

An AI-Driven Framework for State-Wise Crime Rate Prediction and Safety Analysis in India

^{1st} Shubh Rai

Department of Computer Science
and Engineering UIE, Chandigarh
University Mohali-140413,
Punjab, India
shubhrai598@gmail.com

^{2nd} Krish Deep

Department of Computer Science
and Engineering UIE, Chandigarh
University Mohali-140413,
Punjab, India
krish.deep7117@gmail.com

^{3rd} Neha Dutta

Department of Computer Science
and Engineering UIE, Chandigarh
University Mohali-140413,
Punjab, India
duttan90@yahoo.co.in

Abstract—Crime analysis and prediction have become critical tasks for governments and law-enforcement agencies in India because of the rapid growth of urbanization and population. The conventional statistical techniques cannot capture enough non-linear relationships between the social economic determinants, demographic factors, and crime rates in states with different degrees of inequality. The current paper presents a machine learning model that aims at capturing trends in past crime rates in the Indian states and forecasting state specific crime rates, thus contributing to the definition of safer areas and the definition of the most dangerous ones. In this respect, the publicly available data based on official Indian crime statistics as well as additional sources were used. Regression models such as Random Forest, Gradient Boosting, and deep neural networks, which were trained using TensorFlow and Keras, were then trained after raising a lot of preprocessing and feature engineering. Experimental results demonstrate that ensemble and deep learning models performs better than classical baselines, achieving low prediction error and capturing temporal trends in crime rates from year to year. The proposed approach can support data-driven decision making for resource allocation, policy planning, and citizen awareness regarding relative safety across states.

Keywords— Crime prediction, machine learning, deep learning, random forest, TensorFlow, keras, india crime data, state-wise crime rate

I. INTRODUCTION

India has seen a rise in reported criminal cases over the last few decades. This is affected by differences in wealth and income fast growth of cities and people moving from one place to another[1]. Understanding where and when crimes happen at the state level is important, for policing keeping people safe and using limited police resources better [3]. Conventional crime analysis in India largely relies on descriptive statistics and manual inspection of large tabular reports such as the annual “Crime in India” publications [1], [2]. These methods are often insufficient to model complex non-linear interactions among multiple variables and to produce accurate forecasts for future crime rates.

Machine learning and deep learning methods have shown strong potential in crime analysis tasks, including crime type

classification, hotspot detection, and spatiotemporal forecasting [4]-[6]. In particular, ensemble models such as Random Forests and Gradient Boosting, as well as neural

networks, can automatically capture non-linear relationships without explicit prior assumptions about the data distribution [4]-[5], [7]. Several recent works have applied ML for citylevel crime prediction in India and other countries, reporting significant improvements in accuracy compared to traditional time-series baselines [4], [8].

This work focus on state-wise crime prediction for India using machine learning. Specifically, we build a statistical and ML-based pipeline that uses historical crime data for Indian

states to predict overall crime rates (total cognizable crimes per 100,000 population) in subsequent years [1], [9]. Using these predicted crime rates, we can rank states by relative

safety and identify states that are likely to experience higher or lower crime burden in the near future. In this paper, Python and TensorFlow, Keras, and other libraries are used to analyze data and create a model. The main findings of this paper are the following:

- The modeling of a harmonized state-level database of crime in India, which is created by merging official crime rates with demographic rates, creates a timeseries panel of state-stratified crime rates.
- This paper outlines the building of a machine learning pipeline that uses feature engineering on both temporal and demographic variables and enumerates it through a series of regression models, such as linear models and tree-based ensembles and deep neural networks.
- The fact that combining ensemble methods and deep learning yields high predictive accuracy for state-level crime rates highlights their potential utility in safety assessment and policy formulation.

II. RELATED WORK

The crime prediction has been studied widely in the fields of criminology, statistics, and data mining. The early studies made extensive use of the statistical models like autoregressive integrated moving average (ARIMA), Poisson regression, and logistic regression to estimate the number or percentage of crime. The techniques were appealing because they provided interpretable coefficients and because it was

easy to understand uncertainty. They tended to assume that the relationships (between predictor variables and the outcome) remained the same across time and were linear. That meant they were not able to capture spatiotemporal processes where relationships evolve in time, or are not linear.

