medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.12.14.21267199; this version posted January 11, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

# The COVID-19 pandemic amplified long-standing racial disparities in the United States criminal justice system

Brennan Klein*[1,2], C. Brandon Ogbunugafor*[3,4,5], Benjamin J. Schafer[6], Zarana Bhadricha[7], Preeti Kori[7], Jim Sheldon[8], Nitish Kaza[1], Emily A. Wang[9,10], Tina Eliassi-Rad[1,11,12,13], Samuel V. Scarpino*[1,5,8,12,13,14,15], and Elizabeth Hinton*[6,16,17]

[1] *Network Science Institute, Northeastern University, Boston, MA, USA*
[2] *Laboratory for the Modeling of Biological and Socio-Technical Systems, Northeastern University, Boston, MA, USA*
[3] *Department of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology, Yale University, New Haven, CT, USA*
[4] *Public Health Modeling Unit, Yale School of Public Health, New Haven, CT, USA*
[5] *Vermont Complex Systems Center, University of Vermont, Burlington, VT, USA*
[6] *Department of History, Yale University, New Haven, CT, USA*
[7] *College of Engineering, Northeastern University, Boston, MA, USA*
[8] *Roux Institute, Northeastern University, Boston, MA, USA*
[9] *SEICHE Center for Health and Justice, Yale School of Medicine, New Haven, CT, USA*
[10] *Department of Medicine, Yale School of Medicine, New Haven, CT, USA*
[11] *Khoury College of Computer Sciences, Northeastern University, Boston, MA, USA*
[12] *Santa Fe Institute, Santa Fe, NM, USA*
[13] *The Institute for Experiential AI, Northeastern University, Boston, MA, USA*
[14] *Pandemic Prevention Institute, The Rockefeller Foundation, Washington, DC, USA*
[15] *Department of Physics, Northeastern University, Boston, MA, USA*
[16] *Department of African American Studies, Yale University, New Haven, CT, USA*
[17] *Yale Law School, New Haven, CT, USA*

January 11, 2022

**Abstract**

During the first year of the COVID-19 pandemic, the number of incarcerated people in the United States decreased by at least 16%—the largest, fastest reduction in prison population in American history. Using an original dataset curated from public sources on prison demographics across all 50 states and the District of Columbia, we show that incarcerated white people benefited disproportionately from this decrease in the U.S. prison population, and the fraction of incarcerated Black and Latino people sharply increased. This pattern deviates from a decade-long trend before 2020 and

*b.klein@northeastern.edu; brandon.ogbunu@yale.edu; sscarpino@rockfound.org; elizabeth.hinton@yale.edu



NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.12.14.21267199; this version posted January 11, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

the onset of COVID-19, during which the proportion of incarcerated Black people was declining. Using case studies of select states, we explore and quantify mechanisms that could explain these disparities: temporary court closures that led to fewer prison admissions, changes in the frequency of police interactions, and state-level prison release policies that sought to de-densify congregate settings. These findings illuminate how systemic inequalities pervade juridicial and penal institutions and are key features of mass incarceration in America.

# 1 Introduction

Mass incarceration in the United States is distinguished by striking racial disparities and a rate of imprisonment that surpasses all other nations, with 2.12 million people behind bars in 2019 [1–6]. As a result of a combination of structural inequities and discriminatory enforcement, Black and Latino people are more likely to be stopped by police [7], held in jail pretrial [8], charged with more serious crimes [9], and sentenced more harshly than white people [10, 11]. These practices have made Black American men six times as likely to be incarcerated as white men and Latino men 2.5 times as likely [12, 13].

In this study, we demonstrate how the COVID-19 pandemic—which produced the largest, most rapid single-year decrease in prison population in American history—amplified existing disparities in the nation's prison system. We observe a convergent pattern across the country: a substantial decrease in the overall number of people incarcerated (by approximately 200,000), but a significant increase in the proportion of incarcerated Black and other non-white people. This trend represents a strong departure from patterns preceding the pandemic, where the proportion of Black incarcerated individuals had been declining for nearly a decade: In March 2013, roughly 39.9% of people incarcerated in state prisons were Black, and by March 2020 this number had fallen to 37.8%—a decline of 2.1% over 7 years. From March 2020 to November 2020 this percentage increased by 0.8%, erasing much of the progress from the declines over the last decade.

Although data reporting methods on racial demographics in prisons have made it difficult for researchers to identify the disparity that widened in 2020, we curate a large, public dataset across all 50 states and the District of Columbia that offers an unprecedented view into the dynamics of prison populations before, during, and after the pandemic.

To explore potential mechanisms that led to the dramatic reduction in U.S. prison populations and that exacerbated racial disparities, we utilize case studies of states, and analyze data across three developments: (i) interruptions to judicial proceedings that followed the lockdown policies that many institutions and non-essential businesses implemented in March 2020, (ii) changes in the frequency of police interactions during the pandemic, and (iii) decarceration policies that several states enacted to release individuals under a specific set of criteria. All three contain signatures of racial bias and are indicative of uniform and deeply entrenched racial disparities in the criminal justice system. Additionally, we include a case study that analyzes crime and sentencing data of hundreds of thousands of incarcerated people in Texas, and we show that the racial disparities uncovered here cannot be explained

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.12.14.21267199; this version posted January 11, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .




**Figure 1: Dynamics of the U.S. prison population. (A)** Total number of incarcerated people in the United States from 2013 to August 2021. **(B)** Total percent of incarcerated Black people, as reported by states' Departments of Correction. According to data from the United States census, Black people account for 13.4% of the total population [14].

by, for example, systematic differences in crime severity, by race (see Section A.3.1).

Ultimately, the number of incarcerated people decreased dramatically in 2020, regardless of race. However, the observations and analyses introduced here show that these declines were not distributed equally by race, especially for incarcerated Black people. We estimate that nearly 15,000 fewer Black people would be incarcerated in January 2021 if the racial disparities we observe were not present (see Table A.5). We discuss this and related observations in light of the ethics of public health interventions, national debates about the future direction of policing and incarceration, and the importance of data infrastructure in responsible public policy.

# 2 Results

## 2.1 Overall decrease in prison populations across every state

The state prison population in the United States decreased by at least 16.3% between March 2020 and July 2021, from approximately 1.23 million to 1.03 million people incarcerated (Figure 1A). Regardless of its pre-2020 population trends, this decrease in prison population occurred in every state, and, in most, started in early to mid-April 2020 (see Figure A.1 for a state-by-state look at prison populations over time). For instance, some states entered 2020 with a steadily-declining prison population (e.g. Massachusetts, South Carolina, California, among others); others had maintained relatively stable prison populations before 2020 (e.g. Virginia, Georgia, Iowa, etc.); even in states with a growing prison population before the

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.12.14.21267199; this version posted January 11, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .




**Figure 2: Percent of incarcerated Black people across nine representative states.** In some states, the percent of incarcerated Black people had been decreasing over the last several years. In others, this percentage had been increasing. Despite a variety of pre-2020 trends, we see the same general trend across the United States: During the pandemic, incarcerated Black people accounted for an even larger share of the total prison population than in previous years. Note also that the percent of non-white incarcerated people increased in general across these states during the pandemic. See Figure A.6 to see the extent to which this trend is especially pronounced among the Black population in prisons.

pandemic (e.g. Alabama, Indiana, Montana, etc.), we see large reductions in the prison population during the COVID-19 pandemic.

As of October 2021, several states' prison populations continue to decrease (Arizona,

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.12.14.21267199; this version posted January 11, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Massachusetts, Tennessee, Louisiana, Pennsylvania, among others) and have done so monotonically throughout the pandemic. Other states' prison populations dropped sharply in the early months of the pandemic but have seen their prison populations begin to approach pre-pandemic levels through 2021 (North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, West Virginia, among others). In Figure A.1, we plot time series for each state's prison population over the last several years. Additionally, in Table A.1, we give an overview for each state's approach for reporting prison population statistics, along with how we collected each state's data.

## 2.2 Changing racial demographics of the prison population

Amid large-scale reductions in the prison population, the relative number of Black and other non-white incarcerated persons increased (Figure 1B; see Figure A.6 for comparison between effects among non-white vs. Black populations). Perhaps most alarming is the extent to which this sharp increase deviates from a decade-long trend before 2020: incarcerated Black people have accounted for a declining share of the total prison population over the last several years, from approximately 40% of the prison population in 2012 to 37.8% at the start of 2020 (decreasing by 0.275% each year, approximately linearly). This relative increase in the amount of incarcerated Black people is seen in almost every state, which often have very different approaches to crime and incarceration. In Figure 2, we show the percentage of incarcerated individuals who are Black across nine states. Despite the variability in pre-2020 trends, we see the same overall pattern: During the COVID-19 pandemic, the relative number of Black people in prison has increased. In several states and in the national average, this spike is temporary, eventually returning to its pre-pandemic level. We explore possible explanations for this reversal in subsequent sections, but the most likely reason is that the pace of prison admissions began to return to typical rates in early 2021.

## 2.3 Mechanisms of disparity: Admissions and releases

Consider a time series of a state's prison population that does not notably change over several years. In order for this to occur, there needs to be approximately the same number of admissions and releases during this time period. This also means that in order for the demographic makeup of the prison population to remain stable, the relative number of admissions and releases by race also need to be roughly equivalent and constant over time. If there are sustained periods where there are more admissions (or releases) of a certain racial group, that will skew the overall demographic distribution of the prison population.

In our case, understanding this dynamic offers us a path toward identifying and isolating potential mechanisms that could bring about the spike in the proportion of Black incarcerated people during the COVID-19 pandemic. Namely, the observed spike in Figure 1B is either due to a disparity in who was admitted into prison during the pandemic or who was released, or both. In the remainder of this section, we present three data-based case studies from different states that highlight the structural racism within the American criminal justice system. These case studies incorporate data from Florida, Texas, and Arkansas—three states from which we were able to find useful, high quality data. While we do not claim that

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.12.14.21267199; this version posted January 11, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

these states are representative of every justice system nationwide, each case study provides evidence for one potential mechanism that contributed to the trends from Figure 1B. There are surely more, but the general lack of public data hinders our ability to systematically study the issues addressed in each case. As such, these case studies also underscore the fundamental importance of public data in the study of inequality in the United States.

**Disruptions in court operations.** In every state except Nebraska, courts closed at the beginning of the pandemic. This dramatically reduced or altogether halted admissions into prisons for several months, starting around April 2020 [15–17]. Releases from prisons did not experience a commensurate reduction in volume and, as such, disruptions in court proceedings are likely the largest contributor to the reductions in states' prison populations [18]. The Virginia Department of Corrections acknowledges this in their Annual Report from 2020 [19], "The reduction in [average daily population] is directly attributed to the suspension of intake due to COVID-19." Similarly, a spokesperson for the Michigan Department of Corrections estimated that half of the reductions in incarcerated population were due to a decline in prisoner intake from courts and county jails [20].

