DATA-DRIVEN INTELLIGENCE IN DRUG CRIME PREVENTION: PREDICTIVE ANALYTICS, CASE STUDIES, AND ETHICAL PERSPECTIVES

Mátyás Szabolcs[1], PhD
Sivadó Máté, PhD
Ludovika University of Public Service, Budapest, Hungary

ABSTRACT

Purpose: This paper aims to synthesize current evidence on predictive analytics for drug crime prevention, examining the technical foundations, real-world applications, ethical implications, and emerging regulatory frameworks. Drug-related crime poses multifaceted challenges spanning public health, security, and governance. The purpose is to provide a comprehensive overview that integrates insights from criminology, data science, public health, and policy studies to guide evidence-based implementation of predictive tools in drug enforcement while addressing critical concerns about bias, privacy, and accountability.

Design/Methods/Approach: We employ a systematic literature review methodology, examining academic research, technical reports, policy documents, and case evaluations from diverse jurisdictions. The review covers analytic foundations (near-repeat models, risk terrain modeling, spatio-temporal forecasting, network analytics), data integration challenges, and application domains ranging from hotspot policing to online trafficking intelligence and overdose early-warning systems. Case studies from the United States, European Union, and Asia-Pacific regions illustrate implementation successes and failures. We critically assess effectiveness evidence through randomized controlled trials, quasi-experimental studies, and audit reports, while examining ethical and legal frameworks including the EU AI Act's provisions on predictive policing and high-risk AI systems.

Findings: Evidence demonstrates that spatio-temporal forecasting and environmental risk modeling can improve resource allocation and crime prevention when implemented with adequate governance. Randomized field trials show gains over analyst baselines in specific contexts. However, person-based risk scoring has encountered significant challenges related to construct validity, data drift, and fairness concerns, leading to decommissioning in several jurisdictions. Public health integration through overdose surveillance systems (e.g., ODMAP) enables effective early warning and intervention. Critical barriers include data quality issues, algorithmic bias amplifying structural inequalities, transparency deficits hindering accountability, and tensions between enforcement efficiency and civil liberties. The EU AI Act's prohibition of predictive policing applications and stringent requirements for high-risk AI reflect growing regulatory scrutiny.

Originality/Value: This paper provides a comprehensive synthesis bridging technical analytics, empirical evaluation, and normative concerns in drug crime prediction. It advances understanding by: (1) systematically mapping the distinct characteristics of drug markets that shape analytic requirements; (2) connecting enforcement applications to public health surveillance and harm reduction strategies; (3) critically examining fairness trade-offs and inherent limitations of algorithmic prediction; (4) situating predictive policing within evolving regulatory frameworks, notably the EU AI Act;

1 matyas.szabolcs@uni-nke.hu

and (5) proposing practical safeguards and research priorities. The work contributes to responsible innovation by emphasizing that predictive tools should complement, not replace, comprehensive strategies centered on public health, prevention, community trust, and social equity. For practitioners and policymakers, it offers evidence-based guidance on when and how to deploy analytics while managing risks and maintaining legitimacy.

Keywords: predictive policing; drug markets; overdose surveillance; algorithmic fairness; EU AI Act; risk terrain modeling; near-repeat analysis; spatio-temporal forecasting

About the authors

Mátyás Szabolcs (Ph.D.) is a police lieutenant-colonel and associate professor at the Ludovika University of Public Service, Budapest, Hungary. His research focuses on predictive policing, crime analysis, and the criminology of drug-related offenses. He has been involved in the development of predictive analytics software and has published extensively on law enforcement innovation and crime prevention strategies.

Sivadó Máté (Ph.D.) is a police major and associate professor at the Ludovika University of Public Service, Budapest, Hungary. His research interests include criminal justice technology, data-driven policing, and the application of artificial intelligence in law enforcement. He has contributed to several research projects examining the intersection of technology, crime prevention, and human rights.

INTRODUCTION

Illicit drug markets undermine public safety and well-being across multiple dimensions: trafficking fuels violence and organized crime, corrodes institutions through corruption, strains health systems with addiction and overdose crises, and generates enormous social and economic costs (EMCDDA & Europol, 2024; UNODC, 2024). The scale and adaptability of these markets—characterized by the rapid emergence of new psychoactive substances, shifting smuggling routes, sophisticated money laundering networks, and coordination through encrypted digital platforms—pose formidable challenges to conventional law enforcement approaches that rely primarily on reactive investigation and interdiction.

In response to these challenges, many jurisdictions have experimented with data-driven methods broadly referred to as predictive policing, which aim to anticipate crime patterns and deploy resources proactively rather than reactively (Perry et al., 2013; Storbeck, 2022). These approaches promise to shift law enforcement from responding to crimes after they occur to preventing them through strategic intervention at predicted times and locations, or by targeting individuals and networks assessed as high-risk. The theoretical appeal is compelling: by leveraging large datasets, advanced analytics, and machine learning algorithms, police agencies could theoretically optimize resource allocation, disrupt criminal networks before they cause harm, and ultimately reduce crime rates and associated social costs.

However, the practical implementation of predictive analytics in policing has proven far more complex and controversial than early proponents anticipated. The initial enthusiasm—when predictive policing was often portrayed as a revolutionary 'crystal ball' capable of forecasting crime with near-perfect accuracy—has given way to a more sober understanding of both the potential and the limitations of these tools. As Mátyás et al. (2025) observe, predictive policing was a 'magic word' for a long time, with many expecting miracles and 100% accuracy. When reality failed to meet these inflated expectations, disillusionment followed, and many stakeholders turned away from these technologies altogether.

