**Crime Rate per 100,000 population as the dependent variable** and two independent variables: 'Average unemployment rate (Annual %)' and 'Average inflation rate (Annual %)'.

Here are some insights based on the results:

1. \*\*Model Fit:\*\*

- R-squared (R²): 0.295 indicates that approximately 29.5% of the variance in the dependent variable is explained by the independent variables in your model. This suggests a moderate level of explanatory power.

- Adjusted R-squared (Adj. R²): 0.094, which is notably lower than R-squared. This indicates that after adjusting for the number of predictors in the model, the explanatory power decreases substantially.

2. \*\*Coefficient Interpretation:\*\*

- The intercept (const) is 4872.7626, which represents the estimated Total Crime Rate per 100,000 population when both independent variables are zero.

- The coefficient for 'Average unemployment rate (Annual %)' is -6.3830, but with a high p-value of 0.978. This suggests that the average unemployment rate is not statistically significant in predicting the Total Crime Rate.

- The coefficient for 'Average inflation rate (Annual %)' is -136.2417, also with a high p-value of 0.320. This indicates that the average inflation rate is also not statistically significant in predicting the Total Crime Rate.

3. \*\*Other Statistics:\*\*

- The F-statistic tests the overall significance of the model. With a p-value of 0.294, the model as a whole is not statistically significant at the conventional significance level of 0.05. This suggests that the independent variables, as a group, do not reliably predict the dependent variable.

4. \*\*Conclusion:\*\*

Based on these results, it seems that the model with the current independent variables does not effectively explain the variation in the Total Crime Rate per 100,000 population. Consider exploring additional variables or refining the model to improve its predictive power.

**'Property and deception offences Rate per 100,000 population' as the dependent variable** and the same independent variables: 'Average unemployment rate (Annual %)' and 'Average inflation rate (Annual %)'.

Let's break down the results:

1. \*\*Model Fit:\*\*

- R-squared (R²): 0.309 indicates that approximately 30.9% of the variance in the dependent variable is explained by the independent variables in your model. This suggests a moderate level of explanatory power.

- Adjusted R-squared (Adj. R²): 0.112, which is notably lower than R-squared. This indicates that after adjusting for the number of predictors in the model, the explanatory power decreases substantially.

2. \*\*Coefficient Interpretation:\*\*

- The intercept (const) is 3604.9535, which represents the estimated Property and deception offences Rate per 100,000 population when both independent variables are zero.

- The coefficient for 'Average unemployment rate (Annual %)' is 47.3109, but with a high p-value of 0.843. This suggests that the average unemployment rate is not statistically significant in predicting the Property and deception offences Rate.

- The coefficient for 'Average inflation rate (Annual %)' is -121.5810, also with a high p-value of 0.391. This indicates that the average inflation rate is also not statistically significant in predicting the Property and deception offences Rate.

3. \*\*Other Statistics:\*\*

- The F-statistic tests the overall significance of the model. With a p-value of 0.274, the model as a whole is not statistically significant at the conventional significance level of 0.05. This suggests that the independent variables, as a group, do not reliably predict the dependent variable.

4. \*\*Conclusion:\*\*

Similar to the previous analysis, these results indicate that the model with the current independent variables does not effectively explain the variation in the Property and deception offences Rate per 100,000 population. Consider exploring additional variables or refining the model to improve its predictive power.

**Crimes against the person Rate per 100,000 population' dependent variable** and the independent variables 'Average unemployment rate (Annual %)' and 'Average inflation rate (Annual %)':

1. \*\*Model Fit:\*\*

- R-squared (R²): 0.457 indicates that approximately 45.7% of the variance in the dependent variable is explained by the independent variables in your model. This suggests a moderate level of explanatory power.

- Adjusted R-squared (Adj. R²): 0.302, which is lower than R-squared. After adjusting for the number of predictors in the model, the explanatory power decreases, but it's still moderate.

2. \*\*Coefficient Interpretation:\*\*

- The intercept (const) is 1267.8172, which represents the estimated Crimes against the person Rate per 100,000 population when both independent variables are zero.

- The coefficient for 'Average unemployment rate (Annual %)' is -53.6946 with a p-value of 0.068, which is slightly above the conventional significance level of 0.05. This suggests that the average unemployment rate may have some impact on predicting the Crimes against the person Rate, but it's not statistically significant at the usual threshold.

- The coefficient for 'Average inflation rate (Annual %)' is -14.6625 with a p-value of 0.342, indicating that the average inflation rate is not statistically significant in predicting the Crimes against the person Rate.

3. \*\*Other Statistics:\*\*

- The F-statistic tests the overall significance of the model. With a p-value of 0.118, the model as a whole is not statistically significant at the conventional significance level of 0.05. This suggests that the independent variables, as a group, may not reliably predict the dependent variable.

4. \*\*Conclusion:\*\*

The model's R-squared indicates a moderate level of explanatory power, but the p-values for the individual coefficients and the F-statistic for the overall model suggest that the model may not be statistically significant in predicting Crimes against the person Rate per 100,000 population. Consider exploring additional variables or alternative models to improve predictive accuracy.