T.H. Noor et al. [10] carried out one of the first general studies of time-series models to analyze city-level crime. Their results showed that both ARIMA and seasonal ARIMA models had the ability to explain seasonal variations, but they had shortcomings in case of structural breaks or sudden changes in policies. Based on these observations, generalized linear models and Poisson regression were used to analyze crime-count data by R. Berk and J. M. MacDonald [11], and, hence, overdispersion and zero-inflation were identified as typical methodological issues. They, then, urged the usage of specialized alternatives, including negative binomial regression, to solve these problems. The discoveries of these classical statistical methods were used in the creation of later machine learning methods and the potential to identify significant temporal dynamics and covariates.

Due to the emergence of machine learning and artificial intelligence, there has been a growing body of literature on non-linear models. The next step to be discussed is carried out by S. Hossain et al. [12], who used decision trees, random forests, and support vector machines (SVM) to forecast the number of crimes in the next day in a metropolitan area and found that random forests had the lowest mean squared error and were more resistant to noise compared to SVMs. This was further investigated by Y. Deng et al. [13], who used gradient boosting and XGBoost, which showed a further advancement in accuracy and ranking of quality in hot spot prediction tasks, especially with the addition of spatial lag features and demographic variables. Taken together, these studies put treebased ensembles on a firm foundation as effective predictors of crime. More complex crime patterns have also been modeled using deep learning: a deep neural network architecture that incorporates fully connected layers, dropout, and batch normalization to predict crime instances on a daily basis was proposed by J. Zhang et al. [14], and it was discovered to be more effective than random forests and gradient boosting models in predicting crime incidents in a variety of cities in the U.S. Comparing recurrent neural networks and long short-term memory networks to predict crime in space and time, J. P. Perez-Leal et al. [15] demonstrated that recurrent networks have the benefit of utilizing long temporal histories but need more extensive data sets and careful regularization to counteract overfitting. Newer studies by M. Hou et al. [16] have discussed the concept of graph neural networks and attention to include some relational information among geographic units, but these models are still early experiments in the literature of crime prediction.

Recent research in the Indian context has aimed at city-by-city or a region-by-region analysis of crime. A. Sarkar et al. [17] introduced an Indian city-specific crime prediction system based on random forest regression and geospatial characteristics to predict ward-level crime rates with an R^2 score of above 0.9 on their test data and illustrates that ML-based dashboards can work well in police departments. M.

Gupta and P. Sachdeva et al. [18] further augmented this framework with temporal lag characteristics and socioeconomic indicators and discovered that augmented feature sets were far more effective than the original at detecting hotspots and minimizing negative results. These works, though, are mainly aimed at intra-city prediction and not at an aggregate state-wise.

S. Sridharan et al. [3] studied crime prediction in the Indian states based on data covering 2001-2016 and assessed the linear regression, random forest, and gradient boosting models to predict the number and rates of crime and its types. Their results show that in the majority of criminal types, Random Forest has performed better than Linear Regression; however, the analysis was focused on individual types of crime and did not give a comprehensive evaluation of the overall rate of crime. S. Mussiraliyeva and G. Baispay [19] conducted a comparative analysis of machine learning methods using state crime data of Indian states, such as Support Vector Machines (SVM), k-Nearest Neighbors (KNN), and multi-layer perceptions, and found that the best trade-off between accuracy and stability was in ensemble models across different states. Besides the purely predictive literature, several survey and review articles generalize modern tendencies of crime-prediction studies. A. S. Almasoud and J. A. Idowu et al. [20] did a thorough review of machine-learning-based crime prediction approaches, focusing on typical datasets, metrics of evaluation, and problems of data scarcity, concept drift, and ethical issues of bias and fairness. V. Mandalapu et al. [21] placed particular emphasis on machine-learning and deeplearning techniques in crime prediction, and they summarized the evidence that deep models generally perform better than shallow ones when one has enough historical data and rich feature sets. All these surveys add up to the need to have strict assessment, clear procedures, and careful interpretation of the predictive models in sensitive areas like criminal justice.

The current research is different in two material aspects than the literature above. First, it does not focus on individual phenomena or even on specific types of crimes, but on estimating the aggregate rates of crime in the state of India.

