medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.11.08.24316990; this version posted November 11, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Title

Evaluating the effects of Toronto's supervised consumption sites on crime: multiple baseline interrupted time series analyses with and without synthetic controls

Authors

Dimitra Panagiotoglou[1], PhD; Jihoon Lim[1], PhD; Geoff Ingram[1], BA; Mariam El Sheikh[1], MScPH; Imen Farhat[1], MS; Xander Bjornsson[1], BSc; Maximilian Schaefer[1], MScPH

1 Department of Epidemiology, Biostatistics and Occupational Health, McGill University, Montreal, Québec, Canada

Corresponding Author

Dimitra Panagiotoglou, PhD
2001 McGill College Avenue
Montreal, QC
H3A 1G1

Tel: 514-398-8451

Email: dimitra.panagiotoglou@mcgill.ca

Current word count: 3579

Abstract (241 words)

Background: Between 2017 and 2018, nine overdose prevention sites and supervised consumption sites (OPS/SCS) began operating in Toronto, Canada. This paper aimed to evaluate the effects of the OPS/SCS on incidence and rates of crime (i.e., assault, auto theft, break and enter, robbery, theft over $5000, bicycle theft, and theft from motor vehicle) and mental health act apprehensions.

Methods: Primary analyses used multiple baseline interrupted time series to compare outcome incidences within 100m, 200m and 500m of each OPS/SCS pre- vs. post-implementation. Secondary analyses compared rates of outcomes in treated vs. synthetic control neighbourhoods. We used exclusively publicly available confirmed incidents that occurred within city boundaries between 1 January 2014 and 30 June 2024.

Results: Within 100m of OPS/SCS, incidents of assaults (61%, 95%CI: 10 to 134%), robberies (62%, 95%CI: 10 – 138%), and break and enters (47%, 95%CI: 6 – 104%) increased following sites' implementation; but monthly incident trends for robberies (-2%, 95%CI: -3 – 0%) and break and enters (-2%, 95%CI: -3 – -1%) declined. At 200m and 500m, there were no observed level effects in incidents of assault or robberies, but level effects persisted for break and enters. Further, thefts from motor vehicles (-2%, 95%CI: -3% – -1%) declined faster post-implementation. Our secondary analysis revealed rates of assaults increased faster (1%, 95%CI: 0 – 1%; p=0.003) in treated neighbourhoods compared with synthetic controls.

Conclusions and relevance: The effects of Toronto's OPS/SCS on crime were complex; with immediate effects being attenuated or reversed over time.

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/10.1101/2024.11.08.24316990; this version posted November 11, 2024. 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. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Introduction (476 words)

Like much of North America, Canada's largest city, Toronto, has been hit hard by the ongoing opioid crisis. Since 2016 there have been over 3,251 opioid-related deaths; and in 2021 the death rate exceeded 19.4 deaths per 100,000,[1] putting it on par with cities like San Diego, New York, Houston, Las Vegas, and Seattle.[2]

As part of the city's harm reduction strategy, nine overdose prevention sites (OPS) and supervised consumption sites (SCS) were implemented between 2017 and 2018. Despite evidence demonstrating the health benefits of OPS/SCS for people who use unregulated drugs,[3,4] these sites remain controversial. Critics argue OPS/SCS may increase local crime by attracting drug-related activity such as theft, assault and open drug use.[5] In February 2024, a class action lawsuit was filed against one of the city's SCS attributing it to the neighbourhood's deterioration. The lawsuit included reports of 'the sale and use of illicit drug[s], assault, theft, vandalism, property damage and trespass[ing]' and the death of Karolina Huebner-Makurat from a stray bullet months earlier.[6,7]

Early evidence following the implementation of Vancouver's Insite in 2003, and Sydney's Kings Cross site in 2001 found no changes in police-recorded thefts or robberies, drug possession, drug dealing, open drug use or assaults.[8-10] More recently, a study examining the effects of an unsanctioned SCS in the United States reported assault, burglary, larceny theft, robbery and drug related incidents declined in the treated neighbourhood but remained the same in two control communities.[11] Similarly, a study comparing crime near New York's two overdose prevention sites with the city's syringe service programs observed no significant effects on counts of violent or property crimes in aggregate.[12] However, the study did reveal a 30.4% (95% CI: 10.4, 54.0%) increase in aggravated assaults, and a 69.1% (95% CI: 18.3, 141.7%) increase in vehicle thefts offset by the 34.9% (95% CI: -54.0, -7.8%) decline in robberies. Meanwhile, a second study of New York's sites found differential effects of the SCS owing to plausible moderating factors including a 'target of opportunity' for petty larceny near one site but not the other.[13]

While studies indicate SCS do not increase neighbourhood crime and may reduce public drug use, differences in the methods used and their respective limitations may explain the variations in the outcomes reported. These include short observation periods and the inability to detect meaningful differences in crime trends over time, aggregating crimes to improve statistical power but losing nuance in the results reported, and not adjusting for local population demographics. Further, many of the studies dominating the literature are specific to well-resourced sites and, in the case of Vancouver's Insite, set up as a pilot to demonstrate feasibility and impact.[14] Given the ongoing equipoise, and local arguments

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.11.08.24316990; this version posted November 11, 2024. 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. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

opposed to the continued operation of Toronto's sites, we evaluated the effects of the city's nine OPS/SCS on neighbourhood crime and mental health act apprehensions using publicly available data.

Method (1222 words)

Study design

We used a multiple baseline interrupted time series study design with and without synthetic controls.

Setting

Between 2011 and 2021, the population of Toronto grew from 2.6 million to 2.8 million.[15] The city is ethno-racially diverse with 52% of residents self-identifying as visible minorities, and just under half the population comprised of immigrants.[16] Between 1990 and 2022, the city was divided into 140 neighbourhoods with unique demographics and social service needs. Each neighbourhood is comprised of multiple, contiguous Statistics Canada census tracts – and no census tract crosses neighbourhood boundaries.[17] Although some neighbourhoods were redefined to reflect demographic and density change in spring 2022, we refer to the original 140 neighbourhood boundaries in our study.

