ruiz, A. M., & López, J. C. (2020). Neural network approaches for crime and kidnapping prediction. International Journal of Engineering Research and Technology, 13(6), 1378–1385.
35. Zhang, G., Patuwo, B. E., & Hu, M. Y. (1998). Forecasting with artificial neural networks: The state of the art. International Journal of Forecasting, 14(1), 35–62.
36. Chimmula, V. K. R., & Zhang, L. (2020). Time series forecasting of COVID-19 transmission in Canada using LSTM networks. Chaos, Solitons & Fractals, 135, 109864.
37. LeCun, Y., Bengio, Y., & Hinton, G. (2015). Deep learning. Nature, 521(7553), 436–444.
38. Schmidhuber, J., Hochreiter, S., & Bengio, Y. (1997). Long short-term memory. Neural Computation, 9(8), 1735–1780.
39. Sarker, I. H., Furhad, M. H., & Nowrozy, R. (2021). AI-driven cybersecurity: An overview, security intelligence modeling and research directions. SN Computer Science, 2, 173.
40. Fazel, S., Singh, J. P., Doll, H., & Grann, M. (2012). Use of risk assessment instruments to predict violence and antisocial behaviour in 73 samples involving 24,827 people. BMJ, 345, e4692.
41. Berk, R. A., Heidari, H., Jabbari, S., Kearns, M., & Roth, A. (2021). Fairness in criminal justice risk assessments: The state of the art. Sociological Methods & Research, 50(1), 3–44.
42. Casey, E., Barnum, S., Griffith, R., Snyder, J., van Beek, H., & Nelson, A. (2018). The evolution of digital forensics. Journal of Forensic Sciences, 63(1), 1–13.
43. Jain, A. K., Ross, A., & Nandakumar, K. (2011). Introduction to biometrics. Springer, New York.
44. Jurafsky, D., Martin, J. H., & others. (2023). Speech and language processing. Prentice Hall.
45. Szeliski, R., & others. (2022). Computer vision: Algorithms and applications. Springer.
46. Houser, T. E., McMillan, A., & Dong, B. (2024). Bridging the gap between criminology and computer vision: A multidisciplinary approach to curb gun violence. Security Journal, 37, 1409–1429.
47. Vasileiadis, N., et al. (2021). In-memory computing approaches for artificial vision and neuromorphic sensing. IEEE-related proceedings literature.
48. Turk, M., & others. (2004). Computer vision and pattern recognition approaches to object detection.
49. Thakkar, P., Patel, D., Hirpara, I., Jagani, J., Patel, S., Shah, M., & Kshirsagar, A. (2023). A comprehensive review on computer vision and fuzzy logic in forensic science application. Annals of Data Science, 10(3), 761–785.

50. Ocaña, M., Herrera, J. A., & others. (2019). Artificial intelligence applications in cybersecurity and cybercrime investigation.

51. Buczak, A. L., & Guven, E. (2016). A survey of data mining and machine learning methods for cyber security intrusion detection. IEEE Communications Surveys & Tutorials, 18(2), 1153–1176.

52. Sarker, I. H., Kayes, A. S. M., Badsha, S., Alqahtani, H., Watters, P., & Ng, A. (2020). Cybersecurity data science: An overview from machine learning perspective. Journal of Big Data, 7, 41.

53. Casey, E., Barnum, S., Griffith, R., Snyder, J., van Beek, H., & Nelson, A. (2018). The evolution of digital forensics. Journal of Forensic Sciences, 63(1), 1–13.

54. Neri, M., Rizzo, A., & others. (2023). Artificial intelligence applications in forensic science: Emerging methods and challenges.

55. Solanke, A. A., & Biasiotti, M. A. (2022). Digital forensics AI: Evaluating, standardizing and optimizing digital evidence mining techniques. KI–Künstliche Intelligenz, 36, 143–161.

56. Casey, E., & others. (2018). Digital evidence and forensic investigation: Principles and practice.

57. Garach, J., Singh, S. K., Ravikumar, R. N., Reddy, A. P. C., & Khan, H. (2024). A comprehensive review on artificial intelligence in digital forensics with taxonomies, issues, and solutions. In Strategies for E-Commerce Data Security: Cloud, Blockchain, AI, and Machine Learning. IGI Global Scientific Publishing, 1–28.

58. Ahmed, A. A., Hossain, M. S., & others. (2024). Artificial intelligence and machine learning applications in digital forensic investigation.

59. Keim, D. A., Mansmann, F., Schneidewind, J., Thomas, J., & Ziegler, H. (2008). Visual analytics: Scope and challenges. In Visual Data Mining, 76–90. Springer.

60. Andrienko, N., Andrienko, G., Fuchs, G., Jankowski, P., & others. (2017). Visual analytics for spatial decision support: Setting the research agenda. International Journal of Geographical Information Science, 31(2), 1–20.

