



Peer Review Report Form

Manuscript Title:	Conceptualization and Characterization of Police Culture: A Systematic Literature Review
Type of Article:	Review Article

FIRST ROUND

Editor

<u>General Comments and Recommendations</u>
The reviewers acknowledge the significance of your manuscript and recommend several revisions to further improve its clarity, coherence, organization, and overall scholarly quality. In addition, you are advised to thoroughly review and validate all references included in the manuscript. Please ensure that all cited sources are accurate, accessible, and retrievable through Google Scholar to uphold the credibility and reliability of the study. Additionally, make sure to include the DOI or website link for every reference whenever available to facilitate verification and accessibility of sources. Furthermore, only sources that are cited within the manuscript should appear in the References section, and all entries listed in the References section must also be cited in the text. For example, if 20 unique sources are cited in the manuscript, then only those 20 sources should be included in the References section. Please also note that repeated citations of the same source within the text are counted as a single reference entry; therefore, the total number of references may be lower than the total number of in-text citations.

Reviewer 1

<u>General Comments and Recommendations</u>
The manuscript addresses an important and timely topic: the conceptualization and characterization of police culture through a systematic literature review. The subject has clear relevance to policing studies, organizational behavior, public administration, ethics, accountability, and police reform. The paper also attempts to combine conceptual synthesis with bibliometric indicators, which can potentially strengthen its contribution.

<u>Specific Comments and Recommendations</u>
The title is relevant, but it needs grammatical correction. "Conceptualization and Characterizing Police Culture" is not smooth. I suggest revising it to "Conceptualizing and Characterizing Police Culture: A Systematic Literature Review" or "Conceptualization and Characteristics of Police Culture: A Systematic Literature Review." This will make the title clearer and more academic.
The abstract gives a good overview of the topic, but it does not match the methodology section. The databases, number of records, number of duplicates, and final included studies are different from those reported in the PRISMA section. The authors should revise the abstract only after finalizing the actual review process. The abstract should clearly report the exact



databases used, the final number of included studies, and the main themes found. At present, the abstract gives the impression that the review process was broader than what is shown later in the paper.

The introduction explains organizational culture and police culture, but the research gap is still weak. The authors should explain more clearly why another review on police culture is needed. What is missing in previous studies? Is the gap conceptual, geographical, methodological, or policy-related? The objective should also be rewritten. The present objective, "to identify nature the police culture," needs correction. A clearer objective may be: "This review aims to synthesize how police culture has been conceptualized, identify its major characteristics, and examine the organizational and institutional factors that shape it."

The discussion on organizational culture, police culture, values, artifacts, symbols, assumptions, leadership, and communication is useful, but it reads more like a general summary of separate sources. The authors need to synthesize the literature more critically. For example, the paper should explain how values, artifacts, symbols, and assumptions specifically operate in police organizations. Some parts also rely on general organizational culture studies that are not directly about policing. These can be reduced, while police-specific literature should be strengthened. The paper also needs a stronger discussion of classic police culture scholars such as Reiner, Skolnick, Waddington, Chan, Manning, Paoline, Loftus, Holdaway, and Herbert. These names appear in the paper, but their actual theoretical contributions are not yet deeply analyzed.

The methodology is the most important part to revise. Since the manuscript is presented as a systematic literature review, the method must be fully reproducible. The authors should provide the exact search strings used in each database, the date of search, the search fields used, the inclusion and exclusion criteria, and the process for screening articles. The paper should also clarify whether the review included only journal articles or also books, book chapters, conference papers, theses, and reports. The authors mentioned CASP checklist, but the result of the quality appraisal is not shown. If CASP was used, the paper should include a short table or summary explaining how many studies were high, moderate, or low quality. Otherwise, it will look like the checklist was only mentioned but not actually applied.

The PRISMA diagram must be corrected. The numbers in the diagram do not match the abstract. The diagram also says that the records came from Google Scholar and Scopus only, while the abstract mentions Scopus, Web of Science, Taylor & Francis, Wiley, and Springer. The authors need to use one final and consistent set of numbers throughout the whole manuscript.

The bibliometric tables need careful checking. Tables 1 to 7 contain interesting information, but the source of data is not clear. The authors should state whether the data came from Scopus, Web of Science, Google Scholar, or manual checking. They should also explain what software was used, such as Excel, VOSviewer, Bibliometrix, or other tools. Table 4 is especially problematic. It lists highly cited articles, but there are no authors, years, journal names, or DOI. Some titles appear too general and are difficult to verify. For a Scopus-indexed journal, this may raise questions about accuracy. The authors should either provide complete bibliographic details or remove this table. Table 5 also needs revision. The title says "Top 30 most-cited articles by Police context," but the table does not actually show 30 articles or citation counts. It looks more like a thematic matrix. The title should be changed, or the table should be rebuilt.