While heat maps of opioid-poisoning calls from as early as 2017 demonstrate poisonings occurred across the city, the majority of events have been concentrated in the downtown core.[18] In response, the Overdose Prevention Society opened the first unsanctioned OPS in Moss Park in August 2017 and within a year, nine OPS/SCS were in operation (Supplemental Table 1).

Data

We used data from four publicly available datasets collected and maintained by Toronto Police Service: Major Crime Indicators (MCI), Bicycle Thefts, Theft from Motor Vehicle, and Mental Health Act Apprehensions. The MCI included records for five major crimes: assault, auto theft, break and enter, robbery, and theft over $5000. Assaults included the direct or indirect application, and attempt, of force to another person. Auto thefts were limited to acts of taking another person's vehicle and excluded attempts. Break and enters were acts of entering places with the *intent* to commit indictable offenses. Robbery included acts of taking property from a person or business using force or intimidation in the presence of a victim. Theft over $5000 excluded auto theft, while bicycle thefts and theft from motor vehicle included all confirmed bikes stolen or vehicles broken into for the purposes of retrieving items. Finally, mental health act apprehensions included all police apprehensions of persons identified as a risk to themselves or others for the provision of medical care and up to 72 hours of observation. Across all four datasets, each incident record included a unique identifier, date of occurrence, and the name and numeric identifier of

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.11.08.24316990; this version posted November 11, 2024. 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. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

the neighbourhood. Apart from mental health act apprehensions, the remaining three datasets also included geo-coordinates of the intersection closest to the event location.

We restricted analyses to founded crimes that occurred between 1 January 2014 and 30 June 2024; and fall under two types of offences within Canada's Criminal Code: offences against rights of property (e.g., theft) and crimes against persons. Unlike other criminal systems, there is no formal distinction between 'petty' and 'grand' theft, except by way of penalty, using $5000 as the threshold. We considered bicycle theft and theft from vehicle as petty theft, motor vehicle theft and theft over $5000 as grand theft, and assault and robbery as crimes against persons given the presence of a victim.[19] Break and enters are also offences against property but were not categorized as grand or petty theft.

Analysis

We conducted two sets of analyses to overcome the limitations observed in other studies. For our primary analysis, we used a multiple baseline interrupted time series study design with negative binomial regression to test for level and trend changes on counts of crimes within 100m, 200m and 500m of the nine OPS/SCS: $outcome_{jt} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \cdot time_t + \beta_2 \cdot level_j + \beta_3 \cdot trend_{jt} + \varepsilon_{jt}$, where β_1 is the underlying trend in the outcome across time, β_2 captures the level effect immediately post-implementation, and β_3 represents the trend effect following the implementation of the local SCS/OPS relative to the underlying trend. Because some sites opened within the radii of observation of previously implemented sites (e.g., Fred Victor site opened within 500m of the Moss Park site), to avoid double counting crimes/apprehensions, we only assigned events that occurred outside the first site's radius to the new site. We set the month of implementation as time zero, and restricted our observation periods to monthly intervals where all sites contributed to that month's count. To account for data heteroscedasticity and autocorrelation, we used Newey-West standard errors and set our lag to 3. As a sensitivity analysis, we repeated our analysis using a donut hole approach to test for a potential displacement effect (i.e., event incidents rose in the immediate proximity of sites but dissipated elsewhere in the neighbourhood, for a net neutral effect) by excluding events that occurred within 100m for our two other distances (i.e., >100 – 200m, and >100 – 500m).

For our secondary analysis, we used a multiple baseline interrupted time series study design comparing outcome rates in neighbourhoods with OPS/SCS to rates in synthetic control neighbourhoods. For the neighbourhood level analyses, we linked Toronto Police Service records with 2011, 2016, and 2021 census tract profiles using their respective year of incidence and boundary files for point-in-polygon spatial joins and created a synthetic control from the pool of neighbourhoods that never implemented an OPS/SCS during our observation period using Abadie et al.'s approach.[20] This allowed us to control for

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.11.08.24316990; this version posted November 11, 2024. 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. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

underlying trends in outcomes observed elsewhere in the city and for demographic differences within neighbourhoods. To create the synthetic controls, we first created demographic profiles of each neighbourhood by weighting the census tracts that fell within each neighbourhood's boundaries.[21] We excluded from the pool of potential controls neighbourhoods whose boundaries were within the 500m radius of the OPS/SCS and accounted for population size and density, proportion of females, distribution of age (0-14, 15-64, and 65+) and average age, average household size, median income, prevalence of low-income households after tax, unemployment rate, and proportion of lone-parent households, immigrants, visible minorities, and individuals without high school diploma or equivalent certificate when creating synthetic controls.

We used controlled interrupted time series analysis and segmented regression to compare the level and trends of crime and mental health act apprehension rates observed in treated vs. synthetic control neighbourhoods post-implementation: $outcome_{jkt} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \cdot time_t + \beta_2 \cdot group_k + \beta_3 \cdot group_k \cdot time_t + \beta_4 \cdot level_{jt} + \beta_5 \cdot trend_{jt} + \beta_6 \cdot level_{jt} \cdot group_k + \beta_7 \cdot trend_{jt} \cdot group_k + \varepsilon_{jkt}$ where β_1 is the underlying trend in the outcome observed in the synthetic control group, β_2 is the level difference pre-intervention between the synthetic control and treated group, β_3 represents the difference in trend between the treated and synthetic control group *before* the intervention is implemented, β_4 is the level change in the synthetic control group post-implementation compared with immediately before the intervention's implementation, β_5 is the trend change for the synthetic control post-implementation, β_6 is the level change of the treated group *relative* to the synthetic control group change observed post-implementation, and β_7 is the trend change in the treated group *relative* to the synthetic control group post-implementation. As with the primary analysis, we centred on month of implementation for each treated-synthetic control dyad. Since our outcome was rates per 100,000 population, as before, we used negative binomial regressions, with Newey-West standard errors.