61. Thomas, J. J., & Cook, K. A. (2005). Illuminating the path: The research and development agenda for visual analytics. IEEE.

62. Kitchin, R., Lauriault, T. P., & McArdle, G. (2015). Knowing and governing cities through urban indicators, city benchmarking and real-time dashboards. Regional Studies, Regional Science, 2(1), 6–28.

63. Janssen, M., Charalabidis, Y., & Zuiderwijk, A. (2012). Benefits, adoption barriers and myths of open data and open government. Information Systems Management, 29(4), 258–268.

64. Adamopoulou, E., & Moussiades, L. (2020). An overview of chatbot technology. In Artificial Intelligence Applications and Innovations, 373–383. Springer.

65. Mazurier, B., et al. (2019). Conversational agents and online investigative activities in law enforcement.

66. Europol, European Commission, & United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime. (2021). Artificial intelligence, online investigations, and emerging criminal threats.

67. Følstad, A., Nordheim, C. B., & Bjørkli, C. A. (2018). What makes users trust a chatbot for customer service? An exploratory interview study. Internet Science, 194–208.

68. Wirtz, B. W., Weyerer, J. C., & Geyer, C. (2019). Artificial intelligence and the public sector—Applications and challenges. International Journal of Public Administration, 42(7), 596–615.

69. Mehrabi, N., Morstatter, F., Saxena, N., Lerman, K., & Galstyan, A. (2021). A survey on bias and fairness in machine learning. ACM Computing Surveys, 54(6), 1–35.

70. Delgado, J. J., Luque, J. M., & Payá, C. A. (2023). Technology adoption and digital transformation in contemporary policing.

71. Tabassi, E., Bender, A., & others. (2023). Artificial Intelligence Risk Management Framework (AI RMF 1.0). National Institute of Standards and Technology, Gaithersburg, MD.

72. Arrieta, A. B., Díaz-Rodríguez, N., Del Ser, J., Bennetot, A., Tabik, S., Barbado, A., García, S., Gil-López, S., Molina, D., Benjamins, R., Chatila, R., & Herrera, F. (2020). Explainable artificial intelligence (XAI): Concepts, taxonomies, opportunities and challenges toward responsible AI. Information Fusion, 58, 82–115.

73. Kroll, J. A., Huey, J., Barocas, S., Felten, E. W., Reidenberg, J. R., Robinson, D. G., & Yu, H. (2017). Accountable algorithms. University of Pennsylvania Law Review, 165(3), 633–705.

74. Simmler, M., Canova, G., & others. (2022). Algorithms in the criminal justice system: Emerging challenges for law enforcement and courts.

75. Buczak, A. L., & Guven, E. (2016). A survey of data mining and machine learning methods for cyber security intrusion detection. IEEE Communications Surveys & Tutorials, 18(2), 1153–1176.

76. Cath, C., Wachter, S., Mittelstadt, B., Taddeo, M., & Floridi, L. (2018). Artificial intelligence and the "good society": The US, EU, and UK approach. Science and Engineering Ethics, 24, 505–528.

77. Thiebes, S., Lins, S., & Sunyaev, A. (2021). Trustworthy artificial intelligence. Electronic Markets, 31, 447–464.

78. Ryan, M. (2020). In AI we trust: Ethics, artificial intelligence, and reliability. Science and Engineering Ethics, 26, 2749–2767.

79. Raji, I. D., Smart, A., White, R. N., Mitchell, M., Gebru, T., Hutchinson, B., Smith-Loud, J., Theron, D., & Barnes, P. (2020). Closing the AI accountability gap: Defining an end-to-end framework for internal algorithmic auditing. Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency, 33–44.

80. Selbst, A. D., Boyd, D., Friedler, S. A., Venkatasubramanian, S., & Vertesi, J. (2019). Fairness and abstraction in sociotechnical systems. Proceedings of the Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency, 59–68.

81. Binns, R., Van Kleek, M., Veale, M., Lyngs, U., Zhao, J., & Shadbolt, N. (2018). "It's reducing a human being to a percentage": Perceptions of justice in algorithmic decisions. Proceedings of the 2018 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems, 1–14.

82. NIST, AI Risk Management Framework Working Group, & U.S. Department of Commerce. (2023). Artificial Intelligence Risk Management Framework: Govern, map, measure, and manage. National Institute of Standards and Technology, Gaithersburg, MD.

83. Jobin, A., Ienca, M., & Vayena, E. (2019). The global landscape of AI ethics guidelines. Nature Machine Intelligence, 1(9), 389–399.

Citation: Llopart C, Rosselló D. "From Crime Analysis to Intelligent Policing A Review of the Evolving Role of Artificial Intelligence". American Research Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences, Vol 11, no. 4, 2025, pp. 46-56.