The history of predictive policing illustrates this trajectory. The first predictive policing software was developed in Hungary in 2004, capable of predicting five types of property crimes. American and

Italian systems followed, and the 2010s saw a proliferation of hundreds of software tools claiming to predict various crime types with varying degrees of efficiency. It appeared that predictive analytics might indeed revolutionize policing practice. However, by the late 2010s and early 2020s, significant concerns about civil liberties, fairness, and effectiveness emerged. Human rights organizations raised alarms about ethnic profiling, discriminatory impacts on marginalized communities, and lack of transparency and accountability. These concerns led to the discontinuation of predictive policing programs in numerous jurisdictions. Even prominent systems like PredPol (later rebranded as Geolitica) faced discontinuation in major cities such as Los Angeles following audits that revealed implementation problems, inconclusive evidence of effectiveness, and civil rights concerns (LAPD OIG, 2019).

This paper aims to provide a comprehensive, evidence-based assessment of predictive analytics in drug crime prevention. We first outline what makes drug-related crime different from other offense types and why these differences matter for analytic approaches. We then review the analytic foundations—including near-repeat dynamics, risk terrain modeling, spatio-temporal forecasting, and network analytics—and examine the diverse data sources that feed predictive systems. Subsequently, we explore application areas ranging from hotspot policing and targeted patrol deployment to online trafficking intelligence, overdose early-warning systems, and prevention-oriented interventions. Illustrative case studies from the United States, Europe, and Asia demonstrate real-world implementations, highlighting both successes and failures.

Critically, we evaluate the evidence of effectiveness through randomized controlled trials, quasi-experimental studies, and audit reports, finding mixed results that depend heavily on context, implementation quality, and the specific type of predictive tool deployed. We then examine ethical, legal, and social considerations, including algorithmic bias and disparate impact (Lum & Isaac, 2016; Barocas & Selbst, 2016), inherent fairness trade-offs (Kleinberg et al., 2017), transparency and accountability deficits, privacy concerns, and evolving regulatory frameworks such as the EU AI Act (Regulation (EU) 2024/1689), which explicitly prohibits certain predictive policing applications and imposes stringent requirements on high-risk AI systems in law enforcement.

The authors bring practical experience to this analysis, having worked for years on both the criminology of drug crime and the development and evaluation of predictive policing technologies. In 2024, they participated in the development of accident prediction software, which inspired them to address the question of how drug-related crime can be predicted in principle and practice. This study represents the first stage of ongoing research aimed at laying theoretical foundations. The second stage will involve reviewing and processing several hundred drug-related criminal cases from Hungary to develop algorithms potentially suitable for predicting drug-related crimes. If permissions are obtained, the research will also incorporate camera surveillance data and geographical factors—such as settlement structure (Bói, 2024) and hotspot patterns (Vajda, 2024)—which play significant roles in drug crime commission.

While the role of predictive analytics has diminished in many Western countries due to civil liberties concerns and disappointing results, other nations—including China, India, and several Southeast Asian countries—continue to expand their use of predictive technologies in law enforcement. This divergence reflects different governance philosophies, legal frameworks, and societal priorities regarding the balance between security and privacy. The authors maintain that software itself cannot be inherently racist or discriminatory, but its design, implementation, and use must rigorously protect human rights, human dignity, and equal treatment regardless of race, ethnicity, origin, language, religion, or other protected characteristics. With appropriate algorithmic design, governance safeguards, and oversight mechanisms, predictive software can have a legitimate and valuable place in law enforcement—provided it complements rather than replaces comprehensive strategies centered on public health, prevention, community partnership, and social equity.

WHY DRUG-RELATED CRIME IS DIFFERENT

Drug-related crime differs from conventional offenses in fundamental ways that profoundly shape detection strategies, analytic approaches, and prevention efforts. Understanding these differences is essential for designing effective predictive systems. First, drug offenses are often characterized as 'victimless crimes' in the narrow criminal-law sense, meaning there is no immediate complainant reporting the offense to authorities. Unlike robbery, assault, or burglary—where victims typically alert police—drug transactions occur between willing participants (buyers and sellers) who have strong incentives to avoid detection. This consensual nature complicates discovery and means that official statistics on drug crime heavily reflect enforcement patterns and priorities rather than true crime prevalence, introducing significant measurement and reporting biases into any predictive model.

Second, drug markets are organized as multi-level, adaptive networks that span both offline logistics and online marketplaces. Unlike many property crimes committed by individual offenders, drug trafficking involves complex supply chains with distinct roles: cultivation or manufacturing, international smuggling, wholesale distribution, mid-level dealing, and retail sales. These networks exhibit sophisticated organizational structures, often involving connections to broader organized crime groups that also engage in human trafficking, weapons smuggling, money laundering, and corruption. The networks are adaptive, quickly adjusting to enforcement pressure by changing routes, methods, and personnel (EMCDDA & Europol, 2024; UNODC, 2024). This adaptability means that traditional reactive policing may disrupt specific actors or operations but often fails to dismantle the underlying market structures.

Third, drug-related harms cut across multiple domains—health, social, and economic—in ways that require cross-sectoral responses beyond traditional law enforcement. Problematic drug use contributes to addiction, overdose mortality, infectious disease transmission (HIV, hepatitis C), mental health crises, family disruption, and community destabilization. The recent surge in synthetic opioid-related overdoses, particularly involving fentanyl and its analogues, has created a public health emergency in many countries. Effective responses therefore require integration of public health interventions—including harm reduction, treatment access, overdose prevention, and social support services—with enforcement efforts. Predictive analytics can support this integration by identifying not only enforcement targets but also locations and populations where health interventions are most urgently needed.

Fourth, the drug market is highly dynamic, characterized by continuous innovation and evolution. Novel psychoactive substances (NPS) appear regularly, often designed to circumvent existing legal controls. Smuggling routes shift in response to interdiction efforts, with traffickers exploiting new transit countries, transportation methods, and concealment techniques. Retail modalities evolve rapidly, moving from traditional street corners to encrypted messaging apps, social media platforms, and darknet markets that offer anonymity and international reach. This dynamism requires predictive systems that can adapt to emerging patterns and integrate real-time intelligence rather than relying solely on historical crime data.