Here we can use data from Florida as a case study, showing how changes to typical court proceedings can potentially lead to new racial disparities in the prison population [21–24]. In Figure 3, we plot monthly trial statistics from circuit criminal defendants in Florida. Prior to March 2020, an average of 14,000 defendants were disposed each month (i.e., pass through the court system and either have their charges dropped, agree to a guilty plea, go to a jury trial, or go to a non-jury trial; Figure 3A). Starting in March 2020, the number of defendants decreased sharply, reaching nearly 4,000 in May 2020; as a result, we see a backlog of cases begin to accumulate (Figure 3B).

Between March 2020 and June 2020, more than 99% of cases did not go to trial (up from an average of approximately 97% prior to 2020). An increase in the proportion of cases that get resolved pre-trial means that a greater percent of all defendants passing through the Florida courts system will either agree to a guilty plea or see their charges dropped entirely. Importantly, both of these can be sources of bias in the resulting prison population.

First, we know from previous research that Black defendants are almost 70% more likely than white defendants to receive a plea deal that involves spending time in prison [9]. Second, we show here that the percent of cases that were dismissed entirely increased from an average of 10% before 2020 up to 15% in June 2020 (Figure 3C), and this increase in dismissed cases is strongly correlated with the percent of non-white incarcerated individuals (lagged one month to account for time delays in sentencing; Figure 3D). This case study highlights multiple potential sources of bias that can stem from disruptions in the court system, and it emphasizes the need for more states to make similar sentencing data available to the public. Ultimately, the absence of data about defendants' race limits our ability to directly connect case-dismissals to prison demographic distributions. However, we observe these same correlations between percent of dismissed cases and percent of non-white incarcerated people prior to the COVID-19 pandemic, suggesting that this relationship is potentially more general and not merely an anomaly due to the pandemic.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.12.14.21267199; this version posted January 11, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .




**Figure 3: Case study: Circuit criminal defendants in Florida. (A)** Total number of defendants with disposed cases (i.e., number of closed cases) over time. **(B)** Case completion rate (number of disposed defendants divided by the number of cases filed). **(C)** Percent of defendants with cases that are dismissed before going to trial (different from pre-trial guilty pleas). **(D)** Correlation between percent of dismissed cases and percent of incarcerated individuals who are non-white (one month lag). Data is from Florida Office of the State Courts Administrator [21], from November 30, 2018 to June 30, 2020 (latest data available).

**Changes in police interactions.** Another potential source of disparities in terms of who gets admitted into prisons is related to changes in how certain populations are policed during the pandemic [26]. While this is (like other topics) difficult to study quantitatively due to a general lack of data in most states, here we can point to data from Texas as an illustrative case study. Texas Highway Patrol releases monthly data about violations and traffic stops

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.12.14.21267199; this version posted January 11, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .




**Figure 4: Case study: Traffic stop data, Texas.** Percent of total traffic violations that involve **(A)** white drivers or **(B)** Black and Latino drivers [25]. Before 2020, the average number of monthly violations ranged from 350,000 to 425,000; this dropped to under 100,000 during April 2020 and gradually increased to 256,000 by December 2020. In each plot, the 7-day and 28-day rolling averages are shown. On average before March 2020, 36.5% of traffic violations involved white drivers, while 61.7% involved Black or Latino drivers—these averages are plotted as horizontal lines behind the data in each subplot. During the week of May 11, 2020, white drivers made up an average of 28.2% of traffic stops, while Black and Latino drivers accounted for over 70.3% on average.

recorded by highway patrol officers [25]. This dataset includes details about the drivers involved in the traffic stop, including the race and sex of the driver.

In Figure 4, we plot the percent of all monthly traffic violations that involved drivers who were white (Figure 4A) and drivers who were Black or Latino (Figure 4B) between January 2018 and December 2020. On average before March 2020, Black and Latino drivers accounted for 61% of traffic violations in Texas. In April 2020, however, this number climbed to nearly 70% of all traffic violations. Additionally, these numbers may still represent an under-estimate of the true proportion of traffic violations by Black and Latino drivers in the dataset; an analysis from 2015 found that the Texas Department of Public Safety consistently misreported and under-counted the number of Latino drivers that were stopped [27].

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.12.14.21267199; this version posted January 11, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .




**Figure 5: Case study: Eligible releases in Arkansas.** In May 2020, incarcerated white people accounted for 57.2% of the total prison population in Arkansas. However, white incarcerated people accounted for over 72% of the those listed as eligible for early release under public health precautions for COVID-19 [29].

**Decarceration.** Several states enacted policies designed to de-densify prisons in response to pressure from public health officials. In some states, this directive came from an executive order from the governor; in others, this directive originated in the legislature. In Utah, for example, policies around releases are designed, approved, and implemented by the Board of Pardons and Parole (BPP)—an entirely separate entity from the courts and the Department of Corrections. According to the BPP, incarcerated people who are eligible for early release needed to be already characterized as a non-violent offender, be within 90 days of release (this was later extended to 180 days [28]), and have an approved address to stay at after their release. In Arkansas, under authorization from Governor Hutchinson (Executive Orders 20-06 and 20-16 [29]), the parole made 1,243 incarcerated people eligible for early release as of April 30, 2020. These eligible incarcerated people needed to have a parole plan in place, be medically screened (i.e., tested and screened for symptoms of COVID-19), and undergo final approval by the Arkansas Department of Corrections director in order to be released,.

In Figure 5, we compare the demographics of the prison population in Arkansas in May 2020 to the demographics of incarcerated people eligible for early release under Governor Hutchinson's authorization [29]; despite the fact that 57.2% of the Arkansas prison population was white, over 72% of the incarcerated people eligible for early releases were white—a disparity that we would not expect to see in a prison system absent of biases in sentencing.

This is not to suggest that that every state with COVID-19 based release policies was

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.12.14.21267199; this version posted January 11, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

subject to the same difference observed in Arkansas. Indeed, in Figure A.7, we compare multiple states releases-to-incarcerated ratio (i.e., percent of releases of a given race, divided by the percent of the total prison population of the same race—if this ratio is 1.0, then there is a proportional number of releases of a given race as one would expect, given the demographic composition of the prison population). In Figure A.7 we show that while, on average, Black incarcerated people are released at disproportionately low rates (and incarcerate white people are released at disproportionately high rates), the effect of COVID-19 based releases can temporarily bring about less biased release patterns. We see this in Massachusetts especially in May and November of 2020, and we are encouraged that at least in one state, it is possible to carefully decarcerate in a way that does not exacerbate existing racial inequalities.

# 3 Discussion

Several concerning patterns emerge through the unprecedented decrease in US prison population during the COVID-19 pandemic. After declining steadily for the last decade, the percent of Black and other non-white incarcerated people sharply during 2020, a trend that was present across the country. We collected and validated a vast dataset to detect the spike in Black and other non-white incarceration proportions during the COVID-19 pandemic. The dataset we curated for this study is itself a core contribution. In order to obtain data across all 50 states, we had to manually collect data from individual Departments of Corrections, and by filing Freedom of Information Act requests (see Methods). The continued lack of granular data across the police, court, and prison system prevents us from accurately measuring racial disparities or the mechanisms that underlie them.

Given the heterogeneity in the structures of criminal justice systems across states, fully disentangling the precise cause of national patterns is challenging. There is a lack of standardized, systematically-reported data across the country that would permit a detailed interrogation of individual state patterns. However, we explore several potential explanatory mechanisms through case studies, including biases in admissions due to atypical court proceedings (see: Florida case study), biases in admissions due to increased police interactions (see: Texas case study), and biases in releases due to public health interventions (see: Arkansas case study).

We stress that these case studies are not intended to offer a definitive account of the racial disparities that emerged during the COVID-19 pandemic; they instead constitute investigations of three aspects of the justice systems (court admissions, policing, and releases) in three different states. Together, however, they offer potential mechanisms for the trends in Figure 1, and carry evidence for bias in the same direction as the national spike in incarcerations proportions among Black and other non-white people. In Section A.3.1, we explore the possibility that the racial disparities from Figure 1B could arise because of systematic differences in crime severity (i.e., the possibility that the relative increase in the Black incarcerated population was due to, on average, Black people committing and being sentenced to more severe offenses). We in fact show the opposite. Using two years of individual-level data from the Texas Department of Criminal Justice, we look at the race and

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.12.14.21267199; this version posted January 11, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

the offense-severity categorization of incarcerated people in Texas, and we find that there was a relative increase in low and moderate offenses among Black incarcerated people during the COVID-19 pandemic (Figure A.5).

The most probable cause of the large-scale disparities that were observed during the pandemic are disruptions in the court system. Our results indicate that in several settings (see: Florida case study), the increase in Black and Latino incarceration proportions could in part be due to relative increases in pre-trial case dismissals (Figure 3D) and pre-trial plea deals. Plea deals in particular have long been demonstrated to result in a disproportionate number of Black defendants spending time in prison [9, 22, 23]. Consequently, interruptions in court proceedings led circuit courts to amplify a process long understood to drive inequalities, which likely contributed to the patterns outlined in this study.

According to an analysis of data from 12 states' court caseloads as of June 2021, there was a backlog of almost two million active pending cases awaiting legal outcomes [30]. Starting in early 2022, there will be increased pressure to clear this backlog, placing an additional workload on public defenders in particular [31]. Given the backlog of cases and the increased prevalence of algorithmic risk assessment tools [32], it is not unreasonable to imagine judges may start to rely even more on algorithmic-based approaches to clearing cases in the name of meeting standards for speedy trials. Additionally, with staffing shortages on top of an already overburdened prison system [33], we can expect to see conditions for incarcerated people devolve even further.

Another possible mechanism that we highlight in case studies involves the role of disparities in police interactions during the pandemic. A body of literature has demonstrated that Black and Latino communities are policed far more heavily than their white counterparts [1–4, 6, 34], and has identified factors that underlie bias in law enforcement [35, 36]. In Texas, the share of Black and Latino drivers who received traffic violations increased nearly 10% during the pandemic window. There are many potential explanations for why we see this abrupt and increased bias emerge in these data from Texas during the pandemic. While traffic stops are not the only way for people to enter the judicial system—nor are they the primary source of prison admissions—Texas offers an illustrative case study with evidence that policing has changed during the COVID-19 pandemic, which could ultimately bring about changes in the racial distribution of the prison population observed during the pandemic. Note also that this specific dataset—traffic stops—points to the structural nature of racial disparities in the United States carceral system. That is, during the pandemic, we saw large reductions in mobility and commuting patterns across the United States—regional reductions that are strongly correlated with how many jobs in the area allow workers to work from home [37]. Jobs that are more likely to require in-person attendance (i.e., jobs designated as "essential work") are disproportionately held by Black and Latino people [38].

The last of our case-driven investigations involved state-driven decarceration policies. While they played a relatively minor role in the nationwide pandemic prison population decline, they still carried the signature of racial bias that is a feature of the pandemic. Maintaining the largest and most expansive prison system in the world is a major public health threat, especially in the context of infectious diseases [39]. In particular, severely

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.12.14.21267199; this version posted January 11, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

overcrowded conditions have presented a challenging and fundamental public health threat during the COVID-19 pandemic [40]. The physical and administrative structure of prisons provided constraints on ways to quarantine incarcerated people and de-densify congregate settings [40–44]. In recognition of these circumstances, several states enacted policies and initiated executive orders to release individuals who they deem eligible [18].