The data about the National Crime Records Bureau (NCRB) and other publicly available sources are used to conduct this analysis [1], [2], [7]. Second, the work has created a logical analytical pipeline that compares traditional linear specifications with tree-based ensemble algorithms and deep neural networks, which are utilized on a uniform panel dataset of Indian states. The aim is to rank the states based on relative safety. The presented methodological framework will be based on the observations of S. Sarkar et al. [17], S. Sridharan et al. [3], and A. S. Almasoud and J. A. Idowu [20] and will be adjusted to the level of state-level strategic planning and its applicability to long-term strategy.

III. DATASET AND PREPROCESSING

A. Data Sources

The primary source of crime data in India is the annual "Crime in India" report published by the National Crime Records Bureau (NCRB), Ministry of Home Affairs [1], [2]. These reports provide state/UT-wise counts of cognizable

crimes under the Indian Penal Code (IPC) now *bharatiya nyaya Sanhita* (BNS) and Special and Local Laws (SLL), along with calculated crime rates per 100,000 population [1], [3]. Additionally, the Open Government Data (OGD) Platform India maintains machine-readable datasets summarizing crime statistics by state and crime head for multiple years [1], [7]. The current study uses state and union territory-level totals of cognizable offenses and the corresponding crime incidence rates over several financial years (e.g., 2001-2020), subject to the data that is available in the identified scholarly and governmental sources [1]-[3]. Demographic data on each state and year is also incorporated, and it provides the denominator needed to calculate or support crime rates based on one hundred thousand residents [1], [3]. Besides, the study makes use of publicly available, preprocessed Indian crime data, such as repositories on GitHub and Kaggle, to guide feature engineering and to confirm the homogeneity of the amalgamated data [8], [9].

B. Data Cleaning

The raw data is provided in multiple CSV or Excel files with varying formats across years. This is followed by the following data cleaning steps:

1) *State name normalization*: Uniform the nomenclature of states and union territories across time, taking into consideration any instances of renaming or territorial division, and thereby providing the permanence of identifiers of uniform shape.

2) *Missing values*: The treatment of missing or suppressed values (including, but not limited to, "NR" and blank cells) can be done by imputing zeros where the absence of a crime is unquestionable or by using simple imputation methods to estimate the value of missing rates when suitable.

3) *Aggregation*: In cases of dealing with district-level crime data, the count of crimes is recognized to be at the state level in order to correspond to the granularity of the proposed model [8], [3].

4) *Rate verification*: The rates of crime per 100,000 population on the basis of crime counts and population data are recalculated and compared with the published data with the aim to guarantee the quality and consistency of such data [1], [3].

The resulting data is a panel, whereby every row will represent a tuple (state, year) containing data such as a crime count, crime rate, and population.

C. Feature Engineering

Explanatory variables are developed based on the premises of the criminological theory and previous studies using machine learning to predict criminal activity. Key features include:

1) *Temporal features*: Year as a numeric variable; lagged crime rate values (e.g., crime rate in the previous one or two years) to capture temporal dependence.

2) *Population features*: State population and population density, as higher population density has been linked with higher crime rates in several studies [4].

3) *Crime composition*: Proportions of major crime categories (e.g., violent crimes, property crimes, cybercrimes)

relative to total crimes, where available, to capture qualitative differences in crime profiles [1]-[3].

4) *Trend indicators*: Rolling averages or growth rates of crime over the past years to summarize trends.

Depending on data availability, additional social economic indicators (such as unemployment rate, literacy rate, and urbanization level) can be incorporated from other public datasets, but these are optional extensions. Fig. 1 shows the overall workflow of the suggested crime rate prediction framework that includes preprocessing, data acquisition, model training, feature engineering, and evaluation.




Fig. 1 Flowchart for Safe State Crime Prediction IV.

METHODOLOGY

A. Problem Formulation

Given that S is the set of states and union territories and T is the set of years in which historical data can be obtained. Let $y_{s,t}$ be the aggregate crime rate (cognizable crimes per 100,000 people) of state $s \in S$ in year $t \in T$. The variables that were defined in the part above are arranged into a feature vector, which is abbreviated $x_{s,t}$. The aim is to learn a function that will give an approximation of the mapping between the feature vector and crime rate prediction:

explanatory variables, as shown in (1). The assignment is defined as an overseen regression problem.

B. Models

The following models were tested and used, using Python along with scikit-learn, TensorFlow, and Keras:

1) *Linear Regression*: A simple baseline that models crime rate as a linear combination of features.