All data preparation and analyses were conducted using R version 4.3.1 in R studio, with packages geosphere, AICcmodavg, tidyverse, sf, Synth, crsuggest, cancensus, foreign, tsModel, lmtest, Epi, splines, vcd, sandwich, reshape2, SCtools, janitor, gdata, rlang, tidyselect, car, and nlme**.**

Ethics

This study used publicly available data and was exempt from ethics review by McGill's institutional review board.

RESULTS (605 words)

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.11.08.24316990; this version posted November 11, 2024. 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. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

After removing duplicates, errors, and incidents that occurred outside city boundaries, 172,681 assaults, 56,414 auto thefts, 71,255 break and enters, 26,180 robberies, 12,528 thefts over $5000, 29,128 bicycle thefts, 92,803 thefts from motor vehicles, and 110,387 mental health act apprehensions occurred within Toronto during the observation period. Of these, 21,705 (12.57%) assaults, 1,805 (3.20%) auto thefts, 6,808 (9.55%) break and enters, 4,103 (15.67%) robberies, 1,085 (8.66%) thefts over $5000, 5,586 (19.18%) bicycle thefts, and 8,286 (8.93%) thefts from motor vehicles occurred within 500m of the OPS/SCS locations.

Table 1 summarizes the results of our primary analysis and its accompanying sensitivity analysis.

Within 100m of OPS/SCS, there were no statistically significant level or trend effects in incidents of auto theft or thefts over $5000. Counts of assaults rose 61% (1.61, 95% CI: 1.10 to 2.34; p=0.013), break and enters increased 47% (1.47, 95% CI: 1.06 to 2.04; p=0.019), and robberies jumped 62% (1.62, 95% CI: 1.10 to 2.38; p=0.015) immediately following sites' implementation; while monthly incidence trends declined 2% for break and enters (0.98, 95% CI: 0.97 to 0.99; p=0.004) and robberies (0.98, 95% CI: 0.97 to 1.00; p=0.021). We did not detect a statistically significant change in trend for assaults following implementation (1.00, 95% CI: 0.99 to 1.01; p=0.653). In absolute terms, these level and trend differences translate to an estimated 5.96 more assaults, 2.72 fewer break and enters, and 1.19 fewer robberies five years of site openings.

Within 200m of OPS/SCS, the lack of observed level or trend effects for auto theft and theft over $5000 persisted. There was also no level effect observed for assaults (1.05, 95% CI: 0.92 to 1.19; p=0.452) or robberies (0.93, 95% CI: 0.66 to 1.32; p=0.700). However, break and enters increased 70% (1.70, 95% CI: 1.39 to 2.07; p<0.001) immediately following sites' implementations. Monthly trends for assaults (0.99, 95% CI: 0.99 to 1.00; p=0.001), break and enters (0.99, 95% CI: 0.98 to 1.00, p=0.014), and robberies (0.98, 95% CI: 0.97 to 0.99; p=0.002) declined. Further, thefts from motor vehicle declined faster (0.98, 95% CI: 0.97 to 0.99; p=0.002). At five years post-implementation, there were an estimated 15.2 fewer assaults, 0.11 fewer break and enters, 13.0 fewer robberies, and 6.7 fewer thefts from motor vehicles.

Within 500m of sites, all level and trend effects observed within 200m of sites persisted; except trends for theft from motor vehicle were no longer significant (0.99, 95% CI: 0.98 to 1.00; p=0.072). In absolute terms there were approximately 72.6 fewer assaults, 17.7 fewer break and enters, 34.8 fewer robberies, and 19.3 fewer thefts from motor vehicles than expected five years after OPS/SCS began to operate (Figure 1).

[Insert Figure 1 here]

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.11.08.24316990; this version posted November 11, 2024. 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. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Results from our sensitivity analyses revealed that crime displacement may explain the level effects we observed within 100m of sites for assaults and robberies, but not break and enters.

Our secondary analysis found assault rates were lower (0.84, 95% CI: 0.79 to 0.89; $p<0.001$) and were increasing slower (1.00, 95% CI: 0.99 to 1.00; $p=0.040$) in treated compared with synthetic control neighbourhoods, pre-implementation. We also found robbery rates increased slower (0.99, 95% CI: 0.99 to 1.00; $p=0.045$) in treated neighbourhoods compared with synthetic controls, pre-implementation. We observed no statistically significant differences pre-implementation for the rest of our treated-control neighbourhood dyads. After controlling for trend and level changes in synthetic control neighbourhoods, treated neighbourhoods did not experience a level increase for any rates of crime or mental health act apprehensions. Rates of auto theft declined faster (0.99, 95% CI: 0.99 to 1.00; $p=0.038$), while rates of assault rose faster (1.01, 95% CI: 1.00 to 1.01; $p=0.003$) in treated compared with synthetic control neighbourhoods (Table 2, Figure 2).

[Insert Figure 2 here]

DISCUSSION (1157 words)

Our analyses revealed that OPS/SCS did not have a level or trend effect on counts of grand theft across all modes of analysis; and a protective effect on trends in petty theft within 500m. Although we observed significant increases in the level of crimes against persons within 100m and break and enters up to 500m, the level effects diminished with time. A lack of effect on grand theft may reflect the absence or non-differential presence of organized criminal activity near OPS/SCS.[22] Grand theft relies on concerted criminal networks targeting high value items; and is less sensitive to small sociodemographic changes at the community-level such as increases in people who use unregulated drugs.[23] Conversely, changes in crimes against persons, and break and enters indicate an increase in spontaneous crimes and may be a consequence of coupling desire with the opportunity to execute said crimes.

Our results echo others' observations that, *in aggregate*, OPS/SCS did not contribute to increases in crimes.[8,11-13,24] Further, these findings conflict with city-wide increases in the volume and severity of police-reported crimes.[25] To contextualize our results, we consider the plausibility of three alternate explanations for our findings: the 'honey-pot' effect, increased policing, and changes in data collection.