As a public health intervention, decarceration is a highly effective way to mitigate outbreaks inside and outside of prisons [40, 42–46]. During the pandemic, criteria for decarceration differed from state-to-state, but often included factors such as the age of the incarcerated person and the offense for which they were convicted (e.g. nonviolent drug offenders) [47]. In this study, we were able to quantify disparities in the efforts to de-densify prisons (see: Arkansas case study), which suggests that even decarceration policies widely understood to be consistent with effective and ethical public health practice (and that are assumed to be "race blind") are also susceptible to biases. And one of the most important consequences of bias in releases is not only about who is released, but who is left behind: the increase in the proportion of incarcerated Black and other non-white people translates to their being at a heightened risk of exposure to SARS-CoV-2.

The COVID-19 pandemic has disrupted every facet of public life. In this study, we examine how these disruptions reveal structural racism underlying mass incarceration. As is the case with many large and complex social phenomena, the dynamics of the prison populations are defined by interactions between multiple actors, that in combination, create surprising or troubling results. In response to these findings, society has an ethical obligation to act, and reform the criminal legal system towards more equitable ends.

# 4 Data & Methods

## 4.1 Prison population by state over time

Time series data about states' prison population over time were collected manually through scraping Departments of Corrections websites, as well as direct requests to state officials through public record requests (e.g. Freedom of Information Act requests, etc.). For every state in our dataset we sought the most temporally resolved data as possible. We collected population data at either weekly, monthly, quarterly, or, for some states, yearly levels. The most common form of data we were able to collect is the number of currently incarcerated persons in a given state, on a monthly timescale. In Table A.1, we link to the data source for every state in our dataset, and in Section A.1, we show how the prison population of every state has changed over time.

We compared the data collected here to data from other organizations that report statistics about the U.S. prison population—the Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS) [4] and the Vera Institute for Justice [48]—and find high overlap between all three of the datasets. In Section A.2, we identify where our data differs from the BJS data, and we offer an explanation for why we are confident in accuracy of our approach (e.g. in several cases, we received the data directly from the states' Departments of Corrections, via public records requests).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.12.14.21267199; this version posted January 11, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

For every state in this dataset, the total prison population includes both male and female incarcerated people (something that is not always the case in studies about the U.S. carceral system, which so often focuses on male incarcerated people). In New Mexico, Vermont, and California, "Transgender", "Other", or "Non-Binary" are also listed as gender categories, though this practice is not widely adopted in reporting statistics about the incarcerated population. In 27 states, incarcerated race statistics are separated by "male", "female", and "total", and further characterizing the interaction between race and sex in admissions and release bias during the COVID-19 pandemic remains future work.

## 4.2 State policy data

### 4.2.1 Court closures and reduced intake capacity

Qualitative data on the closure and reopening of all 50 state court systems were collected primarily through the administrative orders and/or press releases of each state system's Supreme or Superior Court or chief judicial officer as well as through local news coverage. The vast majority of states suspended all in-person proceedings with the exception of limited emergency matters between March 12 and March 20, 2020. Several states that adopted policies early in this period issued increasingly strict guidance as the pandemic worsened. New Jersey, for example, suspended new trials on March 12 and issued a two-week suspension on municipal court proceedings on March 14 before finally suspending all proceedings (with emergency exceptions) on March 15. In addition to closing judicial buildings and suspending proceedings, most court closures also extended statute of limitations and filing deadlines due to pandemic disruption. A handful of states, Pennsylvania and Texas among them, permitted or encouraged courts to begin conducting remote proceedings in their initial closure orders, though the adoption of remote proceedings was not widespread in this initial lockdown stage.

Court reopening policies were significantly more heterogeneous than the initial closures, though trials remained suspended in most states through at least early-Summer 2020 (and in most cases substantially later). The earliest such policies appeared at the beginning of April 2020, with most aimed at giving regional and local judges discretion to begin hearing proceedings remotely (e.g. Louisiana, Massachusetts, Florida, Iowa, among others). A substantially larger group of states adopted reopening guidelines between late-April and mid-May, many of which allowed essential judicial staff to return to offices following new public health guidance while also maintaining remote proceedings and expanding the number of non-trial proceedings that courts could conduct remotely. Further reopenings and the resumption of limited in-person proceedings took place in many states throughout June, July, and August 2020, though trial proceedings remained suspended. Notably, several states, especially those that adopted phased reopening plans, restricted in-person proceedings and further delayed trial resumption with the Fall-Winter 2020-21 COVID surge. In many states, most administrative orders restricting court operations have at the time of publishing been rescinded, though others, California notably among them, still retain certain accommodations including the option for remote proceedings.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.12.14.21267199; this version posted January 11, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

#### 4.2.2 Release policy data

Data on COVID release policies, where they existed, were collected from states' individual corrections/prison bureau systems, governors' executive orders, and local news coverage. Fifteen states did not adopt any official release policy, though our data nevertheless shows that there were still reductions in the overall prison population during the pandemic in all of these states. The remaining 35 states adopted policies with varying degrees of specificity and effectiveness, though many overlapped in their broadest contours, allowing consideration for early release to be granted to incarcerated people at increased public health risk (either due to age or underlying health condition) and for those nearing parole and/or the end of their prison sentences.

Almost all states with such policies did, however, adopt a restriction preventing the release of those incarcerated for violent crimes or sex offenses. North Dakota was an outlier in this regard. Of the 120 people the state initially released from prison in March 2020, 14 were serving time for violent crime convictions and 11 were convicted of sex offenses. New York's release policy was notably more restrictive (on paper at least) than many other states—only those incarcerated for "non-criminal technical parole violations" were eligible for COVID release. As an example of one state's release policy, we include below an excerpt from the Virginia Department of Corrections' policy on releases [49], from April 24, 2020:

> The Director of the Department of Corrections is authorized to consider early release for individuals with less than one year left to serve while the COVID-19 emergency declaration is in effect. Offenders convicted of a Class 1 felony or a sexually violent offense are not eligible for consideration. The exact number of individuals eligible for early release consideration will change depending on the length of the emergency declaration order. The [Department of Corrections] will identify those that are eligible for consideration using the procedures it has developed to ensure public safety and will notify offenders who are to be released under the early release plan. A diagnosis of COVID-19 is not a release factor.
>
> The following Early Release Criteria will be utilized in considering an incarcerated person for early release pursuant to legislation:
>
> - **Release Date**: The inmate's Good Time Release Date must be calculated and verified in order for the incarcerated to be considered.
> - **Inmate Medical Condition**: The inmate's medical condition will be considered.
> - **Offense History**: By legislative mandate, early release does not apply to inmates convicted of a Class 1 felony or a sexually violent offense. Consideration for early release will be based on the seriousness of the current offense, in descending order as follows: Non-violent Offense, Felony Weapons Offenses, Involuntary Manslaughter, Voluntary Manslaughter, Robbery, Felony Assault, Abduction, Murder, Sex Offense

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.12.14.21267199; this version posted January 11, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

- **Viable Home Plan**: The incarcerated person must have a documented approved home plan to be considered.
- **Good Time Earning Level**: The inmate's current good time earning level must be I or II to be considered.
- **No Active Detainers**: Inmates must have no active detainer to be considered.
- **No Sexually Violent Predator Predicate Offenses**: Inmates convicted of one or more sexually violent offenses established in §37.2-903 of the Code of Virginia are not eligible pursuant to legislation.
- **Recidivism Risk**: Inmates must have a risk of recidivism of medium (5-7) or low (1-4), as identified by the validated COMPAS instrument, to be considered.

Note especially the inclusion of the COMPAS risk assessment tool, which is used in court systems across the U.S. as a way of quantifying an offender's likelihood of re-offending (recidivism). Over the last several years, we've seen a growing body of scholarly work devoted to identifying problematic and harmful racial and economic biases that arise when algorithmic risk assessment tools are used in practice [50–55]. COMPAS, in particular, has been the subject of a number of studies that take a critical look at the effectiveness—and ethics—of these risk assessment tools in the justice system [32, 51]; in one study, COMPAS was found to predict recidivism 61% of the time, but at the same time, Black people were almost twice as likely to be labeled as high risk for re-offending but not actually re-offend [32].

Ultimately, further research is needed to quantify demographic patterns in the incarcerated individuals who were released across different states, and because there was such high heterogeneity in different states' policies, it remains an open question whether we will see the same broad, systematic racial differences among the people who were released. However, as has been the case throughout the COVID-19 pandemic, heterogeneous policy responses across localities has typically had detrimental effects on our collective response to the pandemic [56].

## 4.3 Study definitions of race and ethnicity

The data that we collected for the study used definitions of racial and ethnic groups that were determined by the agencies that collected the data. When the authors are discussing race and ethnicity in their interpretations, they are referring to the historical categories that have social, cultural and political consequences. We use the term "Latino" to describe persons that are otherwise described as "Hispanic" in many settings. We have used the term "non-white" in select locations, as not all states had data disaggregated into the same set of categories. And so for some analyses, "non-white" directly describes the available data. For a table of the race categories reported by every state in our dataset, see Table A.6.

Recent advances in medical conventions have prompted discipline-wide introspection about the ways that race and ethnicity are discussed and used in research [57]. This is

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.12.14.21267199; this version posted January 11, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

of critical importance to health equity and racial justice, and while in this work we rely on race statistics reported by states' Departments of Correction, future work will critically examine the differences in approaches for reporting race and ethnicity statistics of incarcerated populations. Notably, it is important to know whether a state's statistical reports use race categories that have been self-reported by the incarcerated person or whether it is interviewer-observed, which is often the case in administrative databases. These approaches are quite different and often result in inaccuracies in measurement of racial disparities [58].

# Additional information

## Software and data availability

The dataset and Python code to reproduce the analyses and construction of the database is available at `https://github.com/jkbren/decarceration-project`.

## Acknowledgements

The authors thank Harrison Hartle, Stefan McCabe, Timothy LaRock, Ryan Gallagher, and members of the Northeastern University NULab for helpful conversations and tips with constructing the dataset. The findings and conclusions in this study are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position of The Rockefeller Foundation.

## Author contributions

B.K., C.B.O., S.V.S., & E.H. conceived the project. C.B.O., S.V.S., & E.H. directed the project. B.K. directed the construction of the data science pipeline. B.K., B.J.S., Z.B., P.K., J.S., & N.K. collected data. B.K., C.B.O., B.J.S., and S.V.S. conducted analyses. B.K., C.B.O., E.A.W., T.E.R., S.V.S., & E.H. interpreted and integrated the results. B.K., C.B.O., B.J.S., E.A.W., T.E.R., S.V.S., & E.H. contributed to researching, writing, and editing the final manuscript.