Fifth, the consequences of drug markets extend well beyond drug use itself. Drug-related income fuels organized crime and generates violence through territorial disputes, enforcement of debts, and elimination of rivals. Drug trafficking organizations often infiltrate and corrupt legitimate businesses, transportation hubs (especially ports and airports), financial institutions, and government agencies, undermining rule of law and institutional integrity. The economic costs include not only enforcement expenditures but also lost productivity, healthcare costs, incarceration expenses, and the broader social costs of addiction and community disruption (EMCDDA & Europol, 2024; UNODC, 2024).

These distinctive features favor proactive, network-aware, intelligence-led, and cross-sector strategies rather than purely reactive, patrol-driven, or arrest-focused policing. Predictive analytics, when properly designed and implemented, can support such strategies by: identifying spatial and temporal patterns in retail drug markets; mapping trafficking networks and supply chains; detecting emerging trends in drug types, prices, and purity; forecasting overdose hotspots to enable rapid public health response; and optimizing allocation of limited enforcement and treatment resources. However, the same features that make drug crime distinctive also create challenges for predictive modeling—including data gaps, measurement bias, network complexity, and the need to balance enforcement objectives with public health and human rights considerations.

ANALYTIC FOUNDATIONS

Spatio-Temporal Forecasting and Near-Repeat Dynamics

Crime science research demonstrates that criminal events cluster in both space and time, exhibiting patterns that can be exploited for prediction. Near-repeat models formalize the observation that one crime event temporarily elevates the risk of subsequent events at the same location or nearby locations. This phenomenon, initially documented for burglary (Short et al., 2009), reflects both offender behavior (repeat targeting of known locations) and broader environmental risk factors. Self-exciting point process models, particularly the Epidemic-Type Aftershock Sequence (ETAS) model borrowed from seismology, provide a mathematical framework for capturing these dynamics. ETAS models treat crime events as having both background rates (driven by long-term environmental factors) and triggering effects (where each event probabilistically generates additional events in its spatial-temporal neighborhood).

Field experiments using ETAS-based predictions have demonstrated practical value. Mohler et al. (2015) conducted a randomized controlled trial in Los Angeles, comparing ETAS-generated hotspot predictions against predictions made by experienced crime analysts. The study found that ETAS forecasts captured significantly more crime events than analyst predictions and that directed patrols based on ETAS predictions reduced crime per patrol hour. This represents some of the strongest experimental evidence for predictive policing effectiveness. However, it is important to note that these results were obtained for specific crime types (primarily property crimes) in a particular operational context, and generalization to drug markets depends on whether drug offenses exhibit similar near-repeat patterns and whether operational implementation achieves adequate 'dosage' (i.e., sufficient patrol presence in predicted areas).

Environmental risk and Risk Terrain Modeling (RTM)

Risk Terrain Modeling (RTM) takes a complementary approach by quantifying how environmental features create criminogenic risk fields that interact with offender decision-making and opportunity structures (Caplan & Kennedy, 2016). RTM identifies spatial risk factors—such as transit nodes, liquor outlets, abandoned buildings, cash-intensive businesses, check-cashing stores, and areas with poor surveillance—and models their combined influence on crime risk. For drug-related crime, RTM can help identify settings vulnerable to retail drug markets (e.g., locations with high foot traffic, low guardianship, and proximity to user populations) as well as locations suitable for drug handling activities such as stash houses, conversion laboratories, and distribution hubs.

The strength of RTM lies in its focus on modifiable environmental features, which can inform not only enforcement deployment but also situational crime prevention strategies (e.g., improving lighting, increasing surveillance, modifying land use) and multi-agency interventions involving urban planning, business licensing, and community development. However, RTM relies on accurate identification of relevant risk factors and assumes that historical correlations between environmental features and crime will persist into the future. It may also suffer from ecological fallacy if used to make inferences about individual behavior based on aggregate spatial patterns.

Network Analytics and Online Intelligence

Drug trafficking is fundamentally a network enterprise, making network analytics a critical component of predictive and intelligence-led approaches. Graph analytics can reveal key actors (high centrality nodes), critical logistical links (bridges connecting otherwise separate subgroups), and structural vulnerabilities in trafficking organizations. Social network analysis, communication network analysis, and financial network analysis can be integrated to map relationships, identify organizational hierarchies, and prioritize disruption targets based on their network position. Removing highly central actors or critical brokers can potentially fragment networks and disrupt operations more effectively than arresting peripheral members.

The shift of drug markets toward online and darknet platforms has created new intelligence opportunities and challenges. Natural language processing (NLP) and machine learning can monitor surface web platforms (social media, forums), darknet marketplaces, and encrypted communication channels to detect emerging drugs, identify vendors and supply sources, track prices and purity trends, and provide early warning of dangerous substances entering the market. However, these methods face technical challenges (platform churn, encrypted content, adversarial evasion), legal constraints (privacy protections, jurisdictional limits), and ethical concerns (surveillance overreach). Integration of online signals with traditional financial intelligence (anti-money laundering / countering terrorist financing or AML/CTF data, suspicious activity reports) and logistics traces (shipping data, border crossings) can support comprehensive supply-chain disruption strategies.

Model Governance, Explainability, and Fairness

The increasing use of complex machine learning models in predictive policing raises critical questions about governance, accountability, and fairness. Black-box algorithms—where predictions are generated through opaque processes that cannot be readily understood or audited by human operators—pose particular challenges for democratic oversight and legal accountability. When a model predicts that a person is at high risk of future offending or that a location will experience crime, what factors drove that prediction? Can the individual or community affected understand and challenge the prediction? Can external auditors verify that the model is not relying on prohibited factors such as race or ethnicity?