The 'honey-pot' effect describes the phenomenon where an intervention attracts people and/or behaviours, and may explain why counts of assaults, break and enters, and robberies increased within 100m of OPS/SCS immediately following implementation.[5] However, this phenomenon cannot explain why the initial increases in incidents did not persist. One reason may be that between March 2020 and August

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.11.08.24316990; this version posted November 11, 2024. 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. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

2021 the city engaged in a massive displacement of people experiencing homelessness and/or clients of OPS/SCS as part of its COVID-19 public health response. During this time, the city rented three large hotels (i.e., the Bond Hotel in Downtown Yonge East, Edward Village Hotel in Henry Farm, and Novotel Hotel in St. Lawrence – East Bayfront – The Islands) to provide temporary emergency shelter – effectively moving approximately 1000 people to other neighbourhoods. Meanwhile, the enforcement of stringent social distancing measures scaled down OPS/SCS services.[26] The dispersing of clients to other neighbourhoods might explain the decline in incidents of spontaneous crimes. However, when measures were lifted and shelters closed, crime near OPS/SCS did not rebound despite a return to pre-pandemic rates of service use[27] – weakening the claim that the honey-pot effect explains our observations.

Similarly, while increased police presence near OPS/SCS may explain some of the decline in spontaneous crimes, this posits a paradox. Previous studies noted police presence can undermine the social acceptability of harm reduction interventions for people who use unregulated drugs.[28] However, outside COVID-19 restrictions, there was no notable decline in client visits. Further, as far back as 2018, police budgets grew slower and the workforce decreased.[29,30] A possible explanation reconciling the shortages in the police workforce with improvements in crime is the Toronto Police Service's Mental Health and Addictions strategy launched in 2019. The strategy was developed under the guidance of a Mental Health and Addictions Advisory Board, including people with lived experience, in response to a report critical of police use of force.[31] It is possible by improving policing *quality*, incidents of crimes against persons, petty theft, and break and enters decreased with minimal effect on OPS/SCS patronage – and warrants further investigation.

Finally, changes in the reporting or collecting of data may explain the decline in outcomes over time. In 2017, police services and Statistics Canada worked together to amend the definition of 'founded' criminal incidents to include events for which there was no credible evidence the incident *did not* take place.[32] This victim-centred approach first came into effect 1 January 2018; and studies have associated it with 4 – 12% increases in counts of assault, petty theft, and fraud in subsequent years.[33] While it is possible, the public *reported* fewer crimes against persons near OPS/SCS – this, too, seems unlikely when looking at city-wide reporting patterns.[25]

In short, alternate explanations for our findings do not sufficiently explain the neutral to modest positive effects observed in communities with OPS/SCS. Realistically, our results may reflect a combination of factors including changes in data capture and policing quality that occurred over time; as well as the impacts of the sites themselves.

Limitations

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.11.08.24316990; this version posted November 11, 2024. 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. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

We did not include all OPS/SCS operating during the observation period. We excluded Casey House and shelters that provided services to residents only. Casey House became the first hospital to offer supervised consumption services to inpatients in August 2021, and expanded services to outpatients in April 2022. Because of differences in clientele, scope, duration of operation, and proximity to other sites – we opted to exclude Casey House to minimize potentially biasing our analyses. Similarly, we did not include shelters which provided overdose prevention services to their residents, including the three temporary housing units implemented during COVID-19 social distancing efforts. The agglomeration of services along with the displacement of populations is a qualitatively different intervention from traditional OPS/SCS and should be the subject of a separate study.

Further, our primary analyses did not account for changes in population size or demographics over time and assumed pre-intervention temporal trends would have otherwise continued. We supplemented this work with neighbourhood-level analysis. On their own, neighbourhood-level analysis could obfuscate the hyper-localized effects of OPS/SCS. However, by presenting the results of both approaches, we aimed to triangulate the true impact of sites using contemporary methods, examine potential spillover effects, and address methodological limitations which may influence the effect size and interpretability of results.

Lastly, we did not investigate the effects of OPS/SCS on public drug use, needle and syringe debris, graffiti or public defecation – concerns repeatedly mentioned by opponents of OPS/SCS.[34] While we explored the possibility of including 311 calls as an alternate dataset to enable the inclusion of these outcomes in our study, we determined the quality of data insufficient and prone to reporting bias.

Strengths

To our knowledge, this was the first study to evaluate the effects of multiple OPS/SCS implemented across a large metropolitan area. Owing to the number of sites and time elapsed since their implementation, we were sufficiently powered to examine the effects of OPS/SCS on a variety of measures separately, over time, and within close proximity to sites. Further, by using a multiple baseline approach, we reduced the potential for an unmeasured contemporaneous biasing our results. Our synthetic controls were well matched to treated neighbourhoods and only demonstrated small deviations in trends for assaults and robbery pre-intervention in aggregate. While we did not use Bonferroni correction, readers have complete access to the results of our analyses, including statistical tests, to aid in their interpretation of our findings. Nevertheless, we encourage readers to look beyond tests of statistical significance when considering the evidence. Further, by using exclusively open access data, and providing our code, we minimized the possibility for data preparation or analytic errors and increased the

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.11.08.24316990; this version posted November 11, 2024. 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. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

transparency of our work. Lastly, we considered other explanations for our observed effects and found the available evidence did not support these alternate narratives.

PUBLIC HEALTH IMPACTS (121 words)

Our analyses revealed the implementation of Toronto's OPS/SCS had complex effects on neighbourhoods. While the interventions' impacts were neutral to positive over time, this does not negate the initial increases in spontaneous crimes. Our work suggests efforts to improve crime while encouraging use of OPS/SCS are possible. Still, local communities may perceive OPS/SCS as harmful, associating them with disorder and increased drug use in public spaces.[35] This tension needs to be addressed to ensure the long term acceptability and utility of OPS/SCS. Efforts to establish relationships with local community stakeholders and to work collectively through challenges can build goodwill and trust between OPS/SCS operators, clients and the public. Meanwhile, efforts to dismiss or negate apprehensions can undermine the public health intervention.