# References

[1] National Research Council. *The growth of incarceration in the United States: Exploring causes and consequences*. Ed. by Jeremy Travis, Bruce Western, and Steve Redburn. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press, 2014. ISBN: 978-0-309-29801-8. DOI: 10.17226/18613.

[2] Angela J. Davis. *Policing the Black man: Arrest, prosecution, and imprisonment*. New York, NY: Pantheon Books, 2017. ISBN: 9780525436614. URL: https://digitalcommons.wcl.american.edu/facsch_bks/76.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.12.14.21267199; this version posted January 11, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

[3] Bruce Western. *Punishment and inequality in America*. New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation, 2006. ISBN: 9781610445559. URL: https://www.russellsage.org/publications/punishment-and-inequality-america-1.

[4] E. Ann Carson. "Prisoners in 2019". In: *Bureau of Justice Statistics* 255115 (2020). URL: https://bjs.ojp.gov/library/publications/prisoners-2019.

[5] E. Ann Carson. "Prisoners in 2020 – Statistical Tables". In: *Bureau of Justice Statistics* 302776 (2021). URL: https://bjs.ojp.gov/library/publications/prisoners-2020-statistical-tables.

[6] Elizabeth Hinton and DeAnza Cook. "The mass criminalization of Black Americans: A historical overview". In: *Annual Review of Criminology* 4.1 (2021), pp. 261–286. DOI: 10.1146/annurev-criminol-060520-033306.

[7] Erika Harrell and Elizabeth Davis. "Contacts between police and the public, 2018– Statistical tables". In: *Bureau of Justice Statistics* 255730 (2020). URL: https://bjs.ojp.gov/content/pub/pdf/cbpp18st.pdf.

[8] Wendy Sawyer. "How race impacts who is detained pretrial". In: *Prison Policy Initiative Briefing* (2019). URL: https://www.prisonpolicy.org/blog/2019/10/09/pretrial_race/.

[9] Ram Subramanian, Léon Digard, Melvin Washington II, and Stephanie Sorage. "In the shadows: A review of the research on plea bargaining". In: *Vera Institute of Justice* (2020). URL: https://www.vera.org/downloads/publications/in-the-shadows-pleabargaining.pdf.

[10] United States Sentencing Commission. *Demographic differences in sentencing: An update to the 2012 Booker report*. 3. 2018, pp. 212–229. URL: https://www.ussc.gov/research/research-reports/demographic-differences-sentencing.

[11] Vanessa A. Edkins and Allison D. Redlich. *A system of pleas: Social sciences contributions to the real legal system*. Oxford University Press, 2019. DOI: 10.1093/oso/9780190689247.001.0001.

[12] Thomas P. Bonczar and Allen J. Beck. "Lifetime likelihood of going to state or federal prison". In: *Bureau of Justice Statistics* (1997). URL: https://bjs.ojp.gov/library/publications/lifetime-likelihood-going-state-or-federal-prison.

[13] The Sentencing Project. "Criminal justice facts". In: (2021). URL: https://www.sentencingproject.org/criminal-justice-facts/.

[14] *Population estimates, July 1, 2019, – Race and Hispanic Origin*. 2019. URL: https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/fact/table/US/PST045219.

[15] United States Courts. *Federal judges reinventing the jury trial during pandemic*. 2020. URL: https://www.uscourts.gov/news/2020/08/27/federal-judges-reinventing-jury-trial-during-pandemic.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.12.14.21267199; this version posted January 11, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

[16] Julie Marie Baldwin, John M. Eassey, and Erika J. Brooke. "Court operations during the COVID-19 pandemic". In: *American Journal of Criminal Justice* 45.4 (2020), pp. 743–758. DOI: 10.1007/s12103-020-09553-1.

[17] Tarika Daftary-Kapur, Kelsey S. Henderson, and Tina M. Zottoli. "COVID-19 exacerbates existing system factors that disadvantage defendants: Findings from a national survey of defense attorneys". In: *Law and Human Behavior* 45.2 (2021), pp. 81–96. DOI: 10.1037/lhb0000442.

[18] Carlos Franco-Paredes, Nazgol Ghandnoosh, Hassan Latif, Martin Krsak, Andres F. Henao-Martinez, Megan Robins, Lilian Vargas Barahona, and Eric M. Poeschla. "Decarceration and community re-entry in the COVID-19 era". In: *The Lancet Infectious Diseases* 21.1 (2021), e11–e16. DOI: 10.1016/S1473-3099(20)30730-1.

[19] Virginia Department of Corrections. *Legislature Approves Authority for Virginia DOC to Release Some Offenders Early During Pandemic*. URL: https://vadoc.virginia.gov/media/1623/vadoc-financial-annual-mis-report-2020.pdf.

[20] Kyle Kaminski. *MDOC Prison Population Update*. URL: https://www.house.mi.gov/hfa/PDF/Corrections/Corrections_Subcmte_Testimony_MDOC_Population_6-8-20.pdf.

[21] Florida Office of the State Courts Administrator. *Trial Court Statistics Search*. URL: http://trialstats.flcourts.org/.

[22] Ryan T. Cannon. "Sick deal: Injustice and plea bargaining during COVID-19". In: *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology* 110 (2020). DOI: 10.2139/ssrn.3632508.

[23] Thea Johnson. "Crisis and coercive pleas". In: *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology* 110 (2020). DOI: 10.2139/ssrn.3632052.

[24] Miko M. Wilford, David M. Zimmerman, Shi Yan, and Kelly T. Sutherland. "Innocence in the shadow of COVID-19: Plea decision making during a pandemic." In: *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Applied* (2021). DOI: 10.1037/xap0000367.

[25] Texas Department of Public Safety. *Texas Highway Patrol High Value Data Sets*. URL: https://www.dps.texas.gov/section/about-dps/texas-department-public-safety-high-value-data-sets.

[26] Elizabeth Hinton. "Policing social unrest and collective violence". In: *Science* 374.6565 (2021), pp. 272–274. DOI: 10.1126/science.abi9169.

[27] Ben Friberg, David Barer, Rachel Garza, Josh Hinkle, Robert Sims, Calily Bien, Patrick Tolbert, and Chad Cross. "Texas troopers ticketing Hispanic drivers as white". In: *KXAN Austin* (2015). URL: https://www.kxan.com/investigations/texas-troopers-ticketing-hispanic-drivers-as-white/.

[28] Utah Board of Pardons and Parole. *Response to COVID-19 – Early Release*. URL: https://bop.utah.gov/index.php/home-top-public-menu/2-uncategorised/165-bopp-coronavirus-information.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.12.14.21267199; this version posted January 11, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

[29] Arkansas Board of Corrections. *Modified EPA Update*. 2020. URL: https://ssl-adc.ark.org/modified-epa-update.

[30] Diane Robinson and Sarah Gibson. *Pandemic caseloads: Court filings and dispositions*. 2021. URL: https://www.courtstatistics.org/__data/assets/pdf_file/0022/61519/2020_4Q_pandemic.pdf.

[31] Phil McCausland. "Public defenders nationwide say they're overworked and underfunded". In: *NBC* (2017). URL: https://www.nbcnews.com/news/us-news/public-defenders-nationwide-say-they-re-overworked-underfunded-n828111.

[32] Julia Angwin, Jeff Larson, Surya Mattu, and Lauren Kirchner. "Machine bias". In: *ProPublica* (2016). URL: https://www.propublica.org/article/machine-bias-risk-assessments-in-criminal-sentencing.

[33] Jan Ransom, Jonah E. Bromwich, and Rebecca Davis O'Brien. "Inside Rikers: Dysfunction, Lawlessness and Detainees in Control". In: *New York Times* (2021). URL: https://www.nytimes.com/2021/10/11/nyregion/rikers-detainees-correction-officers.html.

[34] Elizabeth Hinton. *From the War on Poverty to the War on Crime*. Harvard University Press, 2016. ISBN: 9780674737235. URL: http://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctvjk2w72.

[35] Marie Pryor, Kim Shayo Buchanan, and Phillip Atiba Goff. "Risky situations: Sources of racial disparity in police behavior". In: *Annual Review of Law and Social Science* 16 (2020), pp. 343–360. DOI: 10.1146/annurev-lawsocsci-101518-042633.

[36] Jillian K. Swencionis and Phillip Atiba Goff. "The psychological science of racial bias and policing". In: *Psychology, Public Policy, and Law* 23.4 (2017), p. 398. DOI: 10.1037/law0000130.

[37] Brennan Klein, Tim LaRock, Stefan McCabe, Leo Torres, Lisa Friedland, Maciej Kos, Filippo Privitera, Brennan Lake, Moritz U.G. Kraemer, John S. Brownstein, David Lazer, Tina Eliassi-Rad, Samuel V. Scarpino, Alessandro Vespignani, and Matteo Chinazzi. "Quantifying collective physical distancing during the COVID-19 outbreak". In: *preprint* (2020). URL: https://www.mobs-lab.org/uploads/6/7/8/7/6787877/covid19mobility_report2.pdf.

[38] "Derrick Palmer et al. vs. Amazon.com, Inc., et al." In: *Case 20-3989, Document 56* (2021). URL: https://www.govinfo.gov/app/details/USCOURTS-nyed-1_20-cv-02468/USCOURTS-nyed-1_20-cv-02468-0.

[39] Christopher Wildeman and Emily A. Wang. "Mass incarceration, public health, and widening inequality in the USA". In: *The Lancet* 389.10077 (2017), pp. 1464–1474. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(17)30259-3.

[40] Gabrielle Beaudry, Shaoling Zhong, Daniel Whiting, Babak Javid, John Frater, and Seena Fazel. "Managing outbreaks of highly contagious diseases in prisons: A systematic review". In: *BMJ Global Health* 5.11 (2020). DOI: 10.1136/bmjgh-2020-003201.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.12.14.21267199; this version posted January 11, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

[41] Alexandria Macmadu, Justin Berk, Eliana Kaplowitz, Marquisele Mercedes, Josiah D. Rich, and Lauren Brinkley-Rubinstein. "COVID-19 and mass incarceration: A call for urgent action". In: *The Lancet Public Health* 5.11 (2020), e571–e572. DOI: 10.1016/S2468-2667(20)30231-0.

[42] Laura Hawks, Steffie Woolhandler, and Danny McCormick. "COVID-19 in prisons and jails in the United States". In: *JAMA Internal Medicine* 180.8 (2020), pp. 1041–1042. DOI: 10.1001/jamainternmed.2020.1856.

[43] Emily A. Wang, Bruce Western, and Donald M. Berwick. "COVID-19, decarceration, and the role of clinicians, health systems, and payers: A report from the National Academy of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine". In: *JAMA* 324.22 (2020), pp. 2257–2258. DOI: 10.1001/jama.2020.22109.

[44] National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine. *Decarcerating correctional facilities during COVID-19: Advancing health, equity, and safety*. Ed. by Emily A. Wang, Bruce Western, Emily P. Backes, and Julie Schuck. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press, 2020. ISBN: 978-0-309-68357-9. DOI: 10.17226/25945.

