|  |
| --- |
|  |
| Book Name: | [New Ideas Concerning Arts and Social Studies](https://www.bookpi.org/bookstore/product/new-ideas-concerning-arts-and-social-studies-vol-1/) |
| Manuscript Number: | **Ms\_BPR\_5152** |
| Title of the Manuscript:  | **EVALUATING THE EFFECTIVENESS OF PREDICTIVE POLICING IN NIGERIA: A QUALITATIVE STUDY OF LAW ENFORCEMENT PRACTICES IN LAGOS STATE** |
| Type of the Article | **Book chapter** |

**Special note:**

**A research paper already published in a journal can be published as a Book Chapter in an expanded form with proper copyright approval.**

**Source Article:**

**This chapter is an extended version of the article published by the same author(s) in the following journal.**

**African Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities Research, Volume 7, Issue 4, 2024**

**DOI: 10.52589/AJSSHR-POLHVJ1F**

|  |
| --- |
| PART 1: Comments |
|  | Reviewer’s comment**Artificial Intelligence (AI) generated or assisted review comments are strictly prohibited during peer review.** | 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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.** |  |  |
| **Is the title of the article suitable?****(If not please suggest an alternative title)** |  |  |
| 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. |  |  |
| **Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.**  |  |  |
| **Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.****-** |  |  |
| Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? |  |  |
| Optional/General comments | **Evaluating the Effectiveness of Predictive Policing in Nigeria: A Qualitative Study of Law Enforcement Practices in Lagos State****Review Comments****Abstract**1. Lack of Specificity on Methodology: While the abstract mentions a qualitative study, it does not specify the methods used for data collection (e.g., interviews, focus groups, observational studies). Clarifying the methodology could provide insight into the reliability and validity of the findings.
2. Limited Contextual Information: There is minimal background information specific to Nigeria’s unique social, political, and economic landscape that might impact the effectiveness of predictive policing. A brief mention of the local dynamics could enrich the understanding.
3. Absence of Stakeholder Perspectives: The abstract does not indicate whether diverse stakeholder perspectives (e.g., law enforcement officers, community members, policymakers) were considered in the evaluation, which could provide a more comprehensive view of the effectiveness of predictive policing.
4. Insufficient Discussion on Ethical Implications: While ethical concerns around predictive policing are touched on, the abstract could better address the potential implications of these ethical concerns specifically within the Nigerian context.
5. Lack of Comparative Analysis: There’s no mention of comparisons with other regions in Nigeria or internationally, which could help contextualize the findings and support or challenge the conclusions drawn.
6. Findings and Implications: The abstract does not summarize the main findings or implications of the research. It would benefit from highlighting key results to guide readers on the study’s contributions to the discourse on predictive policing.
7. Future Research Directions: There is no mention of recommendations for future research, which would be valuable for continuing the conversation around the effectiveness and ethical considerations of predictive policing in Nigeria.

Introduction1. Insufficient Local Context: While the introduction addresses the general principles of predictive policing, it does not provide specific context about its implementation in Nigeria or the unique challenges faced in Lagos State.
2. Lack of Stakeholder Perspectives: The introduction does not mention the voices or perspectives of those affected by predictive policing (e.g., community members, civil liberties advocates).

Review of Predictive Policing Tools1. Missing Nigerian Examples: The discussion on tools like PredPol overlooks the existence or non-existence of such tools in Nigeria, failing to investigate local adaptations or developments.
2. Limited Analysis of Efficacy: The section touches upon theoretical benefits but lacks an examination of empirical data, specifically from Nigeria or Lagos, making it difficult to assess effectiveness.

Bias and Ethical Concerns1. Underexplored Bias Factors: The introduction notes the potential for bias but does not delve into specific socioeconomic or ethnic contexts in Nigeria that could influence data collection and interpretation.
2. Limited Ethical Framework Discussion: The ethical implications are mentioned, but there is a lack of local ethical considerations, such as how Nigerian laws govern data privacy and surveillance.

Legal Perspectives1. Absence of Local Legal Analysis: The legal implications discussed are primarily derived from U.S. law, with no focus on Nigerian legal frameworks or specific laws that govern data use in policing.
2. Neglect of Constitutional Issues in Nigeria: Given that the Fourth Amendment references U.S. practices, there should be an examination of relevant Nigerian constitutional provisions related to individual rights and surveillance.

Effectiveness in Crime Reduction1. Lack of Empirical Evidence: The section states that empirical evidence is mixed but does not include any data or case studies from Nigeria to support or refute the claims.
2. Missing Longitudinal Studies: It should also consider the long-term effects of predictive policing on crime rates and community relations, which are crucial for a comprehensive assessment.

Conclusion1. Insufficient recommendations: The study fails to propose actionable recommendations or solutions for addressing the identified concerns, especially from a Nigerian perspective.
2. No Future Research Directions: The conclusion does not highlight areas for future research, which is crucial for ongoing dialogue on predictive policing's role in Nigeria.

Areas for Improvement:* 1. Depth of Data Analysis: While the study identifies key themes, a more detailed analysis of each theme could enhance understanding. For instance, exploring specific examples of how predictive policing has impacted decision-making in various scenarios would provide richer insights.
	2. Recommendations for Implementation: The conclusion suggests a need for improvements in regulatory frameworks and officer training. However, more concrete recommendations or best practices for integrating predictive policing tools effectively could strengthen the article.
	3. Addressing Ethical Concerns: The paper mentions concerns about privacy and bias but could benefit from a deeper exploration of ethical frameworks or guidelines that should govern the use of predictive technologies. This could include localized approaches that are respectful of community values and rights.
	4. Exploration of Broader Implications: Recommendations on how the findings could influence broader policy changes in Nigeria and similar contexts would be valuable. Discussing the potential for community engagement and trust-building could provide actionable insights for law enforcement.
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