The results should be reorganized around clear themes. The authors may consider these themes: police culture as occupational adaptation, police culture as organizational structure, police culture as symbolic identity, police culture as resistance to reform, and police culture as a factor in accountability and public trust. This will make the paper stronger than simply presenting many tables. The paper should also be balanced. Police culture should not be



presented only as negative. It can support solidarity, identity, and coping with danger, but it can also produce secrecy, cynicism, resistance, and exclusion. This balanced discussion will improve the quality of the review.

The implications for Sri Lanka are interesting, but they appear suddenly. Since the paper is a global literature review, the authors should first discuss general implications, then explain implications for developing countries or Sri Lanka. Some claims about Sri Lanka Police, such as poor corporate image, lack of ethical behavior, and the need for a new uniform, need stronger evidence. These points should not be presented as conclusions unless they are directly supported by the reviewed literature or by local empirical data.

The conclusion is useful but too general and partly repetitive. It should directly answer the research objective. The recommendations are also relevant, but they should be linked more clearly to the review findings. The authors may separate recommendations for researchers and recommendations for police institutions.

The reference list needs careful editing. Some entries appear incomplete or incorrectly formatted. For example, some references have unclear titles, missing journal information, or formatting problems. The authors should check all references, DOIs, and in-text citations.

Please indicate your recommendation by checking the appropriate box below.

<u>Decision</u>	
	Accept the manuscript for publication.
/	Reconsider the manuscript after the authors have satisfactorily addressed and complied with the reviewers' comments and recommendations.
	Reject the manuscript, as it is not suitable for publication.

Reviewer 2

<u>General Comments and Recommendations</u>
The authors have tackled an important subject by attempting to synthesize the literature on police culture. However, the paper currently suffers from a major identity crisis. It is titled as a Systematic Literature Review (SLR), but the results read heavily like a bibliometric analysis. Furthermore, the implications section abruptly shifts into a case study or localized critique of the Sri Lanka Police, which is entirely disconnected from the global, systematic methodology presented earlier.
<u>Specific Comments and Recommendations</u>
There is a critical numerical discrepancy here that would immediately raise red flags for any editor. The abstract claims that the original search found 760 records and that 30 studies were chosen for the final analysis. However, the methodology section and the PRISMA diagram state that the initial search found 150 records and 52 studies were ultimately included. The authors must completely rewrite the abstract to ensure the numbers match the actual PRISMA results reported in the body of the text.
The introduction provides a basic overview of organizational culture but lacks a strong hook. Phrasing can be confusing, such as stating that police service is "a different service that includes identical characteristics". The transition from citing Herbert (1998) regarding



traditional police culture to the main objective of the paper feels rushed. The authors need to clearly state the specific research gap. Why is this review needed now? What is missing in the current literature that this review will solve?

This section feels disjointed. It jumps from general organizational culture (referencing adhocracy and clan cultures) to specific police culture artifacts like the Japanese "Koban" system and badges in Florida. The literature review should be reorganized to flow logically from broad concepts to specific policing contexts. The authors should also thoroughly proofread for phrasing issues, such as "mix values of the organization primarily affecting the employee commitment".

The paper utilizes PRISMA guidelines and details the use of Boolean operators, which is good practice. However, the tables and findings (Tables 1 through 7) are purely bibliometric focusing on author H-indexes, top countries, journal citations, and keyword co-occurrences. While they provide a thematic synthesis and mention conceptual differences, the core "results" presented in the text do not deeply analyze the content or findings of the 52 included studies, but rather their metadata. The authors should explicitly state that they are conducting a hybrid Systematic Review and Bibliometric Analysis. They also need to add a section that actually synthesizes the qualitative findings of the papers, rather than just mapping where and by whom they were published.

The implication section is the most problematic section of the manuscript. The entire methodology is framed as a global review of databases like Scopus and Web of Science, yet the Implications section almost exclusively discusses the Sri Lanka police. The authors make highly specific claims, such as stating the corporate image of the Sri Lanka Police "remains bad" and suggesting they must "design a new uniform". None of this is supported by the preceding global systematic review. The authors must delete the Sri Lanka-specific implications unless they reframe the entire paper from the very beginning to be a study specifically applying global literature to the Sri Lankan context. If they keep it as a general SLR, the implications must address global policing literature, policy, and practice.

There are notable formatting errors in the reference list that do not align with standard academic formatting. For example, one reference includes the word "Documento" twice: "Documento POLICE CULTURE AND COERCION * Documento.". Another includes unusual spacing and punctuation: "North Dakota Law Review The Value of Valor: Money, Medals, and Military Labor.". A thorough scrub of the reference list using a standard style guide is required.

Please indicate your recommendation by checking the appropriate box below.

<u>Decision</u>	
	Accept the manuscript for publication.
/	Reconsider the manuscript after the authors have satisfactorily addressed and complied with the reviewers' comments and recommendations.
	Reject the manuscript, as it is not suitable for publication.



SECOND ROUND

<u>Decision</u>	<u>Editor</u>	<u>Reviewer</u> 1	<u>Reviewer</u> 2
Accept the manuscript for publication.	/	/	/
Reconsider the manuscript after the authors have satisfactorily addressed and complied with the reviewers' comments and recommendations.			
Reject the manuscript, as it is not suitable for publication.			