[45] Alix M.B. Lacoste, Erika Tyagi, and Hope Johnson. "Fast, frequent, and widespread: COVID-19 outbreaks inside federal prisons". In: *COVID Behind Bars* (2021). URL: https://uclacovidbehindbars.org/assets/federalprisonoutbreaks.pdf.

[46] Kathryn M. Nowotny, Zinzi Bailey, and Lauren Brinkley-Rubinstein. "The contribution of prisons and jails to US racial disparities during COVID-19". In: *American Journal of Public Health* 111.2 (2021), pp. 197–199. DOI: 10.2105/AJPH.2020.306040.

[47] Paige St. John. "California to release 3,500 inmates early as coronavirus spreads inside prisons". In: *Los Angeles Times* (2020). URL: https://www.latimes.com/california/story/2020-03-31/coronavirus-california-release-3500-inmates-prisons.

[48] Stephen Roberts, Jennifer Peirce, Sandhya Kajeepeta, and Madeline Bailey. "A Technical Guide to Jail Data Analysis". In: *Vera Institute of Justice* (2021). URL: https://www.vera.org/downloads/publications/a-technical-guide-to-jail-data-analysis-report.pdf.

[49] Virginia Department of Corrections. *COVID-19 Response Inmate Early Release Plan*. URL: https://vadoc.virginia.gov/media/1506/vadoc-covid19-early-release-plan.pdf.

[50] Jennifer Skeem, Nicholas Scurich, and John Monahan. "Impact of risk assessment on judges' fairness in sentencing relatively poor defendants". In: *Law and Human Behavior* 44.1 (2020), pp. 51–59. DOI: 10.1037/lhb0000360.

[51] Julia Dressel and Hany Farid. "The accuracy, fairness, and limits of predicting recidivism". In: *Science Advances* 4.1 (2018), eaao5580. DOI: 10.1126/sciadv.aao5580.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.12.14.21267199; this version posted January 11, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

[52] Zhiyuan "Jerry" Lin, Jongbin Jung, Sharad Goel, and Jennifer Skeem. "The limits of human predictions of recidivism". In: *Science Advances* 6.7 (2020), eaaz0652. DOI: 10.1126/sciadv.aaz0652.

[53] Chelsea Barabas, Karthik Dinakar, and Colin Doyle. "The problems with risk assessment tools". In: *New York Times* (2019). URL: https://www.nytimes.com/2019/07/17/opinion/pretrial-ai.html.

[54] *Mapping Pretrial Injustice: National Landscape*. 2021. URL: https://pretrialrisk.com/national-landscape/.

[55] Alice Xiang, Riccardo Fogliato, and Alex Chouldechova. "Why PATTERN should not be used: The perils of using algorithmic risk assessment tools during COVID-19". In: *Partnership on AI* (2020). URL: https://partnershiponai.org/why-pattern-should-not-be-used-the-perils-of-using-algorithmic-risk-assessment-tools-during-covid-19/.

[56] Benjamin M. Althouse, Brendan Wallace, Brendan Case, Samuel V. Scarpino, Antoine Allard, Andrew M. Berdahl, Easton R. White, and Laurent Hébert-Dufresne. "The unintended consequences of inconsistent pandemic control policies". In: *medRxiv* (2020). DOI: 10.1101/2020.08.21.20179473.

[57] Annette Flanagin, Tracy Frey, Stacy L. Christiansen, and AMA Manual of Style Committee. "Updated guidance on the reporting of race and ethnicity in medical and science journals". In: *JAMA* 326.7 (2021), pp. 621–627. DOI: 10.1001/jama.2021.13304.

[58] Ulrike Boehmer, Nancy R. Kressin, Dan R. Berlowitz, Cindy L. Christiansen, Lewis E. Kazis, and Judith A. Jones. "Self-reported vs administrative race/ethnicity data and study results". In: *American Journal of Public Health* 92.9 (2002), pp. 1471–1472. DOI: 10.2105/AJPH.92.9.1471.

[59] Perry Zurn, Danielle S. Bassett, and Nicole C. Rust. "The citation diversity statement: A practice of transparency, a way of life". In: *Trends in Cognitive Sciences* 24.9 (2020), pp. 669–672. DOI: 10.1016/j.tics.2020.06.009.

[60] Jordan D. Dworkin, Kristin A. Linn, Erin G. Teich, Perry Zurn, Russell T. Shinohara, and Danielle S. Bassett. "The extent and drivers of gender imbalance in neuroscience reference lists". In: *Nature Neuroscience* 23.8 (2020), pp. 918–926. DOI: 10.1038/s41593-020-0658-y.

[61] Paula Chakravartty, Rachel Kuo, Victoria Grubbs, and Charlton McIlwain. "#CommunicationSoWhite". In: *Journal of Communication* 68.2 (2018), pp. 254–266. DOI: 10.1093/joc/jqy003.

[62] Daniel Maliniak, Ryan Powers, and Barbara F. Walter. *The gender citation gap in international relations*. Vol. 67. 4. 2013, pp. 889–922. DOI: 10.1017/S0020818313000209.

[63] Michelle L. Dion, Jane Lawrence Sumner, and Sara Mc Laughlin Mitchell. "Gendered citation patterns across political science and social science methodology fields". In: *Political Analysis* 26.3 (2018), pp. 312–327. DOI: 10.1017/pan.2018.12.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.12.14.21267199; this version posted January 11, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

[64] Neven Caplar, Sandro Tacchella, and Simon Birrer. "Quantitative evaluation of gender bias in astronomical publications from citation counts". In: *Nature Astronomy* 1 (2017). DOI: 10.1038/s41550-017-0141.

[65] Pierre Azoulay and Freda Lynn. "Self-citation, cumulative advantage, and gender inequality in science". In: *Sociological Science* 7 (2020), pp. 152–186. DOI: 10.15195/v7.a7.

[66] Gita Ghiasi, Philippe Mongeon, Cassidy R. Sugimoto, and Vincent Larivière. "Gender homophily in citations". In: *23rd International Conference on Science and Technology Indicators (STI 2018)* (2018), pp. 1519–1525. URL: https://hdl.handle.net/1887/65291.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.12.14.21267199; this version posted January 11, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

# A Supplemental Information

## A.1 State-by-state breakdowns

In Figure A.1, we show the prison population over time for all 50 states and the District of Columbia. In Table A.1, we give an overview of the scope of each state's data in our dataset. In Table A.2, we list every state in order of the maximum reduction in prison population, alongside the month that this decrease was observed.




**Figure A.1: State-by-state time series of prison populations.**

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.12.14.21267199; this version posted January 11, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .




**Figure A.2: Comparison of Black and White incarcerated populations over time.** Note especially that the effect size of the demographic changes during the COVID-19 pandemic are more pronounced in the incarcerated Black population—see Figure A.6 for additional comparisons.

## A.2 Comparison across prison population datasets

Other organizations collect and report data about prison populations over time. In order to situate the data used here within a broader body of work studying U.S. prison population trends, we validate against data released by the Bureau of Justice Statistics [4] (BJS) and the Vera Institute for Justice [48] (Vera). In Figure A.3, we plot the BJS's yearly estimates of the number of people in state prisons across the United States from 2014 until 2020. We concatenate the BJS data with the Vera data to approximate a "ground truth" estimate for the prison population over time.

We note several key points. First, starting in 2020, our dataset almost exactly matches the Vera dataset. Prior to 2020, our dataset reports a prison population that is approximately 1% smaller than the BJS data. After investigating what could have brought about these differences between the two datasets, we identified five states with the largest between-dataset differences (Montana, Florida, Texas, Virginia, and Ohio; see Table A.3). Because of these discrepancies, we took additional care to confirm that the data we had collected was exactly what was reported by states' Departments of Corrections websites (or sometimes, through Freedom of Information Act requests). In Section A.2.1, we describe the rationale for why we are confident in the data included in the present study, and we also directly link to the data sources used to offer transparency in the data collection process.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.12.14.21267199; this version posted January 11, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .




**Figure A.3: Data validation.** We compare the novel data presented here to data from the Bureau of Justice Statistics [4] and the Vera Institute for Justice [48], finding high data agreement during 2020 and early 2021. There are small differences between our dataset and the Bureau of Justice Statistics prior to 2020, but see the Data & Methods section and Table A.3 for further explanation of these differences.

### A.2.1 Comparison to Bureau of Justice Statistics data

To our knowledge, the scale of the data that we assembled in this work is unique among the available public datasets about states' prison populations over time. In Table A.3, we dive deeper into the discrepancies between the data used here and those that were released by the Bureau of Justice Statistics [4]. We offer explanations that reconcile why we may observe such differences, and we conclude that the data reported here is consistent with state prison population statistics reported by states' Department of Corrections.

## A.3 Court system, policing, and inmate release data

In addition to data about states' prison populations and prison policy, we also used state-specific data about outcomes of court proceedings, crime/offense type and severity, traffic stops, and inmate releases in order to tell a broader story about the structural effects of mass incarceration during the COVID-19 pandemic.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.12.14.21267199; this version posted January 11, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .




**Figure A.4: Percent of incarcerated population in Texas state prisons, by race.**

### A.3.1 Texas offense severity data

In recent years, White/Black/Latino people have accounted a for similar percent of the total incarcerated population in Texas state prisons (33.7%, 32.6%, 33.1%, respectively); mirroring the nationwide trend in Figure 1B, the percent of incarcerated Black people increased sharply in Texas after March 2020 (Figure A.4). While it is difficult to point to any single cause behind this abrupt disparity, some have argued that more careful consideration must be given to racial differences in the severity of the crimes for which people are incarcerated. That is, without more extensive data about the incarcerated population in Texas, we cannot rule out the possibility that the observed spike in the relative number of incarcerated Black people is due to a relative increase in the severity of crimes committed, by race. We show, however, that this is not the case.

To do this, we merge data from two sources. The first is monthly data about every incarcerated person in Texas from July 2019 until November 2021 (the Texas Department of Criminal Justice "High Value Dataset" series, from `https://www.tdcj.texas.gov/kss_inside.html`); each row in this dataset corresponds to an incarcerated person and includes details about the individual's race and sex, as well as sentencing information. The second dataset is a table that maps every offense to one of four severity levels: low, moderate, high, or highest (`https://www.tdcj.texas.gov/bpp/parole_guidelines/Offense_Severity_Class.pdf`).

We assign an offense-severity category to each incarcerated person by merging the two datasets along the National Crime Information Center (NCIC) code for the sentenced offense. In Figure A.5, we compare these offense-severity categories by race. In Figure A.5A-D, we

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.12.14.21267199; this version posted January 11, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .




**Figure A.5: Offense severity of incarcerated persons in Texas, by race.** Top row (A-D): For each offense-severity category (low, moderate, high, and highest), we plot monthly time series of the percent of each group who are White, Black, or Latino incarcerated people. Bottom row (E-H): The same curves as A-D, standardized by each race group's average values prior to March 2020. A value of 100% indicates no change relative to pre-pandemic averages.

plot the race distribution within each offense-severity category (i.e., we plot the percent of incarcerated persons with a given offense-severity category who are White/Black/Latino). To accentuate the relative changes in these trends, in Figure A.5E-H, we plot the same curves standardized (i.e., divided by) by their pre-pandemic averages; in these subplots, 100% would indicate no difference from before the pandemic. After March 2020, we see abrupt increases in the relative number of Black incarcerated people in the "low" and "moderate" offense-severity groups (dark green curve, Figure A.5E-F). This is exactly counter to the suggestion that the nationwide trends in Figure 1B are due to Black people committing more severe crimes during the early months of the pandemic. Without these same datasets for every state, we cannot yet say that trends seen in Texas are universal across the United States, but following these analyses, we urge every state to make these types of data available.

### A.3.2 Florida trial statistics data

To collect the court proceedings data used in Section 2.3 [21], we manually downloaded monthly data about the statewide data on the outcomes of Circuit Criminal Defendants between January 2018 and June 2020. We summarize this dataset in Table A.4.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.12.14.21267199; this version posted January 11, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .




**Figure A.6: Larger effect among the Black incarcerated population.** Comparison of the relative increase in the proportion of incarcerated people who are non-white vs. black in three states during the pandemic. This trend is especially pronounced in the three states above, however there are several states where the opposite is true. Further distinguishing these effects will be the subject of future research.

### A.3.3 Texas highway patrol data

Pursuant to Senate Bill 701, the Texas Department of Public Safety provides high resolution datasets about policing, public safety, and law (https://capitol.texas.gov/BillLookup/History.aspx?LegSess=82R&Bill=SB701) [25]. We downloaded monthly traffic stops data starting in January 2018, until December 2020. While we only used data about the reported race of the drivers involved in traffic stops, the dataset includes a rich range of personal and situational variables about the drivers and police officers involved in the traffic stop (for a list of the variables included see https://www.dps.texas.gov/sites/default/files/documents/highwaypatrol/docs/thpviolationscolnames.pdf).

### A.3.4 Arkansas eligible release data

While there are not particularly noticeable changes after March 2020 in the trends of both curves in Figure A.7C, here we directly quantify racial disparities among the inmates who were eligible for release [29]. Using data released by the Arkansas Department of Corrections, we joined inmate identification numbers to their listed race and sex according to the Arkansas Department of Corrections Inmate Search tool (https://apps.ark.org/inmate_info/index.php).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.12.14.21267199; this version posted January 11, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .




**Figure A.7: Ratio of race of releases to race of prison population.** Here, we highlight the evolution of the ratio between $r_x/N_x$, where $r_x$ is the percent of releases who are race $x$ and $N_x$ is the percent of the incarcerated population who are race $x$ (in this case, we use Black and white incarcerated people for $x$). In the three states included here, white incarcerated people account for a larger share of releases than one would expect, given the demographic distribution of the prison population; conversely, incarcerated Black people are released at lower-than-expected rates.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.12.14.21267199; this version posted January 11, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

| State | Primary source of data | Frequency | Data start | Data end |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Alabama | Inmate Search website | weekly | Sep. 2000 | Nov. 2021 |
| Alaska | Research Records website | yearly | Jan. 2015 | Jan. 2021 |
| Arizona | Corrections at a Glance website | monthly | Jan. 2017 | Nov. 2021 |
| Arkansas | Director's Board Reports | yearly | Jan. 2000 | Nov. 2021 |
| California | Offender Population Reports and public records request | monthly | Jan. 2014 | Nov. 2021 |
| Colorado | Inmate Population Profile | 2x-yearly | Jun. 1992 | Nov. 2021 |
| Connecticut | Monthly Statistics | monthly | Jan. 2010 | Nov. 2021 |
| Delaware | Inmate Population Data | monthly | Jan. 2017 | Nov. 2021 |
| Washington D.C. | Inmate Demographics and Statistics | quarterly | Oct. 2015 | Sep. 2021 |
| Florida | Statistics and Publications and public records request | monthly | Jan. 2005 | Nov. 2021 |
| Georgia | Monthly Profile of All Inmates | monthly | Jan. 2006 | Nov. 2021 |
| Hawaii | Annual Reports and public records request | monthly | Mar. 2018 | Oct. 2021 |
| Idaho | Incarcerated Population Report and public records request | monthly | Jan. 2013 | Oct. 2021 |
| Illinois | Prison Population Data Sets | quarterly | Jun. 2005 | Nov. 2021 |
| Indiana | Fact Cards | quarterly | Jan. 2002 | Oct. 2021 |
| Iowa | Quarterly Quick Facts and public records request | monthly | Feb. 2005 | Oct. 2021 |
| Kansas | Population Reports | monthly | Jun. 1990 | Oct. 2021 |
| Kentucky | Monthly Reports | monthly | Dec. 2011 | Nov. 2021 |
| Louisiana | Annual Statistics and public records request | 2x-yearly | Jan. 1989 | Jul. 2021 |
| Maine | Reports & Statistical Data | monthly | Jan. 2015 | Nov. 2021 |
| Maryland | Inmate Characteristics Reports and public records request | quarterly | Jul. 1990 | Jul. 2021 |
| Massachusetts | Institutional Fact Cards and Research Reports | monthly | Jan. 2012 | Oct. 2021 |
| Michigan | Statistical Reports | yearly | Jan. 1961 | Jan. 2021 |
| Minnesota | Historical Population Summary Reports | 2x-yearly | Jan. 1998 | Jul. 2021 |
| Mississippi | Monthly Fact Sheets | monthly | Apr. 2001 | Nov. 2021 |
| Missouri | Publications and Information & Missouri Sunshine Law | monthly | Jun. 2004 | Sep. 2021 |
| Montana | Data & Statistics and public records request | monthly | Jan. 2005 | Nov. 2021 |
| Nebraska | Statistical Reports | quarterly | Dec. 2007 | Oct. 2021 |
| Nevada | Weekly Fact Sheets | weekly | Jan. 2015 | Nov. 2021 |
| New Hampshire | Annual Reports | yearly | Jul. 1999 | Jul. 2020 |
| New Jersey | Offender Stats | yearly | Jan. 2011 | Jan. 2021 |
| New Mexico | Notice & Reports and public records request | monthly | Jan. 2010 | Nov. 2021 |
| New York | Inmates Under Custody and public records request | monthly | Jan. 2000 | Nov. 2021 |
| North Carolina | DPS Research & Planning | quarterly | Jan. 1996 | Nov. 2021 |
| North Dakota | Data Narratives: Prison | monthly | Nov. 2001 | Nov. 2021 |
| Ohio | Monthly Fact Sheets | monthly | Aug. 2016 | Nov. 2021 |
| Oklahoma | Offender Information and BJS Statistical Tables | weekly | Jul. 2010 | Nov. 2021 |
| Oregon | Inmate Population Profile and public records request | monthly | Jan. 1998 | Nov. 2021 |
| Pennsylvania | Monthly Population Reports and public records request | monthly | Feb. 2017 | Nov. 2021 |
| Rhode Island | Offender Statistics & Reports and public records request | monthly | Jan. 2012 | Sep. 2021 |
| South Carolina | Archived SCDC FAQS | monthly | Jul. 2011 | Nov. 2021 |
| South Dakota | Adult Inmates by Race/Ethnicity | monthly | Dec. 2016 | Nov. 2021 |
| Tennessee | Felon Population Reports | monthly | Jul. 2004 | Sep. 2021 |
| Texas | Yearly Statistical Reports and public records request | monthly | Sep. 2005 | Nov. 2021 |
| Utah | UDC Statistics and public records request | monthly | Sep. 2012 | Jul. 2021 |
| Vermont | Population Report | monthly | Jan. 2020 | Nov. 2021 |
| Virginia | Offender Population Reports | monthly | Jul. 2010 | Sep. 2021 |
| Washington | Statistical Reports | quarterly | Nov. 2009 | Oct. 2021 |
| West Virginia | Adult prison statistics and public records request | 2x-yearly | Jul. 2002 | Jul. 2021 |
| Wisconsin | Data & Reports | monthly | Jul. 1990 | Nov. 2021 |
| Wyoming | Population Demographics Report and public records request | quarterly | Jan. 2006 | Jul. 2021 |

**Table A.1: Overview of Klein et al. dataset.** This dataset includes prison population time series for all 50 states and the District of Columbia. Here, we have included hyperlinks to each state's website where we started to collect the data. For some states, we submitted public records requests in order to obtain data about inmate race statistics.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.12.14.21267199; this version posted January 11, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

| State | Date | Largest population reduction (% of pre-pandemic population) |
|---|---|---|
| New Jersey | 2021-09-01 | 65.72% |
| West Virginia | 2021-01-01 | 68.15% |
| District of Columbia | 2020-06-01 | 68.93% |
| Washington | 2021-11-30 | 70.56% |
| New York | 2021-04-01 | 71.58% |
| Connecticut | 2021-05-01 | 72.24% |
| Illinois | 2021-05-31 | 72.65% |
| Maine | 2021-10-01 | 73.67% |
| North Dakota | 2020-09-01 | 74.03% |
| Rhode Island | 2021-08-01 | 74.92% |
| Vermont | 2021-04-30 | 74.94% |
| California | 2021-02-03 | 76.59% |
| Hawaii | 2021-04-01 | 76.78% |
| Massachusetts | 2021-10-01 | 77.44% |
| Delaware | 2021-05-01 | 77.75% |
| Kentucky | 2021-07-15 | 78.18% |
| Minnesota | 2021-07-01 | 78.55% |
| Colorado | 2021-06-30 | 78.80% |
| Maryland | 2021-07-01 | 79.56% |
| New Mexico | 2021-10-06 | 80.61% |
| Nevada | 2021-10-31 | 80.85% |
| Arizona | 2021-11-01 | 80.89% |
| Virginia | 2021-02-01 | 80.95% |
| Pennsylvania | 2021-11-01 | 81.41% |
| Wisconsin | 2021-06-30 | 81.72% |
| Missouri | 2021-08-31 | 82.38% |
| South Carolina | 2021-07-01 | 82.45% |
| Utah | 2020-12-01 | 82.55% |
| Oregon | 2021-12-01 | 82.79% |
| Tennessee | 2021-10-01 | 83.16% |
| Texas | 2021-04-30 | 83.27% |
| North Carolina | 2021-09-01 | 83.30% |
| Kansas | 2021-11-30 | 83.37% |
| Idaho | 2020-11-01 | 83.41% |
| Georgia | 2021-04-01 | 83.67% |
| South Dakota | 2021-01-31 | 83.93% |
| Florida | 2021-10-31 | 84.15% |
| Louisiana | 2021-06-01 | 84.51% |
| Oklahoma | 2021-11-29 | 85.14% |
| Indiana | 2021-12-01 | 85.71% |
| Montana | 2020-12-31 | 86.23% |
| Iowa | 2020-09-01 | 87.35% |
| Ohio | 2021-07-01 | 88.23% |
| Alaska | 2020-05-01 | 88.23% |
| Michigan | 2020-12-01 | 88.34% |
| Arkansas | 2021-03-01 | 88.47% |
| Alabama | 2021-03-15 | 88.56% |
| Mississippi | 2021-12-15 | 90.98% |
| New Hampshire | 2020-07-01 | 91.55% |
| Nebraska | 2020-09-01 | 92.88% |
| Wyoming | 2020-08-31 | 93.11% |