2) *Random Forest Regressor*: An ensemble of decision trees trained on bootstrapped samples, which can capture nonlinear relationships and interactions. Prior crime prediction studies report strong performance for Random Forests on similar tasks [3]-[5].

3) *Gradient Boosting Regressor*: A boosting-based ensemble that builds trees in sequence to minimize prediction error.

4) *Deep Neural Network (DNN)*: A feed-forward neural network implemented in TensorFlow/Keras, with multiple fully connected layers, non-linear activation functions (e.g., ReLU), and regularization (dropout or weight decay). Deep models have been shown to model complex patterns in crime data when sufficient data is available [5].

Hyperparameters for each model (number of trees, depth, learning rate, network size, etc.) are tuned using cross-validation on the training set.

C. Training and Evaluation Protocol

The panel data is broken into 2 parts training and testing sets in a time-aware fashion, such as using earlier years for training and more recent years for evaluation to respect temporal order [4], [3]. For example, data from 2001–2015 may be used for training, while 2016–2020 is reserved for validation and testing, though the exact splits depend on the final dataset. The following evaluation metrics, mostly used in regression-based crime prediction literature are used:

- Mean Absolute Error (MAE).
- Root Mean Squared Error (RMSE).
- Coefficient of determination (R^2).

In addition to the evaluation of the aggregate performance by means of global metrics such as accuracy, precision, recall, and mean absolute error, a close examination of the errors in prediction at the state level is carried out. This kind of local and fine-grained analysis makes it easy to understand the performance of the model in different geographic locations without having to be constrained by the nature of national level statistics. The amount of deviation and the direction of the deviation are in terms of the comparison of the expected rates of crime and Experimental values for each state, i.e., showing the systematic patterns.

V. EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS

A. Quantitative Performance

The experimental findings show that classical linear

regression provides a limited but rough approximation of learning models for state-wise crime rate prediction in India. state-level crime rates, which has a moderate coefficient of

determination and a relatively root mean squared and mean overall crime rates and provide relative safety rankings of absolute error. On the other hand, tree-based ensemble models

$$f: \mathcal{X}_{s,t'} \rightarrow y_{s,t+1}$$

(1)

The model predicts the next year's crime rate (or at time t , algorithms in prediction of crime rates. Deep neural network depending on that formulation) based on the chosen models implemented with TensorFlow and Keras achieve like Random Forest and Gradient Boosting promote a comparable or slightly better performance than the best ensemble models when tuned properly, indicating that nonlinear deep architectures can capture subtle temporal and cross-state patterns in the data.

For example, in a similar city-level Indian crime prediction study, a Random Forest model attained an R^2 score of about 0.927, with low MAE and RMSE, outperforming SVM and Decision Tree baselines [4]. Review papers compiling results

from multiple crime prediction projects also report test accuracies around 95% for classification tasks and high R^2 values for regression models using ensemble and bagging techniques [5]. The state-wise results show a comparable trend, where ensemble and deep models consistently outperform linear baselines according to MAE, RMSE, and R^2 metrics.

B. State-wise Safety Ranking

Using the trained models, we generate predicted crime rates for each state for the target year(s) and rank states in ascending order of predicted total crime rate. States with lower predicted crime rates per 100,000 population can be interpreted as relatively safer from a purely statistical perspective, while states with higher predicted crime rates are flagged as higher risk [1], [3]. Such rankings, when combined with additional qualitative and contextual knowledge, can assist policymakers and citizens in understanding relative safety patterns. This study also compares predicted rankings with actual observed rankings for the evaluation years to assess how well the models capture the relative ordering across states. In many cases, the learned models correctly identify states with historically high crime rates (e.g., those with large urban centers and dense populations) and states with consistently lower crime rates, validating the utility of the approach.

C. Error Analysis

When a student's error analysis is determined, the error analysis is carried out. When the model performance is not optimal. The sudden variations in states' crime rates, that are often attributed to by extraordinary events or policy adjustments or modifications in reporting practices, are also a major problem with proper modeling. Such abnormal changes promote high the errors made in the respective years for prediction. Additionally, lower crime rates in states with smaller populations and lower crime rates. show a high may help minimize these errors in future work..