Foundational research by Kleinberg et al. (2017) demonstrates that commonly proposed fairness criteria for algorithmic decision-making are mathematically incompatible except under very specific conditions (perfect prediction or equal base rates across groups). For example, equalizing false positive rates across racial groups conflicts with equalizing false negative rates, and both conflict with overall accuracy maximization. This fundamental result underscores that there are inherent trade-offs in fairness, and no single definition of fairness is universally appropriate. Agencies deploying predictive tools must make explicit choices about which fairness criteria they prioritize and why, based on normative considerations and stakeholder input, rather than assuming that fairness can be 'solved' through technical means alone.

Furthermore, training data for predictive policing systems inevitably reflect historical enforcement patterns and reporting biases, which can encode and amplify structural inequalities (Barocas & Selbst, 2016; Lum & Isaac, 2016). If police have historically concentrated enforcement in certain neighborhoods or against certain demographic groups—whether due to legitimate crime patterns, resource allocation decisions, or discriminatory practices—then models trained on this data will learn to predict continued patterns of enforcement rather than true underlying crime risk. This creates feedback loops where biased predictions lead to biased deployment, generating new biased data that reinforces the bias. Mitigating these risks requires diverse strategies: careful data auditing and documentation; use of multiple data sources beyond police records; regular monitoring of disparate impact; human oversight of model predictions; community involvement in governance; and transparency measures that enable external accountability.

DATA SOURCES AND INTEGRATION

Predictive systems for drug crime integrate heterogeneous data streams, each contributing unique value while introducing potential biases. Criminal justice data—including incident reports, arrests, calls for service, and drug seizures—provide the primary signal for enforcement patterns but suffer from reporting bias, enforcement bias, latency in recording and geocoding, and incompleteness (many offenses go undetected or unreported). Public health data, particularly emergency medical services (EMS) and emergency department (ED) overdose records accessed through systems like the Overdose Detection Mapping Application Program (ODMAP), enable early warning and rapid response but face coverage gaps, inconsistent definitions across jurisdictions, and underreporting of non-fatal events.

Demographic and socio-economic indicators from census data, administrative records, and surveys provide context for vulnerability mapping and prevention prioritization. However, using socio-economic variables raises ethical concerns about proxying for protected attributes (race, ethnicity, economic status) and potentially stigmatizing already-marginalized communities. Financial intelligence data, including suspicious activity reports (SARs) from banks and money service businesses, can support supply-chain tracing and identification of money laundering typologies, but access is restricted by confidentiality rules and the data contain high rates of false positives. Digital traces from online and darknet marketplaces, social media, and communications metadata offer insights into demand, supply, and emerging trends, but face challenges of platform churn, encryption, scraping restrictions, and legal constraints on collection and use.

Environmental and infrastructure data—including transit networks, land use, points of interest, mobility patterns, and CCTV coverage—support risk terrain modeling and situational analysis. Integration typically occurs through geographic information systems (GIS), data lakes with unified schemas, and application programming interfaces (APIs) enabling real-time data exchange. Successful integration requires attention to data quality (accuracy, completeness, timeliness), semantic interoperability (common definitions and coding schemes), and governance frameworks that specify access controls, retention policies, and audit trails. Table 1 summarizes common data sources, their typical uses, and associated pitfalls.

Table 1. *Common data sources for predictive drug-crime analytics and typical pitfalls*

Data source	Typical use	Common pitfalls
Incident/arrest data	Hotspot maps; trend models	Reporting and enforcement bias; latency; geocoding errors
EMS/ED overdoses (e.g., ODMAP)	Early warning; outreach targeting	Coverage gaps; inconsistent definitions; underreporting non-fatal events
Socio-economic indicators	Vulnerability mapping; prevention prioritization	Proxying protected attributes; outdated/census lag
Financial (SARs, typologies)	Supply-chain tracing; lab detection	Confidentiality constraints; false positives
Online/darknet signals	Demand/supply monitoring; product alerts	Platform churn; scraping bias; legal constraints
Environment/land use	RTM features; situational prevention	Mis-specified risk correlates; ecological fallacy

APPLICATION AREAS

Predictive analytics for drug crime find application across multiple operational and strategic domains. Spatial and temporal analysis encompasses hotspot forecasting, risk terrain overlays, and diffusion-of-benefits analysis to optimize patrol deployment and intervention targeting (Perry et al., 2013; Caplan & Kennedy, 2016; Mohler et al., 2015). Network and behavioral analysis includes transport route mining, clandestine laboratory detection, precursor chemical tracking, criminal network mapping to identify high-value targets, and behavioral pattern recognition such as delivery windows and payment methods. Prevention and community intervention applications involve socio-structural risk mapping to target social services, demand-side prediction to guide treatment outreach and harm reduction programs, and community resilience modeling to identify protective factors. Operational and strategic support includes tactical deployment planning, event security assessments, online trafficking and darknet monitoring using natural language processing, and multi-agency intelligence fusion with governance workflows for information sharing and coordinated action.

CASE STUDIES

United States

The United States has witnessed extensive experimentation with predictive policing technologies, producing both promising results and cautionary lessons. The randomized controlled trial conducted in Los Angeles by Mohler et al. (2015) represents some of the strongest experimental evidence for predictive policing effectiveness. Using the ETAS (Epidemic-Type Aftershock Sequence) model to generate crime forecasts, researchers found that algorithmic predictions captured significantly more property crime events than predictions made by experienced crime analysts, and that directed patrols based on ETAS forecasts reduced crime per patrol hour without simply displacing crime to adjacent areas. This study demonstrated that rigorous mathematical modeling of spatio-temporal crime dynamics can improve resource allocation and crime prevention outcomes when implemented with adequate operational compliance.