Table 1. Results from primary analysis: Level and trend changes to crime incidence (counts) following the implementation of overdose prevention sites / supervised consumption sites by reportable crime and distance from site

	100 metres		200 metres				500 metres			
Assault	**Primary**	**p-value**	**Primary**	**p-value**	**Sensitivity**	**p-value**	**Primary**	**p-value**	**Sensitivity**	**p-value**
Intercept	5.49	< 0.0001	35.80	< 0.0001	30.32	< 0.0001	164.50	< 0.0001	164.00	< 0.0001
	(4.07 – 7.42)		(32.97 – 38.87)		(26.61-34.54)		(163.56 – 175.65)		(157.63 – 170.63)	
Time	1.00	0.7176	1.01	< 0.0001	1.01	0.0009	1.01	< 0.0001	1.01	< 0.0001
	(0.99 – 1.01)		(1.00 – 1.01)		(1.00-1.01)		(1.01 – 1.01)		(1.01 – 1.01)	
Level	**1.61**	0.0131	1.05	0.4515	0.95	0.5776	1.07	0.0846	1.06	0.1834
	(1.10 – 2.34)		(0.92 – 1.19)		(0.80-1.13)		(0.99 – 1.17)		(0.97 – 1.15)	
Trend	1.00	0.5630	**0.99**	0.0014	**0.99**	**0.0032**	**0.99**	< 0.0001	**0.99**	**< 0.0001**
	(0.99 – 1.01)		**(0.99-1.00)**		**(0.99-1.00)**		**(0.99 – 1.00)**		**(0.99 – 1.00)**	
Auto theft										
Intercept	0.52	0.0393	1.77	0.0011	1.25	0.2855	10.65	< 0.0001	10.14	< 0.0001
	(0.27 – 1.03)		(1.26 – 2.49)		(0.83 – 1.89)		(8.32 – 13.65)		(7.67 – 13.39)	
Time	1.00	0.9146	1.00	0.5863	1.01	0.6109	1.00	0.3288	1.00	0.3646
	(0.98-1.02)		(0.99 – 1.02)		(0.98 – 1.03)		(1.00 – 1.01)		(1.00 – 1.01)	
Level	1.18	0.7019	1.35	0.3028	1.43	0.3477	1.35	0.0858	1.36	0.1002
	(0.50 – 2.79)		(0.76 – 2.41)		(0.68 – 2.99)		(0.96 – 1.90)		(0.93 – 1.98)	
Trend	1.00	0.8602	1.00	0.8955	1.00	0.8249	1.00	0.7681	1.00	0.8002
	(0.97 – 1.03)		(0.98 – 1.02)		(0.97 – 1.02)		(0.99 – 1.01)		(0.99 – 1.01)	
Break and enter										
Intercept	2.20	< 0.0001	7.45	< 0.0001	5.30	< 0.0001	47.83	< 0.0001	45.65	< 0.0001
	(1.67 – 2.90)		(6.61 – 8.39)		(4.51 – 6.23)		(42.04 – 54.42)		(39.39 – 52.89)	
Time	1.01	0.0098	1.00	0.6387	1.00	0.5512	1.01	0.0083	1.01	0.0256
	(1.00 – 1.02)		(1.00 – 1.01)		(0.99 – 1.01)		(1.00 – 1.01)		(1.00 – 1.01)	
Level	**1.47**	**0.0194**	**1.70**	**< 0.0001**	**1.77**	**< 0.0001**	**1.48**	**0.0001**	**1.48**	**0.0004**
	(1.06 – 2.04)		**(1.39 – 2.07)**		**(1.40 – 2.24)**		**(1.21 – 1.81)**		**(1.19 – 1.84)**	
Trend	**0.98**	**0.0039**	**0.99**	**0.0136**	0.99	0.1432	**0.99**	**0.0001**	**0.99**	**0.0003**
	(0.97 – 0.99)		**(0.98 – 1.00)**		(0.99 – 1.00)		**(0.98 – 0.99)**		**(0.98 – 0.99)**	