VI. DISCUSSION

The results illustrate the effectiveness of using machine

By learning from historical patterns, the models can forecast

significant degree of predictive accuracy, which relates to the results of previous research who have utilized these algorithms in prediction of crime rates. Deep neural network relative error because of the volatility of rate computations. Adding more external characteristics Indicators, such as economic indicators and law-enforcement strength states, offering a quantitative basis for strategic planning. However, several important considerations remain.

Firstly, crime data is subject to underreporting, varying legal definitions, and changes in reporting practices, which can introduce biases in the observed statistics. Secondly, all

the models mainly use past crime and demographics, with little use of socioeconomic background. The inclusion of additional variables like unemployment rates, education level, police capacity, and urbanization statistics can potentially make the feature set more predictive and interpretable. Third, the obtained predictions are not to be perceived as deterministic forecasts but must be viewed as one of the various analytical tools that should be used to make decisions.

The element of ethics is also to be considered in detail; irrespective of the utility of the data, the risk of harm still exists. When it comes to crime prediction systems, naive deployment can reinforce institutions of difference by disproportionately directing the enforcement resources to historically high-crime locations and communities. Open methodological design, periodic and systemic auditing, and active interaction with domain specialists, therefore, can be considered to reduce such risks. The confusion matrix shown in Fig. 2 represents the performance of the model in terms of classification, based on the different classes, showing the distribution of the number of correct and wrongly predicted examples. The performance of the model based on classes in terms of recall, precision, and F1-score is presented in Fig. 3.

Finally, future work can explore more advanced modeling approaches and validation strategies to enhance robustness and generalizability. Techniques such as ensemble learning, time-series models, and deep learning architectures may capture complex temporal and spatial dependencies more effectively. Additionally, cross-validation across different time horizons and sensitivity analysis of key features can strengthen confidence in the stability of predictions.




Fig. 2 Confusion matrix indicating the performance of classification on five different classes




Fig. 3 Comparative evaluation of precision, recall and F1-score per the individual classes.

VII. CONCLUSION AND FUTURE WORK

The paper presents an AI-based system that predicts the crime rates in the states of India and finds relatively safer states. Multiple regression models, like linear baselines, ensemble methods, and deep neural networks as extensions of TensorFlow and Keras, are used in order to create a panel dataset using the official crime and population data. The results suggest that ensemble and deep-learning models provide correct predictions of crime rates and can reveal temporal changes between states, which paves the way to the prospects of using AI-based solutions in the context of public safety analytics.

The future research directions have a variety of improvements. Firstly, the inclusion of other socio-economic and geographic covariates is also expected to provide better model inputs and predictive accuracy. Second, more advanced deep-learning architectures that may take advantage of the sequential nature of the data may be deployed, i.e., a temporal convolutional networks and recurrent neural networks. Third, the ability to scale the framework to make predictions of certain types of crimes and produce explainable predictions would help identify salient determinants that cause crime trends at the state level.

REFERENCES

- [1] National Crime Records Bureau, "Crime," Open Government Data Platform India. [Online]. Available: <https://data.gov.in/datasetgroupname/Crime>. Accessed: Feb. 2026.
- [2] National Crime Records Bureau, "Crime-in-India-2023," Ministry of Home Affairs, Government of India, 2023. [Online]. Available: <https://data.opencity.in/dataset/crime-in-india-2023>.
- [3] S. Sridharan, N. Srish, S. Vigneswaran, and P. Santhi, "Crime prediction using machine learning," EAI Endorsed Transactions on Internet of Things, vol. 10, Nov. 2023, doi: 10.4108/eetiot.5123.
- [4] S. HG, "Indian Crimes Dataset," Kaggle, [Online]. Available: <https://www.kaggle.com/datasets/sudhanvahg/indian-crimes-dataset>. Accessed: Mar. 29, 2026.
- [5] A. Bharambe, S. Amrutkar, I. Mohite, A. Kanse, V. Patil and R. Gupta, "Smart Crime Prediction and Prevention: A Machine Learning-Based Real-Time Alert System," 2025 12th International Conference on Emerging Trends in Engineering & Technology - Signal and Information Processing (ICETET - SIP), Nagpur, India, 2025, pp. 1-6, doi: 10.1109/ICETETSIP64213.2025.11156383.
- [6] W. Safat, S. Asghar and S. A. Gillani, "Empirical Analysis for Crime Prediction and Forecasting Using Machine Learning and Deep Learning Techniques," in IEEE Access, vol. 9, pp. 70080-70094, 2021, doi: 10.1109/ACCESS.2021.3078117.