However, person-based predictive tools have encountered significant challenges. Chicago's Strategic Subject List (SSL), later rebranded as the Crime and Victimization Risk Model (CVRM), aimed to identify individuals at high risk of involvement in gun violence, either as perpetrators or victims. An investigation by the Chicago Office of Inspector General (2020) revealed fundamental problems: data quality issues that undermined model validity, inadequate documentation and version control, lack of rigorous evaluation to determine whether the tool actually reduced violence, and absence of clear protocols for how officers should use risk scores in practice. The tool generated concerns about creating watch lists without due process, potential for harassment of individuals based on algorithmic predictions, and disproportionate impact on African American and Latino communities. Following the audit, Chicago decommissioned the system, illustrating the reputational and operational risks of deploying inadequately validated person-based risk tools.

The Los Angeles Police Department's experiences with data-driven strategies provide additional lessons. An audit by the LAPD Inspector General (2019) examined two major initiatives: the LASER (Los Angeles Strategic Extraction and Restoration) program, which combined place-based and person-based targeting, and the use of PredPol software for hotspot prediction. The audit identified inconsistent implementation across divisions, inconclusive evidence regarding crime reduction effectiveness, concerns about community trust impacts, and inadequate documentation of decision-making processes. These findings contributed to program reforms and eventual discontinuation. Investigative journalism by organizations such as The Markup has further documented problems with predictive policing deployments nationwide, reporting exceedingly low hit rates (predictions that fail to materialize), feedback loops where predictions drive enforcement that generates data confirming predictions, and disparate impacts on communities of color (Sankin & Mattu, 2023).

In parallel with these mixed enforcement experiences, public health applications of predictive analytics have shown more consistent success. The Overdose Detection Mapping Application Program (ODMAP) has achieved national adoption as a real-time overdose surveillance system. ODMAP enables emergency medical services, hospitals, and law enforcement agencies to share overdose incident data rapidly, creating early warning capacity for identifying geographic and temporal spikes in overdoses that may indicate presence of particularly dangerous drug batches (e.g., fentanyl-contaminated supplies). When integrated with rapid public health responses—including targeted distribution of naloxone, public health alerts, enhanced outreach to at-risk populations, and offers of treatment access—ODMAP has demonstrated clear value in harm reduction and overdose prevention (Washington/Baltimore HIDTA, n.d.). This success suggests that predictive analytics may be most effective when oriented toward health outcomes and when embedded in comprehensive multi-sector response systems rather than used primarily for punitive enforcement.

Europe

European approaches to predictive analytics in drug enforcement generally emphasize legality, proportionality, and privacy protection, reflecting the region's stronger data protection frameworks and human rights traditions. The European Monitoring Centre for Drugs and Drug Addiction (EMCDDA) and Europol have jointly documented escalating drug-related violence, particularly associated with cocaine trafficking through major European ports (Rotterdam, Antwerp, Hamburg), and the infiltration of legitimate logistics and port operations by organized crime groups (EMCDDA & Europol, 2024). These agencies call for advanced detection capabilities, improved coordination among member states, and intelligence-led strategies to disrupt trafficking networks while acknowledging the need to balance security objectives with fundamental rights protections.

Member states have piloted various analytic approaches, typically under strict legal constraints imposed by the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) and national data protection laws. Many initiatives combine community policing philosophies with intelligence-led targeting, emphasizing partnership between law enforcement and social services. Predictive tools are generally framed as decision-support systems to optimize resource allocation rather than as automated decision-making systems. The EU AI Act (Regulation (EU) 2024/1689), adopted in 2024, significantly constrains the future of predictive policing in Europe by explicitly prohibiting AI systems intended to predict criminal offenses based solely on profiling individuals or assessing personality traits, and by classifying law enforcement AI systems as high-risk, thus subjecting them to stringent requirements including risk management systems, data governance and quality standards, comprehensive documentation, transparency obligations, human oversight, accuracy and robustness requirements, and incident reporting (EUR-Lex, 2024). These provisions reflect a policy decision to prioritize fundamental rights protection and democratic oversight over potential efficiency gains from predictive technologies.

Asia-Pacific

Approaches to predictive policing in Asia-Pacific countries vary dramatically, reflecting diverse governance systems, legal frameworks, and cultural contexts. China has integrated predictive analytics into extensive surveillance infrastructure, including facial recognition systems, social credit scoring, predictive policing platforms, and mass data collection from digital communications and movements. While Chinese authorities report operational successes in crime prevention and social control, these systems raise profound concerns about transparency, lack of independent oversight, mass surveillance, and systematic human rights violations, particularly regarding the targeting of ethnic and religious minorities in regions such as Xinjiang (Sprick, 2019). The Chinese model represents an authoritarian application of predictive technologies that is fundamentally incompatible with democratic governance and rule of law principles.

Southeast Asian countries, facing significant drug trafficking challenges related to the Golden Triangle region and emerging synthetic drug production, have pursued capacity-building partnerships with international organizations such as the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC). Indonesia has piloted AI and big data analytics for intelligence on trafficking routes, money laundering networks, and organized crime connections. Reported outcomes include improved intelligence products and enhanced inter-agency coordination, though implementation faces challenges including uneven technical infrastructure, capacity gaps in data science and analytics expertise, resource constraints, and governance questions about oversight and accountability (Ismail et al., 2025).

More advanced technological capacities are visible in Singapore, which has invested heavily in 'smart nation' initiatives including smart policing systems combining sensors, analytics, and command-and-control platforms. Japan and South Korea have pursued academic-agency collaborations to develop crime prediction models, generally with more transparent governance and public engagement than observed in authoritarian contexts. The diversity of approaches across Asia-Pacific illustrates how technological capabilities interact with political systems, legal frameworks, cultural values, and institutional capacities to produce vastly different implementations and outcomes. Table 2 summarizes illustrative implementations and key takeaways across jurisdictions.

