

# Targeting missing persons most likely to come to harm

Superintendent Ryan Doyle





 National: Biggest threat to the Police Service is Legitimacy – trust and confidence of the public in effective use of our resources and ability to keep people safe

• Devon and Cornwall: Missing People account for up to 15% of our daily demand, safeguarding and vulnerability focussed force mission

• Personal: Wanted research to add value to the service



• Retrospective analysis of 92, 681 mispers recorded on COMPACT in Devon & Cornwall, between 2008 and 2019

 Predictive associations between binary predictors, gained from COMPACT risk factors known at the time of report, and harmful outcomes in missing person cases, are measured using odds ratios.

• All types of harm are aggregated in to one outcome of harm

Findings



#### 92,681 Misper Records...



#### Findings: Which Mispers come to harm?





Findings



The predictive value of risk factors

is conditional on age and gender

The current risk assessment process is less accurate

at forecasting outcomes than simply assuming no

missing persons will ever come to harm.

#### Findings: Accuracy



#### **RISK GRADES**

High Risk: Serious harm is very likely

Medium Risk: Harm is likely but not serious

Low Risk: Harm is possible but minimal

GRADE	% of Total	Number	% Came to Harm	% of all Harm
HIGH	15%	13,260	11%	41%
MEDIUM	75%	70,046	3%	53%
LOW	10%	9,375	2%	6%



Category	Accuracy
All (HR as Harm Predictor)	85.0%
All (HR and MR as Harm Predictor)	13.4%
Juveniles (HR as Harm Predictor)	94.4%
Juveniles (HR and MR as Harm Predictor)	6.9%
Adults (HR as Harm Predictor)	75.7%
Adults (HR and MR as Harm Predictor)	24.4%
Over 65 (HR as Harm Predictor)	46.6%
Over 65 (HR and MR as Harm Predictor)	13.2%

### Odds Ratios: Predictive Factors for All Mispers



3.5

3

2.5

2

Predictor	Predictor N	Smallest N	Odds Ratio	OR Sig.	Vieual Impaired	0	0.5	1	1.5
Visual Impaired	94	10	3.06	0.002	Visual Impaireu				
Reduced Mobility	413	40	2.77	< 0.001					
Suicidal	529	47	2.52	< 0.001	Suicidal				
Mental Illness	7740	535	2.07	< 0.001	Mental Illness				
No repeat	26237	1401	1.75	< 0.001	No repeat				
Not in Care	82070	3234	1.72	< 0.001	Not In Care				
Disability	10288	597	1.7	< 0.001	Disability				
Vulnerable Adult	129	6	1.25	0.49	Vulnberable Adult				•
Female	42414	1650	1.07	0.05	Female				
Dyslexic	136	4	0.78	0.82	Dyslexic				
Hearing Impaired	179	5	0.74	0.69	Hearing Impaired				
Learning Disability	2410	64	0.69	0.003	Learning Disability				
CSE Risk	4829	119	0.63	< 0.001	CSE Risk				
In care	10611	247	0.58	< 0.001	In Care				
Repeat	66444	2080	0.57	< 0.001	Repeat				
					nopour				



Predictor	Predictor N	Smallest N	Odds Ratio	OR Sig.
Suicidal	469	29	4	< 0.001
Reduced Mobility	24	1	2.58	0.33
Mental Illness	2155	74	2.2	< 0.001
Female	27625	586	1.8	< 0.001
Disability	3598	100	1.78	< 0.001
Learning Disability	1411	40	1.76	0.001
Dyslexic	104	3	1.76	0.24
CSE Risk	4826	119	1.57	< 0.001
In Care	10384	236	1.51	< 0.001
Repeat	46160	800	1.37	0.002
Hearing Impaired	77	1	0.78	1





Predictor	Predictor N	Smallest N	Odds Ratio	OR Sig.
Suicidal	57	16	5.42	< 0.001
Reduced Mobility	197	21	1.65	0.04
Mental Illness	4561	396	1.38	< 0.001
Female	12614	933	1.18	< 0.001
Disability	5497	411	1.14	0.02
No Repeat	14243	1014	1.11	0.02
Vulnerable Adult	42	3	1.06	0.76
Visually Impaired	42	3	1.06	0.76
Repeat	18465	1196	0.9	0.02
In Care	203	9	0.64	0.21
Hearing Impaired	51	2	0.56	0.58
Dyslexic	32	1	0.44	0.72
Learning Disability	985	24	0.34	< 0.001





Predictor	Predictor N	Smallest N	Odds Ratio	OR Sig.
Suicidal	3	1	27.65	0.01
Visually Impaired	49	7	2.32	0.045
No Repeat	3551	280	1.77	<0.001
Reduced Mobility	192	18	1.44	0.14
In Care	24	2	1.25	0.68
Male	3195	233	1.23	0.08
Disability	1193	86	1.09	0.51
Mental Illness	1024	65	0.92	0.58
Female	2175	131	0.81	0.08
Repeat	1819	84	0.57	<0.001
Hearing Impaired	51	2	0.56	0.58







• The risk assessment process for Mispers should be specific to the age and gender of the Misper.

• Six risk different risk assessment models should be built for Mispers; Male and Female for each of the three age categories

 Consider risk grading titles; e.g. Low, Standard, Raised and Critical, rather than Low, Medium and High

 Odds Ratios provide strong indicators, but future model should be built on more sophisticated prediction tool such as Random Forest





## Superintendent Ryan Doyle

ryan.doyle@devonandcornwall.pnn.police.uk

