

# Review of: "The Correlation between Poverty and Crime in Pakistan"

Francesco Domenico d'Ovidio<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> University of Bari

**Potential competing interests:** No potential competing interests to declare.

I regret having to give a negative opinion on this short article, which AT LEAST suffers from communication defects and excessive ambition.

A miscommunication is already present in the title 'The Correlation between Poverty and Crime in Pakistan'. But in the paper, there is no mention at all of 'correlation', understood in the scientific sense as a measurable or at least estimable, verifiable, and describable inter-relationship: it is a mathematical and statistical property that follows well-defined criteria, which are not to be found at all in this paper. The author merely describes some results (which are not exactly new, and which, presented in this way, even appear trivial) without providing verification elements. The title should therefore be made more general and less ambitious: 'Presumable relationships between Poverty and Crime in Pakistan'.

Another flaw in communication is what one gets from reading the first few lines of the paper: "This article delves into the correlation between poverty and crime in Pakistan". A more realistic start would be: "This article provides a quick primer on the presumed relationships between poverty and crime in Pakistan".

But this article is limited in the same way in every part.

Based on what we read, there is no in-depth analysis, but a simple superficial overview of other people's works in the introduction, some banal considerations in the second section, while in the third, some "risk factors" are exposed which to the simple observer seem plausible, but about whose evolutionary mechanisms nothing is said (despite the fact that numerous statistical, economic, sociological, and legal studies are available on the web which investigate the topic in depth: a small search on Google would lead to a very significant increase in references, and probably also in concepts expressed here).

In the fourth section, "implications" are declared whose plausibility is based solely on the low depth of the chosen topic, and give the idea of simple guidelines taken from other sources without any connection to independent research. The Conclusion practically does not exist.

The fact that the References are very few, however, did not prevent the author from showing superficiality even in compiling this short list, breaking the first quote (Arif & Raza) into two pieces, the second of which is evidently senseless. Furthermore, there is no trace of this article (as well as the subsequent one, Bhutta 2016) on the web, except in the erroneous quotes disseminated on various platforms by the author of this paper. On the journal websites, the cited issues

contain very different articles (see <https://lahoreschoolofeconomics.edu.pk/getLjeArticles>, and [https://jespk.net/publication\\_paper.php?publicationid=23](https://jespk.net/publication_paper.php?publicationid=23)). I am refusing to verify the other references now.

My final opinion is that this article is not a scientific article, but only the summary of a class assignment assigned to the author by the teacher; and that the vote wasn't even very encouraging. And that the author not only has never written a scientific article, but has not even read any carefully: not even those cited, which moreover cannot be found on the web, and are cited only by the author (leaving one to think that they are fake references). Citing the DOI could also be useful, if these articles really exist.

A scientific article must be constructed with an appropriate study of the literature, with a hypothesis or a proposal (possibly innovative), a series of demonstrations (mathematical or legal, sociological or dialectical, depending on the discipline in which one engages), with a clear and unambiguous description of the results, even those in contrast with the hypothesis, and only then can we think of drawing implications, suggestions, and conclusions from the work done.

Perhaps the author is not an author, but just a clumsy, bored time-waster who enjoys wasting scholars' time, without any respect for the scientific world. Or perhaps he wants to find out if the peer reviewers actually read the papers. Other hypotheses about his nature are possible, but they are much worse.