Table 2. *Illustrative implementations and takeaways*

Jurisdiction	Tool/approach	Outcome/lesson
Los Angeles (US)	ETAS hotspot patrols	Improved capture of events; crime reduction per patrol hour (Mohler et al., 2015)
Chicago (US)	Person-based risk scoring (SSL/CVRM)	Decommissioned; data/oversight deficiencies; fairness concerns (Chicago OIG, 2020)
Los Angeles (US)	LASER/PredPol	Inconsistent implementation; mixed evidence; audit-driven reforms (LAPD OIG, 2019)
EU-level	Ports/market analytics	Heightened focus on organized crime and port security; strict rights protections (EMCDDA & Europol, 2024)
Indonesia	AI + big data pilots	Intelligence gains; capacity and governance hurdles (Ismail et al., 2025)

EVIDENCE OF EFFECTIVENESS: WHAT DO WE KNOW?

The evidence base for predictive policing effectiveness remains mixed and context-dependent. For spatio-temporal forecasting and near-repeat models, randomized controlled trial evidence shows that algorithmic predictions can improve targeting relative to analyst baselines, at least for certain property crime types. The Los Angeles ETAS trial (Mohler et al., 2015) provides the strongest evidence that directed patrols based on rigorous mathematical crime forecasts can capture more crime events and reduce crime per patrol hour. However, generalization of these findings to drug markets depends on several factors: whether drug offenses exhibit similar spatio-temporal clustering patterns as property crimes; the quality and completeness of drug offense data; operational implementation quality and compliance (dosage); and whether interventions beyond mere presence are applied when entering predicted hotspots. Some research suggests drug markets may show weaker near-repeat effects than burglary due to different offender decision-making processes and opportunity structures.

Person-based predictive tools have consistently struggled with construct validity (what exactly are we predicting?), data quality and drift (training data become outdated), fairness and legitimacy concerns (disproportionate impacts on marginalized groups), and lack of clear operational protocols (how should officers use risk scores?). External audits and inspector general reviews have documented these problems repeatedly, leading to recommendations for extreme caution or outright discontinuation (Chicago OIG, 2020; LAPD OIG, 2019). Research by Brayne (2020) shows that predictive risk scores can fundamentally alter police-community interactions, creating surveillance relationships that undermine trust and legitimacy even when crime reduction effects are unclear. The track record suggests that person-based tools should be approached with great skepticism, particularly in contexts where civil liberties protections and democratic oversight are priorities.

Intelligence-led strategies that combine network analysis with financial and logistical tracing show promise when adequately resourced and when inter-agency data sharing barriers are overcome. These approaches align with evidence-based principles of focusing on high-harm offenders and criminal enterprises, using multiple data sources to build comprehensive intelligence pictures, and applying interventions proportionate to threat levels (Perry et al., 2013; Caplan & Kennedy, 2016). However, such strategies require sustained investment in analytic capacity, human expertise to interpret complex network data, legal frameworks enabling information sharing while protecting privacy, and coordinated multi-agency action.

Public health surveillance systems, exemplified by ODMAP, have demonstrated clearer and more consistent value. By enabling real-time sharing of overdose data across agencies and jurisdictions, these systems support actionable early warning for spikes that may indicate dangerous drug batches circulating in communities. When coupled with rapid public health responses—naloxone distribution, public alerts, outreach to at-risk populations, treatment access—overdose surveillance can reduce harm and save lives (Washington/Baltimore HIDTA, n.d.). The success of health-oriented applications suggests that predictive analytics may achieve better outcomes when framed as public health tools rather than purely enforcement tools, and when integrated into comprehensive harm reduction and treatment systems.

ETHICAL, LEGAL, AND SOCIAL CONSIDERATIONS

Bias and Disparate Impact

Algorithmic bias in predictive policing has become a central concern in scholarly analysis and public debate. The fundamental problem is that training data inevitably reflect historical enforcement and reporting patterns, which embed existing biases and structural inequalities (Lum & Isaac, 2016; Barocas & Selbst, 2016). If police have historically concentrated enforcement in predominantly minority neighborhoods—whether due to actual crime patterns, political pressure, resource allocation decisions, officer bias, or systemic racism—then predictive models trained on this data will learn to direct future enforcement to the same neighborhoods, perpetuating and potentially amplifying disparate impacts. This creates feedback loops where biased predictions generate biased enforcement, which produces new biased data confirming the original predictions. Mathematical analysis by Lum and Isaac (2016) demonstrates that even in the absence of explicit racial variables, proxies such as neighborhood characteristics can produce racially disparate predictions. The inherent trade-offs between different fairness metrics documented by Kleinberg et al. (2017) mean that optimizing one fairness criterion (e.g., equal false positive rates across groups) necessarily compromises others (e.g., equal false negative rates or overall accuracy). Agencies must therefore make explicit normative choices about which trade-offs they accept, based on stakeholder input and democratic accountability rather than purely technical optimization.

Transparency, Explainability, and Accountability

Opaque algorithmic systems that operate as 'black boxes' impede democratic oversight, legal accountability, and individual due process rights. When individuals or communities are subjected to enhanced enforcement based on algorithmic predictions they cannot understand or challenge, fundamental principles of transparency and procedural justice are violated. Agencies deploying predictive tools should therefore maintain comprehensive documentation including data lineage (where data come from, how they were processed), feature definitions (what variables the model uses and how they are measured), model cards describing system capabilities and limitations, validation protocols, and performance metrics disaggregated by demographic groups. Independent external audits should be enabled through appropriate data access while protecting individual privacy. Where stakes are high—particularly in person-based prediction—interpretable methods should be preferred over black-box machine learning even if this involves some sacrifice of predictive accuracy, because explainability is essential for accountability.

Privacy and Data Protection

Predictive systems often integrate sensitive data including health information, location tracking, financial records, and communications metadata. Collection, storage, and use of such data must comply with strict legal frameworks—the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) in Europe, Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA) in the United States for health data, and various national privacy laws. Key principles include purpose limitation (data collected for specific legitimate purposes), data minimization (collecting only necessary data), proportionality (balancing benefits against privacy intrusions), access controls (restricting who can view sensitive data), retention limits (deleting data when no longer needed), and individual rights (notice, access, correction, deletion). De-identification and aggregation should be default practices where possible. Person-based predictive scoring deserves heightened scrutiny because it creates permanent digital profiles that may follow individuals throughout their lives, potentially affecting employment, housing, and other opportunities beyond the criminal justice context.

