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| PART 1: Review Comments | | |
| Compulsory REVISION comments | Reviewer’s comment | Author’s Feedback*(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)* |
| **Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimumof 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.** | This manuscript is highly significant for the scientific community as it addresses the critical issue of detective workload and its impact on investigative effectiveness. By utilizing a data-driven approach to analyze how overwhelming workloads affect detectives, the study provides valuable insights into the challenges faced by law enforcement and explores evidence-based strategies to enhance productivity. The research’s focus on innovative workload management strategies, such as data-driven case prioritization and the adoption of advanced technologies, offers practical solutions to improve investigative outcomes and detective well-being. Additionally, the emphasis on maintaining a healthy work-life balance underscores the importance of addressing stress and burnout in law enforcement.  I find this manuscript particularly compelling because it combines rigorous data analysis with practical recommendations, bridging the gap between theory and real-world application. The comprehensive approach, including literature and policy reviews, ensures that the findings are well-supported and relevant to policymakers, police leadership, and detectives. This research has the potential to drive meaningful reforms in detective workload management, ultimately benefiting both the efficiency of criminal investigations and the well-being of law enforcement professionals. |  |
| **Is the title of the article suitable?**  **(If not please suggest an alternative title)** | OPTIMIZING THE DETECTIVE'S BURDEN: A DATA-DRIVEN APPROACH TO ENHANCING INVESTIGATIVE PRODUCTIVITY.  Yes, this title is suitable |  |
| Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here. | The abstract is quite detailed and lengthy. While it provides a comprehensive overview of the study, it can be made more concise by focusing on the key elements. |  |
| **Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?** | Yes, this manuscript is appropriate |  |
| **Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimumof 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.** | The manuscript demonstrates scientific robustness and technical soundness through several key aspects. First, it adopts a data-driven approach to analyze detective workload, ensuring that findings are grounded in empirical evidence rather than anecdotal observations. This methodology is crucial for producing reliable insights into the impact of workload on detective productivity and well-being.  Second, the study incorporates a comprehensive literature review and policy analysis, which strengthens its scientific validity by contextualizing findings within existing research and current practices. By examining traditional investigative practices alongside innovative strategies and technological advancements, the research provides a balanced and forward-thinking perspective.  Lastly, the manuscript addresses critical elements such as work-life balance and the integration of advanced tools, which are essential for a holistic understanding of the challenges faced by detectives. These elements not only highlight the relevance of the study but also ensure that its recommendations are both practical and actionable, benefiting policymakers, police leadership, and detectives alike. |  |
| **Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.**  **-** | While the existing references provide a strong historical and foundational context, incorporating more recent studies and sources will enhance the manuscript’s relevance and comprehensiveness. Look for updated research, policy reports, and technological reviews to ensure that the study reflects the current state of detective workload management and investigative effectiveness. |  |
| Minor REVISION commentsIs the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | The language and English quality of the article are generally suitable for scholarly communications, but there are several areas where clarity, coherence, and formal tone can be improved. |  |
| Optional/Generalcomments | Some sections are detailed, like the significance and methodology, while others, like the research focus and key arguments, lack sufficient detail. For example, the "Main Topics" and "Key Arguments" sections could benefit from more concise and focused descriptions.  In the Introduction  The passage repeats several ideas, particularly the reference to Liederbach et al. (2010) and the challenges faced by detectives due to outdated procedures and workload imbalance. The repeated mention of the same studies and challenges can make the text feel redundant and less concise.  Example: The statements "Building on the work of earlier studies..." and "We will now examine how..." essentially reiterate the same point about outdated procedures and workload imbalance without adding new information.  Some phrases are vague and lack specificity, such as "there is a ton of promise in the future" and "a reservoir of unrealized potential." These statements are broad and could be more specific to better convey the potential solutions or innovations being referred to.  The introduction makes several broad statements, such as "we may transform detective work" and "examining detective workload and offering evidence-based alternatives." These statements could be narrowed down and made more specific to highlight the particular innovations or strategies that will be discussed in the paper.  The citation style is inconsistent. For example, "Rand Corporation" is mentioned without a proper citation, and "maybe citing Eck, 1983 or Brandl& Frank, 1994" is informal and uncertain, which is not suitable for scholarly writing. Proper citation format and confidence in referencing are important in academic work.  Problem Statement: Please see the track changes  **Significance of the Study**  The provided section on the "Significance of the Study" contains several strengths, such as addressing important aspects of detective work and highlighting the potential impact of the research. However, there are some weaknesses that could be addressed to strengthen the section:  Issue: The final point about "Policy and Practice Implications" is broad and doesn't specify how the findings will translate into practical changes.  Suggestion: Clarify how the study's findings will inform specific policy changes or best practices. For example, "The findings of this study could inform specific policy changes, such as the development of standardized workload management protocols and the integration of advanced technology in detective training programs. |  |
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