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.11.08.24316990; this version posted November 11, 2024. 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. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Robbery										
Intercept	1.41	0.0020	10.55	< 0.0001	9.12	< 0.0001	40.18	< 0.0001	38.78	< 0.0001
	(1.13 – 1.75)		(7.88 – 14.11)		(6.81 – 12.21)		(34.57 – 46.70)		(33.33 – 45.12)	
Time	1.01	0.0791	1.01	0.1088	1.01	0.1286	1.01	0.1127	1.01	0.1300
	(1.00 – 1.02)		(1.00 – 1.02)		(1.00 – 1.02)		(1.00 – 1.01)		(1.00 – 1.01)	
Level	**1.62**	**0.0148**	0.93	0.6996	0.83	0.3048	1.08	0.4608	1.07	0.5575
	(1.10 – 2.38)		(0.66 – 1.32)		(0.58 – 1.19)		(0.87 – 1.35)		(0.86 – 1.32)	
Trend	**0.98**	**0.0206**	**0.98**	**0.0023**	**0.98**	**0.0036**	**0.98**	**0.0001**	**0.98**	**0.0001**
	(0.97 – 1.00)		**(0.97 – 0.99)**		**(0.97 – 0.99)**		**(0.97 – 0.99)**		**(0.97 – 0.99)**	
Theft > $5000										
Intercept	0.19	0.0081	0.95	0.8880	0.78	0.4435	8.29	< 0.0001	8.12	< 0.0001
	(0.06 – 0.65)		(0.48 – 1.88)		(0.41 – 1.48)		(6.12 – 11.24)		(6.13 – 10.76)	
Time	0.99	0.6331	1.00	0.8319	1.01	0.4604	1.01	0.2581	1.01	0.1769
	(0.94 – 1.04)		(0.97 – 1.04)		(0.98 – 1.04)		(1.00 – 1.02)		(1.00 – 1.02)	
Level	3.19	0.2829	2.09	0.1201	1.78	0.1089	1.21	0.3559	1.16	0.4246
	(0.38 – 26.55)		(0.82 – 5.32)		(0.88 – 3.59)		(0.81 – 1.79)		(0.81 – 1.66)	
Trend	1.00	0.8988	0.99	0.5139	0.98	0.2090	0.99	0.1878	0.99	0.1337
	(0.95 – 1.07)		(0.96 – 1.02)		(0.96 – 1.01)		(0.98 – 1.00)		(0.98 – 1.00)	
Bicycle thefts										
Intercept	2.09	0.0004	10.22	< 0.0001	8.15	< 0.0001	51.25	< 0.0001	49.19	< 0.0001
	(1.39 – 3.16)		(7.67 – 13.63)		(6.19 – 10.72)		(40.59 – 64.72)		(39.10 – 61.89)	
Time	1.00	0.6734	1.01	0.4695	1.01	0.4253	1.01	0.1472	1.01	0.1270
	(0.99 – 1.02)		(0.99 – 1.02)		(0.99 – 1.02)		(1.00 – 1.02)		(1.00 – 1.02)	
Level	0.75	0.2778	0.87	0.5886	0.90	0.6964	0.91	0.6346	0.92	0.6621
	(0.45 – 1.26)		(0.53 – 1.43)		(0.54 – 1.51)		(0.63 – 1.33)		(0.63 – 1.33)	
Trend	1.00	0.9296	0.99	0.3162	0.99	0.2264	0.99	0.1477	0.99	0.1257
	(0.98 – 1.02)		(0.97 – 1.01)		(0.97 – 1.01)		(0.98 – 1.00)		(0.98 – 1.00)	
Thefts from vehicle										
Intercept	1.64	0.1400	12.62	< 0.0001	11.03	< 0.0001	69.25	< 0.0001	67.61	< 0.0001
	(0.85 – 3.15)		(9.66 – 16.48)		(8.34 – 14.57)		(51.00 – 94.02)		(51.12 – 89.40)	
Time	0.99	0.2729	1.00	0.9300	1.00	0.6602	1.00	0.6879	1.00	0.7002
	(0.97 – 1.01)		(0.99 – 1.01)		(0.99 – 1.01)		(0.99 – 1.01)		(0.99 – 1.01)	
Level	1.45	0.2981	1.20	0.2964	1.16	0.4667	1.36	0.0782	1.36	0.0619
	(0.72 – 2.90)		(0.85 – 1.71)		(0.77 – 1.74)		(0.97 – 1.93)		(0.98 – 1.89)	
Trend	1.00	0.9814	**0.98**	**0.0022**	**0.98**	**0.0007**	0.99	0.0716	**0.99**	**0.0471**
	(0.98 – 1.02)		**(0.97 – 0.99)**		**(0.97 – 0.99)**		(0.98 – 1.00)		**(0.98 – 1.00)**	

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.11.08.24316990; this version posted November 11, 2024. 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. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Table 2. Results from secondary analysis: Differences in level and trend changes in rates of crimes in treated vs. synthetic control neighbourhoods following the implementation of overdose prevention sites / supervised consumption sites

	Assault		**Auto Theft**		**Break and Enter**	
	Rate (95% CI)	**p-value**	**Rate (95% CI)**	**p-value**	**Rate (95% CI)**	**p-value**
Intercept	110.44 (105.72-115.37)	< 0.0001	7.05 (6.20-8.01)	< 0.0001	33.51 (27.39-41.01)	< 0.0001
Time	1.00 (1.00-1.01)	0.0058	1.00 (0.99-1.00)	0.6252	1.00 (0.99-1.01)	0.9326
Group	**0.84 (0.79-0.89)**	**< 0.0001**	1.07 (0.92-1.24)	0.4138	0.97 (0.77-1.21)	0.7715
Group×Time	**1.00 (0.99-1.00)**	**0.0401**	1.00 (1.00-1.01)	0.7575	1.00 (0.99-1.01)	0.9944
Level	0.99 (0.87-1.12)	0.8690	**1.24 (1.03-1.48)**	**0.0201**	**1.37 (1.06-1.78)**	**0.0166**
Trend	**0.99 (0.99-1.00)**	**0.0019**	**1.01 (1.01-1.02)**	**< 0.0001**	1.00 (0.99-1.00)	0.1940
Group×Level	1.10 (0.95-1.27)	0.1965	0.91 (0.69-1.21)	0.5203	1.19 (0.85-1.68)	0.3076
Group×Trend	**1.01 (1.00-1.01)**	**0.0029**	**0.99 (0.99-1.00)**	**0.0380**	1.00 (0.99-1.00)	0.3927
	Robbery		**Theft > $5000**		**Bicycle Theft**	
Intercept	16.28 (14.78-17.94)	< 0.0001	6.46 (5.75-7.25)	< 0.0001	37.95 (30.74-46.85)	< 0.0001
Time	1.00 (1.00-1.01)	0.0316	1.00 (1.00-1.01)	0.2833	1.00 (0.99-1.01)	0.8867
Group	0.92 (0.79-1.07)	0.2716	0.98 (0.81-1.19)	0.8363	0.96 (0.65-1.43)	0.8482
Group×Time	**0.99 (0.99-1.00)**	**0.0452**	1.00 (0.99-1.01)	0.7910	1.00 (0.99-1.02)	0.6296
Level	0.94 (0.81-1.10)	0.4534	1.09 (0.82-1.44)	0.5660	1.13 (0.77-1.66)	0.5337
Trend	**0.99 (0.98-0.99)**	**0.0001**	1.00 (0.99-1.01)	0.5679	1.00 (0.98-1.01)	0.3389
Group×Level	1.21 (0.97-1.50)	0.0853	1.00 (0.63-1.59)	0.9845	1.00 (0.58-1.71)	0.9945
Group×Trend	1.01 (1.00-1.01)	0.1898	1.00 (0.98-1.01)	0.5628	0.99 (0.98-1.01)	0.3512
	Thefts from motor vehicles		**Mental health apprehensions**			
Intercept	34.34 (29.57-39.88)	< 0.0001	55.42 (52.00-59.07)	< 0.0001		
Time	0.99 (0.99-1.00)	0.0096	1.00 (1.00-1.01)	0.0003		
Group	1.28 (0.98-1.67)	0.0685	1.10 (1.02-1.18)	0.0118		
Group×Time	0.99 (0.98-1.01)	0.3300	1.00 (1.00-1.00)	0.6988		
Level	**1.45 (1.18-1.78)**	**0.0004**	1.08 (0.98-1.18)	0.1197		
Trend	1.00 (0.99-1.01)	0.9480	**1.00 (0.99-1.00)**	**0.0006**		
Group×Level	0.86 (0.59-1.24)	0.4084	1.12 (0.98-1.28)	0.0839		
Group×Trend	1.00 (0.99-1.01)	0.9238	1.00 (1.00-1.00)	0.9833		