Effectiveness and Proportionality

From both ethical and resource allocation perspectives, predictive tools should demonstrate meaningful outcome improvements relative to less intrusive alternatives before widespread deployment. Problem-oriented policing, community partnerships, situational crime prevention, and evidence-based treatment and prevention programs have established track records of effectiveness without requiring sophisticated predictive analytics or extensive data collection. When predictive tools are deployed, rigorous evaluation should establish whether they produce incremental benefits sufficient to justify their costs (financial, operational, privacy, legitimacy). Evidence thresholds for continuation should be defined in advance, and sunset or mandatory review clauses should prevent indefinite operation of systems whose effectiveness remains uncertain. This approach aligns with precautionary principles and proportionality doctrines embedded in human rights law.

Legal Frameworks: the EU AI Act

Regulation (EU) 2024/1689, commonly known as the EU AI Act, represents the world's first comprehensive legal framework for artificial intelligence. It introduces a tiered, risk-based regulatory regime. The Act explicitly prohibits certain AI applications deemed to present unacceptable risks to fundamental rights, including AI systems intended to predict whether individuals will commit criminal offenses based solely on profiling or assessment of personality traits. This prohibition directly targets person-based predictive policing applications. AI systems used in law enforcement are classified as high-risk, subjecting them to extensive obligations including ex-ante risk assessments, rigorous data governance ensuring quality and representativeness, technical documentation, logging of system operations for auditability, transparency requirements, mandatory human oversight, accuracy and robustness requirements, and registration in a public database. Non-compliance can result in substantial fines up to EUR 35 million or 7% of global annual turnover, whichever is higher (EUR-Lex, 2024). The EU AI Act thus codifies a rights-centric, precautionary approach to law enforcement AI, prioritizing fundamental rights protection and democratic oversight over technological solutionism.

PRACTICAL SAFEGUARDS AND OPERATING MODEL

Responsible deployment of predictive analytics requires multi-layered governance and operational safeguards. Governance structures should include AI oversight boards with diverse representation including community members, civil liberties advocates, data protection officers, technical experts, and ethicists—not solely law enforcement personnel. These boards should define use policies, establish red lines (prohibited uses), review high-risk deployments, investigate complaints, and recommend modifications or discontinuation when problems arise. Clear appeal and redress mechanisms should enable individuals and communities affected by predictive systems to challenge decisions and seek remedies.

Data stewardship practices should include comprehensive data inventories documenting all data sources and flows, explicit purpose specifications that limit use to defined legitimate aims, retention schedules that delete data when no longer needed, continuous monitoring for data quality degradation and concept drift, bias auditing to detect disparate impacts, and regular ethics reviews. Data protection officers should have authority to halt deployments that violate privacy or data protection standards. Model lifecycle management should encompass pre-deployment impact assessments examining foreseeable harms, baseline establishment and experimental or quasi-experimental evaluation designs (A/B testing, randomized controlled trials when feasible), continuous performance monitoring including calibration checks and error analysis, disaggregated reporting of performance by demographic subgroups, and periodic re-evaluation as contexts change.

Human-in-the-loop and human-on-the-loop architectures ensure that algorithmic outputs serve only as decision support rather than autonomous decision-making. Officers must receive training on system capabilities and limitations, cognitive biases in interpreting algorithmic outputs, and decision-making protocols. All deployment decisions influenced by predictions should be logged with justifications to enable accountability. Public health integration should establish formalized pathways from detection of drug activity or overdose risk to harm reduction services, treatment referrals, social support, and community intervention—moving beyond purely punitive responses. Transparency measures should include public documentation of system design and evaluation results (subject to appropriate security redactions), periodic independent audits with published findings, and publication of aggregate impact metrics and complaint statistics.

FUTURE DIRECTIONS

Future development of predictive analytics for drug crime should emphasize several priorities. Methodologically, advancing multi-modal fusion techniques that integrate text, signals intelligence, and financial data while maintaining interpretability; developing causal inference methods for rigorous policy evaluation beyond correlational prediction; and implementing privacy-preserving analytics using technologies such as secure enclaves, federated learning, and differential privacy. Real-time data ecosystems may incorporate Internet of Things (IoT) sensors, mobility analytics, and other novel data streams, but must do so under strict governance frameworks that prevent surveillance overreach and mission creep. Interoperable data standards and common ontologies can facilitate information sharing across agencies and jurisdictions while protecting privacy through appropriate access controls and purpose limitations.

Research priorities include conducting more randomized controlled trials and quasi-experimental studies specifically focused on drug markets and overdose outcomes rather than generalizing from property crime studies; investigating displacement and diffusion effects to understand whether interventions truly reduce crime or merely move it; examining long-term impacts on community trust, police legitimacy, and health outcomes; and developing better metrics for algorithmic fairness that account for the inherent trade-offs identified by Kleinberg et al. (2017). Policy development should focus on harmonizing approaches to the EU AI Act's requirements, potentially extending similar principles globally; establishing export controls on law enforcement AI systems to prevent authoritarian misuse; developing standardized audit frameworks and certification schemes; and investing in capacity building, particularly in lower-resource jurisdictions, to ensure that technical capabilities are matched by governance capacity.

CONCLUSION

Predictive analytics can contribute meaningfully to drug crime prevention when deployed judiciously within robust governance frameworks that prioritize accountability, transparency, and human rights. Evidence demonstrates potential value for spatio-temporal targeting of enforcement resources and environmental risk mapping, particularly when coupled with situational prevention and community partnership strategies. Public health applications such as overdose early warning systems have shown consistent success in reducing harm when integrated with rapid response protocols and treatment access. However, experience also reveals significant pitfalls: person-based risk scoring has repeatedly failed to meet validity, fairness, and legitimacy standards; black-box systems impede accountability and reproduce biases; and feedback loops can amplify structural inequalities rather than ameliorate them.