**Table A.2: Extent of prison population reductions.** For each state, we list the date (after March 2020) that the prison population reached its lowest reported value, as well as the magnitude of each state's reduction (measured as the percent of pre-pandemic prison population). States are listed in ascending order by largest population reductions.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.12.14.21267199; this version posted January 11, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

| State | Source | BJS: State Prison Pop. (as of Dec. 31, '19) | Klein et al.: State Prison Pop. (as of Dec. 31, '19) | Difference |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Texas | Demographic Highlights, On Hand [link] | 158,429 | 142,169 | 16,260 |
| Virginia | Monthly Population Summary [link] | 36,091 | 29,233 | 6,858 |
| Montana | Public records request; [link] | 4,723 | 2,806 | 1,917 |
| Florida | Public records request; [link] | 96,009 | 94,197 | 1,812 |
| Ohio | Monthly Fact Sheet [link] | 50,338 | 48,697 | 1,641 |

**Table A.3: Five states with the largest differences to BJS data.** Because there were slight discrepancies between the data collected in the current study and the yearly data released by the BJS, we include this table, which links to the data sources used. These data were collected from states' Departments of Corrections websites (or obtained through Freedom of Information Act requests). For both of these states, the BJS includes a disclaimer. Montana: "Data for 2019 are not comparable to data for previous years." Ohio: "Includes a small number of incarcerated individuals sentenced to one year or less." For Texas and Virginia, we include the link to directly access data reported by the state for the time period in question, and in each case, the BJS data does not correspond to data reported by the state. The discrepancies in Florida's numbers are relatively small compared to the overall number of people in prison. As stated above, we are confident in the data collection here, which involved making successful public records requests to the Department of Corrections.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.12.14.21267199; this version posted January 11, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

| Date | Total Defendants Filed | Total Disposed | Total Disposed Pre-trial | Pre-trial: Total Dismissed | Pre-trial: Total Guilty Plea | Pre-trial: Other |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2017-01-01 | 14,165 | 14,440 | 14,197 | 1,062 | 11,382 | 1,753 |
| 2017-02-01 | 14,121 | 14,313 | 14,077 | 1,771 | 10,521 | 1,785 |
| 2017-03-01 | 15,789 | 16,241 | 15,941 | 1,773 | 12,163 | 2,005 |
| 2017-04-01 | 13,425 | 13,667 | 13,416 | 1,163 | 10,393 | 1,860 |
| 2017-05-01 | 15,838 | 15,071 | 14,841 | 1,160 | 11,675 | 2,006 |
| 2017-06-01 | 15,667 | 15,490 | 15,257 | 1,143 | 11,871 | 2,243 |
| 2017-07-01 | 14,883 | 12,442 | 12,199 | 1,094 | 9,604 | 1,501 |
| 2017-08-01 | 16,621 | 16,362 | 15,885 | 1,321 | 12,838 | 1,726 |
| 2017-09-01 | 12,109 | 10,461 | 10,148 | 913 | 8,043 | 1,192 |
| 2017-10-01 | 15,297 | 15,674 | 15,180 | 1,350 | 12,276 | 1,554 |
| 2017-11-01 | 13,848 | 13,799 | 13,403 | 1,131 | 10,748 | 1,524 |
| 2017-12-01 | 13,217 | 11,267 | 10,961 | 1,053 | 8,623 | 1,285 |
| 2018-01-01 | 15,752 | 14,322 | 13,845 | 1,408 | 10,908 | 1,529 |
| 2018-02-01 | 14,156 | 13,628 | 13,187 | 1,157 | 10,499 | 1,531 |
| 2018-03-01 | 15,309 | 13,956 | 13,579 | 1,145 | 10,837 | 1,597 |
| 2018-04-01 | 15,167 | 13,757 | 13,368 | 1,097 | 10,760 | 1,511 |
| 2018-05-01 | 15,590 | 14,643 | 14,170 | 1,228 | 11,332 | 1,610 |
| 2018-06-01 | 15,470 | 14,509 | 14,097 | 1,199 | 11,119 | 1,779 |
| 2018-07-01 | 15,265 | 14,080 | 13,874 | 1,324 | 11,150 | 1,400 |
| 2018-08-01 | 16,667 | 15,399 | 15,146 | 1,405 | 12,209 | 1,532 |
| 2018-09-01 | 13,475 | 13,233 | 13,046 | 1,204 | 10,488 | 1,354 |
| 2018-10-01 | 15,749 | 15,530 | 15,299 | 1,397 | 12,510 | 1,392 |
| 2018-11-01 | 13,904 | 13,634 | 13,433 | 1,210 | 10,744 | 1,479 |
| 2018-12-01 | 13,124 | 11,798 | 11,602 | 1,118 | 9,128 | 1,356 |
| 2019-01-01 | 15,431 | 14,839 | 14,665 | 1,430 | 11,444 | 1,791 |
| 2019-02-01 | 13,997 | 13,376 | 13,175 | 1,184 | 10,357 | 1,634 |
| 2019-03-01 | 14,423 | 14,440 | 14,237 | 1,364 | 10,990 | 1,883 |
| 2019-04-01 | 14,823 | 15,069 | 14,851 | 1,461 | 11,441 | 1,949 |
| 2019-05-01 | 15,973 | 15,054 | 14,627 | 1,615 | 11,052 | 1,960 |
| 2019-06-01 | 14,810 | 13,659 | 13,281 | 1,327 | 9,781 | 2,173 |
| 2019-07-01 | 15,004 | 14,689 | 14,311 | 1,523 | 11,340 | 1,448 |
| 2019-08-01 | 15,280 | 14,437 | 14,057 | 1,603 | 10,899 | 1,555 |
| 2019-09-01 | 12,629 | 12,855 | 12,477 | 1,435 | 9,827 | 1,215 |
| 2019-10-01 | 15,350 | 15,813 | 15,338 | 1,753 | 12,013 | 1,572 |
| 2019-11-01 | 11,901 | 12,720 | 12,379 | 1,354 | 9,691 | 1,334 |
| 2019-12-01 | 12,535 | 11,649 | 11,350 | 1,235 | 8,761 | 1,354 |
| 2020-01-01 | 13,715 | 14,590 | 14,212 | 1,483 | 10,914 | 1,815 |
| 2020-02-01 | 13,171 | 13,445 | 13,167 | 1,417 | 10,277 | 1,473 |
| 2020-03-01 | 14,335 | 9,935 | 9,789 | 1,121 | 7,412 | 1,256 |
| 2020-04-01 | 10,844 | 4,563 | 4,528 | 578 | 3,344 | 606 |
| 2020-05-01 | 10,783 | 4,542 | 4,513 | 582 | 3,229 | 702 |
| 2020-06-01 | 12,653 | 9,012 | 8,950 | 1,605 | 6,293 | 1,052 |

**Table A.4: Statewide statistics for Florida Circuit Criminal Defendants.** Data collected from the Trial Court Statistics Search (http://trialstats.flcourts.org/). Note the substantial drop-off in April and May of 2020 (highlighted above), corresponding to the period when Florida courts were closed or operating at highly reduced capacities.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.12.14.21267199; this version posted January 11, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