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.11.08.24316990; this version posted November 11, 2024. 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. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.11.08.24316990; this version posted November 11, 2024. 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. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

REFERENCE LIST

1. Ontario Agency for Health Protection and Promotion (Public Health Ontario). *Interactive Opioid Tool*. 2024. Accessed 18 September 2024. https://www.publichealthontario.ca/en/data-and-analysis/substance-use/interactive-opioid-tool
2. Niamatullah S, Auchincloss A, Livengood K. *Data Brief: Drug Overdose Deaths in Big Cities*. 2022. August 2022. Accessed 4 October 2024. https://drexel.edu/~/media/Files/uhc/briefs/BCHC_DrugOverdoseDeaths.ashx?la=en
3. Lim J, Panagiotoglou D. The effect of Montreal's supervised consumption sites on injection-related infections among people who inject drugs: An interrupted time series. *PLoS One*. 2024;19(8):e0308482. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0308482
4. Rammohan I, Gaines T, Scheim A, Bayoumi A, Werb D. Overdose mortality incidence and supervised consumption services in Toronto, Canada: an ecological study and spatial analysis. *The Lancet Public Health*. 2024;9(2):e79-e87. doi:10.1016/S2468-2667(23)00300-6
5. Kolla G, Strike C, Watson TM, Jairam J, Fischer B, Bayoumi AM. Risk creating and risk reducing: Community perceptions of supervised consumption facilities for illicit drug use. *Health, Risk & Society*. 2017/02/17 2017;19(1-2):91-111. doi:10.1080/13698575.2017.1291918
6. Staff. Ontario reviewing supervised consumption sites after Toronto shooting death. *Global News*. 17 August 2023. Accessed 18 September 2024. https://globalnews.ca/news/9902169/ontario-reviewing-supervised-consumption-sites-after-toronto-shooting-death/
7. Finkle D. Neighbours suing supervised injection site linked to fatal shooting of Toronto mother. *National Post*. 16 February 2024. Accessed 18 September 2024. https://nationalpost.com/news/toronto-supervised-injection-site-class-action-lawsuit
8. Wood E, Tyndall MW, Lai C, Montaner JS, Kerr T. Impact of a medically supervised safer injecting facility on drug dealing and other drug-related crime. *Subst Abuse Treat Prev Policy*. 2006;8(1):13.
9. Fitzgerald J, Burgess M, Snowball L. *Trends in property and illicit drug crime around the medically supervised injecting centre in Kings Cross: An update*. 2010. *Crime and Justice Statistics*. August 2010. https://bocsar.nsw.gov.au/documents/publications/bb/bb01-100/bb51.pdf
10. Kral AH, Davidson PJ. Addressing the Nation’s Opioid Epidemic: Lessons from an Unsanctioned Supervised Injection Site in the U.S. *American journal of preventive medicine*. 2017;53(6):919-922. doi:10.1016/j.amepre.2017.06.010

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.11.08.24316990; this version posted November 11, 2024. 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. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

11. Davidson PJ, Lambdin BH, Browne EN, Wenger LD, Kral AH. Impact of an unsanctioned safe consumption site on criminal activity, 2010–2019. *Drug and alcohol dependence*. 2021/03/01/ 2021;220:108521. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.drugalcdep.2021.108521

12. Chalfin A, del Pozo B, Mitre-Becerril D. Overdose Prevention Centers, Crime, and Disorder in New York City. *JAMA Network Open*. 2023;6(11):e2342228-e2342228. doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2023.42228

13. Hall JJ, Ratcliffe JH. Assessing the impact of safe consumption sites on neighborhood crime in New York City: a synthetic control approach. *Journal of Experimental Criminology*. 2024/07/09 2024;doi:10.1007/s11292-024-09630-z

14. Urban Health Research Initiative. *Findings from the evaluation of Vancouver's Pilot Medically Supervised Safer Injecting Facility - Insite*. 2009. Accessed 18 September 2024. https://www.bccsu.ca/wp-content/uploads/2016/10/insite_report-eng.pdf

15. City of Toronto. *2021 Census: Population and Dwelling Counts*. 2022. Accessed 23 September 2024. https://www.toronto.ca/wp-content/uploads/2022/02/92e3-City-Planning-2021-Census-Backgrounder-Population-Dwellings-Backgrounder.pdf

16. Toronto Public Health. *T.O. Health Check*. 2019. Accessed 23 September 2024. https://www.toronto.ca/wp-content/uploads/2019/11/92ef-TOHealthCheck_2019.pdf

17. City of Toronto. About Toronto Neighbourhoods. City of Toronto. Accessed 23 September 2024, https://www.toronto.ca/city-government/data-research-maps/neighbourhoods-communities/neighbourhood-profiles/about-toronto-neighbourhoods/

18. Surveillance & Epidemiology. Toronto Overdose Information System. Toronto Public Health. Accessed 27 September 2024, https://public.tableau.com/app/profile/tphseu/viz/TOISDashboard_Final/ParamedicResponse