The fundamental lesson is that technology alone cannot solve complex social problems like drug markets, addiction, and associated crime. Predictive tools should complement, not replace, comprehensive strategies that address root causes: poverty, inequality, lack of treatment access, untreated mental illness, community disinvestment, and systemic discrimination. Enforcement-oriented prediction must be balanced with health-oriented intervention and prevention-focused resource allocation. The EU AI Act's prohibition of certain predictive policing applications and strict regulation of high-risk AI systems reflects a policy judgment that fundamental rights protection and democratic oversight must take precedence over potential efficiency gains from unconstrained algorithmic prediction.

Moving forward, agencies considering predictive analytics for drug crime should: demand rigorous evidence of effectiveness through experimental evaluation; establish governance structures with community representation and independent oversight; implement comprehensive bias auditing and fairness monitoring; prioritize transparency and explainability; integrate enforcement tools with public health and social service responses; and maintain proportionality by ensuring that privacy intrusions and civil liberties restrictions are justified by demonstrated benefits. Research must continue to develop methods that are both technically sophisticated and ethically sound, recognizing inherent limitations and trade-offs rather than promising technological silver bullets. With appropriate safeguards and realistic expectations, predictive analytics can serve as one component—but only one component—of evidence-based, health-integrated, and rights-respecting approaches to the complex challenge of drug-related crime.

REFERENCES

Barocas, S., & Selbst, A. D. (2016). Big data's disparate impact. California Law Review, 104(3), 671–732. https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=2477899

Bói, L. (2024). A városfejlődési szakaszok és a bűnözés kapcsolata a főváros VIII. kerületében [The relationship between urban development phases and crime in the 8th district of the capital]. Magyar Rendészet, 24(1), 33–44.

Brayne, S. (2020). Predict and surveil: Data, discretion, and the future of policing. Oxford University Press. https://academic.oup.com/book/33466

Caplan, J. M., & Kennedy, L. W. (2016). Risk terrain modeling: Crime prediction and risk reduction. University of California Press. https://books.google.com/books/about/Risk_Terrain_Modeling.html?id=PinlCwAAQBAJ

Chicago Office of Inspector General. (2020, January 23). Advisory concerning the Chicago Police Department's predictive risk models. https://igchicago.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/01/OIG-Advisory-Concerning-CPDs-Predictive-Risk-Models-.pdf

EMCDDA & Europol. (2024, March 7). EMCDDA and Europol spotlight drug-related violence in latest market overview [Press release]. https://www.europol.europa.eu/media-press/newsroom/news/europol-and-emcdda-spotlight-drug-related-violence-in-latest-market-overview

EUR-Lex. (2024). Regulation (EU) 2024/1689 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 13 June 2024 laying down harmonised rules on artificial intelligence (AI Act). Official Journal of the European Union. https://eur-lex.europa.eu/eli/reg/2024/1689/oj/eng

Ismail, I., Felecia, F., Azizah, A. K., & Rahmawati, D. (2025). Artificial intelligence and big data analytics to break drug networks: Lessons from law enforcement in Indonesia. West Science Law and Human Rights, 3(02), 124–131.

Kleinberg, J., Mullainathan, S., & Raghavan, M. (2017). Inherent trade-offs in the fair determination of risk scores. In Proceedings of the 8th Innovations in Theoretical Computer Science Conference (ITCS 2017). https://arxiv.org/abs/1609.05807

Los Angeles Police Department, Office of the Inspector General. (2019). Audit of selected data-driven policing strategies. https://www.lapdpolicecom.lacity.org/031219/BPC_19-0072.pdf

Lum, K., & Isaac, W. (2016). To predict and serve? Significance, 13(5), 14–19. https://rss.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1111/j.1740-9713.2016.00960.x

Mátyás, S., Sivadó, M., & Molnár, K. (2025). Predictive policing in the 21st century: Expectations and reality. Ludovika Press.

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. https://mshort9.math.gatech.edu/papers/MohlerEtAl-2015-JASA-Predictive-InPress.pdf

Perry, W. L., McInnis, B., Price, C. C., Smith, S., & Hollywood, J. S. (2013). Predictive policing: The role of crime forecasting in law enforcement operations. RAND Corporation. https://www.rand.org/content/dam/rand/pubs/research_reports/RR200/RR233/RAND_RR233.pdf

Sankin, A., & Mattu, S. (2023, October 2). Predictive policing software terrible at predicting crimes. The Markup. https://themarkup.org/prediction-bias/2023/10/02/predictive-policing-software-terrible-at-predicting-crimes

Short, M. B., D'Orsogna, M. R., Brantingham, P. J., & Tita, G. E. (2009). Measuring and modeling repeat and near-repeat burglary effects. Journal of Quantitative Criminology, 25, 325–339. https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s10940-009-9068-8

Sprick, D. (2019). Predictive policing in China: An authoritarian dream of public security. Naveiñ Reet: Nordic Journal of Law and Social Research, 9, 149–168.

Storbeck, M. (2022). Artificial intelligence and predictive policing: Risks and challenges. EU Crime Prevention Network (EUCPN).

UNODC. (2024). World drug report 2024: Key findings and conclusions. United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime. https://www.unodc.org/documents/data-and-analysis/WDR_2024/WDR24_Key_findings_and_conclusions.pdf

Vajda, E. (2024). A Magyarországon elkövetett rablások és kifosztások forró pontos elemzése [Hot spot analysis of robberies and muggings committed in Hungary]. Bűnözésföldrajzi Közlemények, 5(1-2), 39–48.

Washington/Baltimore High Intensity Drug Trafficking Area. (n.d.). Overdose Detection Mapping Application Program (ODMAP). https://www.odmap.org/