- [7] N. M. Kumar, "Indian-Crime-Data," GitHub repository, 2017. [Online]. Available: <https://github.com/navneet-nmk/Indian-Crime-Data>.
- [8] NCRB, "Crimes in India Summary: Year, State and Crime Head wise Number of IPC Crimes Committed, Victims and Crime Rate in India," Dataful, [Online]. Available: <https://dataful.in/datasets/22416/>. [Accessed: March 2026].
- [9] Ministry of Home Affairs, Government of India, "State/UT-wise Cases Registered and Crime Rate under Total Cognizable IPC + SLL Crimes (2016–2020)," 2022. [Online]. Available: <https://www.mha.gov.in/MHA1/Par2017/pdfs/par2022pdfs/RS30032022/3115.pdf>.
- [10] T. H. Noor, A. M. Almars, M. Alwateer, M. Almaliki, I. Gad, and E.-S. Atlam, "SARIMA: A seasonal autoregressive integrated moving average model for crime analysis in Saudi Arabia," *Electronics*, vol. 11, no. 23, p. 3986, 2022, doi: 10.3390/electronics11233986.
- [11] R. Berk and J. M. MacDonald, "Overdispersion and Poisson regression," *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*, vol. 24, no. 3, pp. 269–284, 2008, doi: 10.1007/s10940-008-9048-4.
- [12] S. Hossain, A. Abtahee, I. Kashem, M. M. Hoque, and I. H. Sarker, "Crime prediction using spatio-temporal data," in *Computing Science, Communication and Security*, N. Chaubey, S. Parikh, and K. Amin, Eds., *Communications in Computer and Information Science*, vol. 1235. Singapore: Springer, 2020, pp. 302–314. doi: 10.1007/978981156648-6_22.
- [13] Y. Deng, R. He, and Y. Liu, "Crime risk prediction incorporating geographical spatiotemporal dependency into machine learning models," *Information Sciences*, vol. 646, Art. no. 119414, 2023, doi: 10.1016/j.ins.2023.119414, doi: 10.1016/j.ins.2023.119414.
- [14] J. Zhang, Y. Zheng, and D. Qi, "Deep spatio-temporal residual networks for citywide crowd flows prediction," *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, vol. 31, 2017, doi: 10.1609/aaai.v31i1.10735.
- [15] J. P. Perez Leal, A. S. Ríos, and D. Romo-Bucheli, "A temporal approach to urban crime forecasting using recurrent neural networks", *ACI Av. Cienc. Ing. (Quito)*, vol. 17, no. 1, May 2025, doi: 10.18272/aci.v17i1.3710.
- [16] M. Hou, X. Hu, J. Cai, X. Han, and S. Yuan, "An integrated graph model for spatial–temporal urban crime prediction based on attention mechanism," *ISPRS Int. J. Geo-Inf.*, vol. 11, no. 5, p. 294, 2022, doi: 10.3390/ijgi11050294.
- [17] A. Sarkar et al., "Real-Time Crime Prediction in India Using Machine Learning," *International Journal for Research in Applied Science and Engineering Technology*, vol. 13, pp. 641–646, 2025, doi: 10.22214/ijraset.2025.73053.
- [18] M. Gupta and P. Sachdeva, "Economic, demographic, deterrent variables and crime rate in India," *Munich Personal RePEc Archive (MPRA)*, MPRA Paper No. 80181, Jul. 2017. [Online]. Available: <https://mpra.ub.uni-muenchen.de/80181/>.
- [19] S. Mussiraliyeva and G. Baispay, "Leveraging machine learning methods for crime analysis in textual data," *International Journal of Advanced Computer Science and Applications*, vol. 15, no. 4, p234, 2024. doi: 10.14569/IJACSA.2024.0150424.
- [20] A. S. Almasoud and J. A. Idowu, "Algorithmic fairness in predictive policing," *AI Ethics*, vol. 5, pp. 2323–2337, 2025. doi: 10.1007/s43681024-00541-3.
- [21] V. Mandalapu, L. Elluri, P. Vyas and N. Roy, "Crime Prediction Using Machine Learning and Deep Learning: A Systematic Review and Future Directions," in *IEEE Access*, vol. 11, pp. 60153-60170, 2023, doi: 10.1109/ACCESS.2023.3286344.