Errata

On Yokum, Ravishankar and Coppock (2019), *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 116(21)

This note lists five corrections to "A randomized control trial evaluating the effects of police body-worn cameras," published in the *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 116(21):10329–10332, doi 10.1073/pnas.1814773116. The first covers two figure captions that misstate the window the figures cover; the second a compliance figure that disagrees with the article's own Table C.37; the third a count that disagrees with the article's own Table A.1; the fourth a cross-reference to a section the supplement does not have; the fifth a misspelling in a run-in heading. **None changes any conclusion of the paper.** Every treatment effect estimate, standard error, constant and sample size in Tables C.5 through C.37 reproduces exactly, and no estimate anywhere in the article moves.

The numbers in the corrected sentences and every number in the notes beneath them are computed from the deposited replication archive (10.17605/OSF.IO/P6VUH) at the time this document is rendered. The code and output supporting the corrections are at github.com/active-maintenance-aec/yokum_ravishankar_coppock_2019.

1. The captions of supplementary Figures E.3 and E.4 name the wrong window

> Figure E.3: Uses of Force per 1000 Officers, 90 days before and after BWC deployment, broken out by police district. This figure plots pre- and post-treatment uses of force for both control and treatment group officers in each police district. As the chart indicates, there is no statistically significant difference between the two groups in either the 90-day period before or after the deployment of BWCs (which occurs on day 0).

Corrected:

> Figure E.3: Uses of Force per 1000 Officers, **690 days before and 510 days after** BWC deployment, broken out by police district. This figure plots pre- and post-treatment uses of force for both control and treatment group officers in each police district. As the chart indicates, there is no statistically significant difference between the two groups in either **the period** before or after the deployment of BWCs (which occurs on day 0).

> Figure E.4: Complaints per 1000 Officers, 90 days before and after BWC deployment, broken out by police district. This figure plots pre- and post-treatment complaints for both control and treatment group officers in each police district. As the chart indicates, there is no statistically significant difference between the two groups in either the 90-day period before or after the deployment of BWCs (which occurs on day 0).

Corrected:

> Figure E.4: Complaints per 1000 Officers, **690 days before and 510 days after** BWC deployment, broken out by police district. This figure plots pre- and post-treatment complaints for both control and treatment group officers in each police district. As the chart indicates, there is no statistically significant difference between the two groups in either **the period** before or after the deployment of BWCs (which occurs on day 0).

Both figures plot the deposited officer-day panel collapsed to 30-day periods, and that panel runs from 690 days before each district's deployment date to 510 days after it, 41 periods in all. The published horizontal axis is broken at −750, −500, −250, 0, 250 and 500 and carries points across that whole span, so the figures are correct and the captions describe something narrower than what is drawn.

The wording appears to have travelled from a figure the supplement does not print. The deposited `time_series_plot.R` draws each outcome twice, once pooled across districts and once faceted by district, and only the pooled version filters the panel to the periods within 100 days of deployment, which on a 30-day grid is exactly the 90 days before and after that the caption names. The faceted version, which is the one published, carries no such filter. The correction is to the caption alone; nothing in the figures changes.

Neither caption's claim about statistical significance is corrected here, because the deposit contains no test behind it. The figures are scatterplots with smoothed conditional means and shaded bands, and the reader is being pointed at overlapping bands rather than at an estimate.

2. Treatment officers uploaded about 663 videos a year, not about 665

> On average, treatment officers uploaded about 665 videos annually (compared with 14 videos uploaded among control officers).

Corrected:

> On average, treatment officers uploaded about **663** videos annually (compared with 14 videos uploaded among control officers).

The article's own supplementary Table C.37 gives the same quantity. Its control mean is 13.9 videos a year and its estimated effect of being assigned a camera is 649.1, which sum to 663.0. Computed directly on the analysis sample, the inverse-probability-weighted mean among officers assigned a camera is 663.1. No sample or weighting scheme in the deposit returns 665: dropping the weights gives 659.3 on the seven patrol districts, and taking all 2,224 officers in the trial gives 592.5 weighted and 591.9 unweighted. The control figure of 14 is unchanged and is restated above only because it sits in the same sentence.

The manipulation check the sentence supports is unaffected: officers assigned a camera uploaded roughly 48 times as many videos as control officers, and the difference is significant at any conventional level.

3. 178 officers in the pilot were not given cameras, not 180

> In June 2015, eligible officers in these two districts were randomly assigned to receive a BWC or not: 325 officers were outfitted with BWCs, while 180 were not given cameras (the "control" group).

Corrected:

> In June 2015, eligible officers in these two districts were randomly assigned to receive a BWC or not: 325 officers were outfitted with BWCs, while **178** were not given cameras (the "control" group).

The two pilot districts are 5D (79 control, 166 camera) and 7D (99 control, 159 camera) in the supplement's own Table A.1. Their camera counts sum to 325, which is exactly the figure the sentence gives; their control counts sum to 178. The deposited officer file agrees with Table A.1 on both, carrying 178 control and 325 camera officers across the two districts. Nothing else in the article depends on the pilot's control count.

The sentence appears twice in the supplement, word for word. Appendix A carries it on p. 3, and the pre-analysis plan the supplement reproduces carries it again on p. 47, with the same figure of 180. The second occurrence was found by the remastered edition's builder, which searches the supplement's own text layer for every entry it is about to flag rather than trusting a page number, and it is corrected here as well.

4. The alternate measurement plots are in Appendix D, not in a Section 4

> The coefficient plots for each of the outcomes using this alternate measurement strategy are provided in Section 4.

Corrected:

> The coefficient plots for each of the outcomes using this alternate measurement strategy are provided in **Appendix D**.

The supplement's sections are lettered A, B, C, D, E, F, G and it has no Section 4. The alternate measurement plots are Figure D.2, the sole content of Appendix D, "Application of Alternate Measurement Strategy", which is the fourth lettered section and is presumably where the numeral came from.

5. The run-in heading of the data availability statement is misspelled

Data Availablity.

Corrected:

Data Availability.