| State Prisons | Incarcerated Total | | | Incarcerated White | | | Incarcerated Black | | | Expected additional reduction in Black incarcerated population under White decarceration rates |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 2019 | 2020 | % diff | 2019 | 2020 | % diff | 2019 | 2020 | % diff | |
| Alabama | 28,304 | 25,328 | 10.51% | 13,454 | 11,607 | 13.73% | 14,631 | 13,519 | 7.60% | –897 |
| Alaska | 4,475 | 4,578 | –2.30% | 1,863 | 1,850 | 0.70% | 454 | 464 | –2.20% | –14 |
| Arizona | 42,441 | 37,731 | 11.10% | 16,523 | 14,613 | 11.56% | 6,233 | 5,614 | 9.93% | –102 |
| Arkansas | 17,759 | 16,094 | 9.38% | 9,767 | 8,691 | 11.02% | 7,282 | 6,721 | 7.70% | –242 |
| California | 122,687 | 97,328 | 20.67% | 25,510 | 18,819 | 26.23% | 35,056 | 28,578 | 18.48% | –2,717 |
| Colorado | 19,785 | 16,168 | 18.28% | 9,026 | 7,363 | 18.42% | 3,507 | 3,016 | 14.00% | –156 |
| Connecticut | 12,823 | 9,559 | 25.45% | 3,803 | 2,619 | 31.13% | 5,457 | 4,201 | 23.02% | –443 |
| Delaware | 5,692 | 4,710 | 17.25% | 1,932 | 1,493 | 22.72% | 3,436 | 2,934 | 14.61% | –279 |
| Florida | 96,009 | 81,027 | 15.60% | 38,335 | 31,647 | 17.45% | 45,121 | 38,665 | 14.31% | –1,416 |
| Georgia | 54,816 | 47,141 | 14% | 19,795 | 16,650 | 15.89% | 32,656 | 28,406 | 13.01% | –939 |
| Hawaii | 5,279 | 4,171 | 20.99% | 1,198 | 949 | 20.78% | 323 | 186 | 42.41% | 69 |
| Idaho | 9,437 | 8,171 | 13.42% | 7,076 | 5,966 | 15.69% | 287 | 267 | 6.97% | –26 |
| Illinois | 38,259 | 29,729 | 22.30% | 12,223 | 9,271 | 24.15% | 20,851 | 15,866 | 23.91% | –51 |
| Indiana | 27,180 | 23,944 | 11.91% | 16,878 | 14,748 | 12.62% | 8,852 | 7,888 | 10.89% | –154 |
| Iowa | 9,282 | 8,307 | 10.50% | 6,047 | 5,350 | 11.53% | 2,355 | 2,129 | 9.60% | –46 |
| Kansas | 10,177 | 8,779 | 13.74% | 5,854 | 5,030 | 14.08% | 2,755 | 2,399 | 12.92% | –32 |
| Kentucky | 23,082 | 18,552 | 19.63% | 17,542 | 13,936 | 20.56% | 4,877 | 4,052 | 16.92% | –178 |
| Louisiana | 31,609 | 26,964 | 14.70% | 10,436 | 8,710 | 16.54% | 21,061 | 18,143 | 13.85% | –566 |
| Maine | 2,185 | 1,714 | 21.56% | 1,779 | 1,389 | 21.92% | 231 | 178 | 22.94% | 2 |
| Maryland | 18,595 | 15,623 | 15.98% | 4,310 | 3,531 | 18.07% | 13,197 | 11,120 | 15.74% | –309 |
| Massachusetts | 8,205 | 6,762 | 17.59% | 3,462 | 2,805 | 18.98% | 2,306 | 1,934 | 16.13% | –66 |
| Michigan | 38,053 | 33,617 | 11.66% | 17,224 | 14,194 | 17.59% | 20,040 | 17,231 | 14.02% | –717 |
| Minnesota | 9,982 | 8,148 | 18.37% | 4,675 | 3,744 | 19.91% | 3,586 | 2,994 | 16.51% | –123 |
| Mississippi | 19,417 | 17,577 | 9.48% | 7,133 | 6,345 | 11.05% | 12,025 | 10,998 | 8.54% | –302 |
| Missouri | 26,044 | 23,062 | 11.45% | 16,286 | 14,405 | 11.55% | 9,027 | 8,003 | 11.34% | –19 |
| Montana | 4,723 | 3,927 | 16.85% | 3,359 | 2,778 | 17.30% | 131 | 103 | 21.37% | 5 |
| Nebraska | 5,682 | 5,306 | 6.62% | 2,943 | 2,733 | 7.14% | 1,559 | 1,454 | 6.74% | –7 |
| Nevada | 12,840 | 11,422 | 11.04% | 5,537 | 4,830 | 12.77% | 3,990 | 3,555 | 10.90% | –75 |
| New Hampshire | 2,691 | 2,352 | 12.60% | 3,268 | 1,978 | 39.47% | 140 | 159 | –13.57% | –75 |
| New Jersey | 18,613 | 12,830 | 31.07% | 3,978 | 2,619 | 34.16% | 11,372 | 7,772 | 31.66% | –286 |
| New Mexico | 6,723 | 5,500 | 18.19% | 1,687 | 1,477 | 12.45% | 463 | 398 | 14.04% | 7 |
| New York | 43,500 | 34,128 | 21.54% | 10,421 | 7,685 | 26.25% | 21,109 | 17,066 | 19.15% | –1,500 |
| North Carolina | 34,079 | 29,461 | 13.55% | 13,553 | 11,614 | 14.31% | 17,545 | 15,148 | 13.66% | –114 |
| North Dakota | 1,794 | 1,401 | 21.91% | 1,098 | 848 | 22.77% | 186 | 167 | 10.22% | –24 |
| Ohio | 50,338 | 45,036 | 10.53% | 25,070 | 22,470 | 10.37% | 21,752 | 19,454 | 10.56% | 42 |
| Oklahoma | 25,679 | 22,462 | 12.53% | 13,184 | 11,165 | 15.31% | 6,689 | 5,940 | 11.20% | –276 |
| Oregon | 14,961 | 12,753 | 14.76% | 10,757 | 9,257 | 13.94% | 1,436 | 1,179 | 17.90% | 56 |
| Pennsylvania | 45,702 | 39,357 | 13.88% | 20,086 | 17,131 | 14.71% | 20,846 | 18,240 | 12.50% | –461 |
| Rhode Island | 2,740 | 2,227 | 18.72% | 1,142 | 853 | 25.31% | 782 | 661 | 15.47% | –77 |
| South Carolina | 18,608 | 16,157 | 13.17% | 6,950 | 5,896 | 15.17% | 10,993 | 9,680 | 11.94% | –355 |
| South Dakota | 3,801 | 3,250 | 14.50% | 1,998 | 1,727 | 13.56% | 289 | 266 | 7.96% | –17 |
| Tennessee | 26,349 | 22,685 | 13.91% | 14,633 | 12,359 | 15.54% | 11,012 | 9,656 | 12.31% | –356 |
| Texas | 158,429 | 135,906 | 14.22% | 53,597 | 45,596 | 14.93% | 51,584 | 44,760 | 13.23% | –877 |
| Utah | 6,665 | 5,446 | 18.29% | 4,048 | 3,245 | 19.84% | 471 | 400 | 15.07% | –23 |
| Vermont | 1,608 | 1,284 | 20.15% | 1,386 | 1,108 | 20.06% | 141 | 123 | 12.77% | –11 |
| Virginia | 36,091 | 31,838 | 11.78% | 15,005 | 13,266 | 11.59% | 19,808 | 17,414 | 12.09% | 98 |
| Washington | 19,261 | 15,724 | 18.36% | 11,262 | 8,843 | 21.48% | 3,275 | 2,777 | 15.21% | –206 |
| West Virginia | 6,800 | 6,044 | 11.12% | 5,819 | 5,144 | 11.60% | 875 | 802 | 8.34% | –29 |
| Wisconsin | 23,956 | 20,298 | 15.27% | 10,815 | 8,879 | 17.90% | 10,003 | 8,542 | 14.61% | –330 |
| Wyoming | 2,479 | 2,087 | 15.81% | 1,864 | 1,591 | 14.65% | 129 | 89 | 31.01% | 21 |
| **Nationwide** | **1,255,689** | **1,063,665** | **15.29%** | **515,591** | **430,817** | **16.44%** | **492,186** | **421,311** | **14.40%** | **–14,593** |

**Table A.5: Quantifying racial disparities in incarcerated population declines.** Using yearly data from the Bureau of Justice Statistics [4, 5], we compare the incarcerated Black and White populations in each state from end-of-year 2019 to end-of-year 2020. The last column shows the expected additional decreases in the Black incarcerated population if the Black and White incarcerated populations declined at the same rates.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.12.14.21267199; this version posted January 11, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

| State | Races included in incarcerated population reports |
|---|---|
| Alabama | Black, White, Other |
| Alaska | Alaska Native, Asian/Pacific Island, Black, Caucasian, Hispanic/Latino, Other/Unknown |
| Arizona | Hispanic, Caucasian, African-American, Native American, Other |
| Arkansas | Asian, Black, Hispanic, Native American Indian, Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander, White, Other, Unknown |
| California | Hispanic, Black, White, Other |
| Colorado | Caucasian, Hispanic, African American, Native American, Asian |
| Connecticut | White, Black, Hispanic, American Indian, Asian |
| Delaware | Black, White, Asian or Pacific Islander, American Indian/Alaskan, Unknown |
| District of Columbia | Black, White, Hispanic, Other |
| Florida | White, Hispanic, Black, Other |
| Georgia | White, Black, Other, Asian, Unknown, Hispanic, Native American |
| Hawaii | American Indian, African American, Caucasian, Chinese, Filipino, Guam/Pacific Islander, Native Hawaiian, Hispanic, Japanese, Korean, Samoan, Other, Unknown |
| Idaho | Asian, Black or African American, Hispanic or Latino, Indian, Other, Unknown, White |
| Illinois | American Indian or Alaskan Native, Asian, African American or Black, Hispanic or Latino, Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander, White, Other, Two or More Races |
| Indiana | White, Black, Hispanic, Undetermined, American Indian/Alaskan Native, Asian/Pacific Islander |
| Iowa | White, Black, Hispanic, American Indian or Alaskan Native, Asian or Pacific Islander, Unknown |
| Kansas | White, Black, American Indian, Asian; reports Hispanic and Non Hispanic separately as ethnicity |
| Kentucky | White, Black, Hispanic, Bi-Racial, Asian, Native American, Other |
| Louisiana | White, Black, Other |
| Maine | Asian, Black or African American, Native American, Native Hawaiian, Two or More Races, Unknown, White |
| Maryland | Black, White, Latinx, Indian, Asian, Unknown |
| Massachusetts | Caucasian, African American, Hispanic, Asian, Other, Native American, Native Hawaiian/Pacific |
| Michigan | White, Non-White |
| Minnesota | White, Black, American Indian, Asian, Unknown/Other; reports Hispanic separately as ethnicity |
| Mississippi | Black, White, Hispanic, Native American, Asian, Data Unavailable |
| Missouri | Asian, Black, Hispanic, Native American, Unknown, White |
| Montana | American Indian/Alaska Native, Black, White, Asian/Pacific Islander |
| Nebraska | White, Black, Hispanic/Latino, American/Alaskan Native, Asian, Hawaiian/Pacific Islander, Other, Data Unavailable |
| Nevada | African American, American Indian, Asian, Caucasian, Hispanic, Other |
| New Hampshire | White, Black, Native American, Asian, Other/Unreported |
| New Jersey | Black, White, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian, Other or Not Coded |
| New Mexico | Asian, Black/African American, Hispanic Black, Hispanic Native Indian, Hispanic White, Native American/Alaskan, Native American, Pacific Islander, Unknown, White |
| New York | White, African American, Hispanic, Native American, Asian, Other, Unknown |
| North Carolina | White, Black/African American, American Indian/Alaskan Native, Asian/Asian American, Other, Unknown |
| North Dakota | Native American, Black, Hispanic, White, Other |
| Ohio | White, Black, Other Race |
| Oklahoma | African American, Caucasian, Hispanic, Native American, Other |
| Oregon | Asian, Black, Hispanic, American Indian, White, Unknown, Pacific Islander |
| Pennsylvania | Black, White, Hispanic, Other |
| Rhode Island | Black, White, Asian, Hispanic, Other |
| South Carolina | Black, White, Other |
| South Dakota | White, Native American, African American, Hispanic, Asian, Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander |
| Tennessee | White, Black, Other |
| Texas | Black, White, Hispanic, Other and Unknown Race |
| Utah | Asian/Pacific Islander, Black, Hispanic, Native American/Alaskan, White, Unknown, White |
| Vermont | American Indian/Alaskan Native, Asian/Pacific Islander, Black or African American, White, Some Other Race/Unknown; reports Hispanic/Latinx/Spanish Identification separately as ethnicity |
| Virginia | Black, White, Other |
| Washington | White, Black, American Indian/Alaska Native, Asian/Pacific Islander, Other, Unknown |
| West Virginia | American Indian/Alaska Native, Asian, Black, Hispanic or Latino, Multi-Racial or Other, Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander, White |
| Wisconsin | White, Black, American Indian/Alaskan Native, Asian or Pacific Islander, Unknown |
| Wyoming | Caucasian, African American, Hispanic, Native American, Other Race |

**Table A.6: States report race differently.** In this table, the races listed (and their ordering) are copied exactly as reported by the state. All states include White or Caucasian as a race, most include Black or African American, many include Latino or Hispanic. Michigan reports White and Non-White as its race categories.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.12.14.21267199; this version posted January 11, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

## A.4 Citation diversity statement

Recent work has quantified bias in citation practices across various scientific fields; namely, women and other minority scientists are often cited at a rate that is not proportional to their contributions to the field [59–66]. In this work, we aim to be proactive about the research we reference in a way that corresponds to the diversity of scholarship in this field. To evaluate gender bias in the references used here, we obtained the gender of the first/last authors of the papers cited here through either 1) the gender pronouns used to refer to them in articles or biographies or 2) if none were available, we used a database of common name-gender combinations across a variety of languages and ethnicities. By this measure (excluding citations to datasets/organizations, citations included in this section, and self-citations to the first/last authors of this manuscript), our references contain 30% woman(first)-woman(last), 19% woman-man, 11% man-woman, 9% man-man, 0% nonbinary, 13% man solo-author, and 17% woman solo-author. This method is limited in that an author's pronouns may not be consistent across time or environment, and no database of common name-gender pairings is complete or fully accurate.