19. Statistics Canada. Classification of common offence. Accessed 26 September 2024, https://www23.statcan.gc.ca/imdb/p3VD.pl?Function=getVD&TVD=257740&CVD=257742&CPV=1.1&CST=01012015&CLV=1&MLV=3&D=1

20. Abadie A, Diamond A, Hainmueller J. Synthetic Control Methods for Comparative Case Studies: Estimating the Effect of California's Tobacco Control Program. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*. 2010;105(490)

21. Statistics Canada. Find 2021 Census data. Statistics Canada. Accessed 4 October 2024, https://www12.statcan.gc.ca/census-recensement/index-eng.cfm

22. Criminal Intelligence Service Canada. Organized Crime Involvement in Vehicle Theft in Canada. Accessed 27 September 2024, https://www.cisc-scrc.gc.ca/media/2023/2023-12-15-eng.htm

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.11.08.24316990; this version posted November 11, 2024. 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. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

23. Campana P, Meneghini C. Organised crime movement across local communities: A network approach. *Trends in Organized Crime*. 2024/09/01 2024;27(3):286-313. doi:10.1007/s12117-024-09531-7

24. Freeman K, Jones CG, Weatherburn DJ, Rutter S, Spooner CJ, Donnelly N. The impact of the Sydney Medically Supervised Injecting Centre (MSIC) on crime. *Drug Alcohol Rev*. Mar 2005;24(2):173-84. doi:10.1080/09595230500167460

25. Toronto Police Service. Major Crime Indicators Dashboard. Toronto Police Service. Accessed 9 October 2024, https://www.tps.ca/data-maps/data-analytics/major-crime-indicators/

26. Panagiotoglou D, Lim J. Using synthetic controls to estimate the population-level effects of Ontario's recently implemented overdose prevention sites and consumption and treatment services. *The International journal on drug policy*. Dec 2022;110:103881. doi:10.1016/j.drugpo.2022.103881

27. Statistics Canada. Supervised consumption sites Dashboard. Accessed 27 September 2024, https://health-infobase.canada.ca/supervised-consumption-sites/

28. Bardwell G, Strike C, Altenberg J, Barnaby L, Kerr T. Implementation contexts and the impact of policing on access to supervised consumption services in Toronto, Canada: a qualitative comparative analysis. *Harm reduction journal*. 2019;16(1):30-30. doi:10.1186/s12954-019-0302-x

29. Lee-Shanok P. Police budge held at $1B for second year but TPS could cut more, critics say. *CBC News*. 26 October 2017. https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/toronto/2018-police-budget-held-at-billion-dollars-1.4374220

30. Gillis W. Proposed city budget poses 'unacceptable risks,' Toronto police cheif warns. *Toronto Star*. 18 January 2024. https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/toronto/2018-police-budget-held-at-billion-dollars-1.4374220

31. Toronto Police Service Board. Mental Health and Addictions Advisory Panel (MHAAP). Accessed 30 September 2024, https://www.tpsb.ca/advisory-panels?view=article&id=100&catid=24#objectives

32. Moreau G. Police-reported crime statistics in Canada, 2018. Statistics Canada. Accessed 4 October 2024, https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/n1/pub/85-002-x/2019001/article/00013-eng.htm

33. Moreau G, Jaffray B, Armstrong A. Police-reported crime statistics in Canada, 2019. Statistics Canada. Accessed 4 October 2024, https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/n1/pub/85-002-x/2020001/article/00010-eng.htm#a4

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.11.08.24316990; this version posted November 11, 2024. 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. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

34. Jones RP, Martin S. Kensington Market split over drug consumption site's future. *CBC News*. 1 October 2024. Accessed 2 October 2024. https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/toronto/supervised-consumption-site-kensington-market-1.7335968

35. Côté-Lussier C, Rodrigues P. The public health impacts of supervised injection sites in Canada: Moving beyond social acceptability and impacts on crime. *Canadian Journal of Public Health*. 2024/06/01 2024;115(3):468-471. doi:10.17269/s41997-024-00874-w

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.11.08.24316990; this version posted November 11, 2024. 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. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Figure 1. Aggregate number of public safety events that occurred within 100m of overdose prevention sites and supervised consumption sites, per month



medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.11.08.24316990; this version posted November 11, 2024. 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. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Legend: The black dashed line represents time zero (i.e., month when local overdose prevention site or supervised consumption site (OPS/SCS) began operating). Negative time represents time before site implementation and positive time represents time since sites began operating. Blue triangles are the aggregate sum of incidents that occurred for the given month within 100m of OPS/SCS locations. Solid blue line is the result of the interrupted time series (ITS) negative binomial regression with a break at time zero. The blue ribbon around the segmented regression captures the 95% confidence interval (CI) for the ITS estimates. Light blue dashed line extends pre-intervention trends and represents the counterfactual where no change in level or trend is observed post-implementation. The light blue ribbon captures the 95% CI for the counterfactual.

Figure 2: Crime rates pre- and post-opening of overdose prevention sites/supervised consumption sites in treated vs. synthetic control neighbourhoods





Months before and after OPS/SCS implementation

Legend: The black dashed line represents time zero (i.e., month when overdose prevention site or supervised consumption site (OPS/SCS) began operating in treated neighbourhood). Negative time represents time before site implementation and positive time represents time since sites began operating. Red circles represent the aggregate rate of incidents in synthetic control neighbourhoods for the given month. The red line captures the trend and level changes observed pre- vs. post-implementation time for synthetic controls. The red ribbon captures the 95% confidence interval (CI) around the observed level and trends for synthetic controls. Blue triangles are the aggregate rate of incidents that occurred for the given month in treated neighbourhoods. The blue line represents the trend and level changes observed pre- vs. post-implementation time for treated neighbourhoods. The blue ribbon captures the 95% CI around the observed level and trends for treated neighbourhoods. The light blue dashed line represents the counterfactual for the treated neighbourhoods accounting for the observed level and trend changes in the synthetic controls post-implementation. The light blue ribbon captures the 95% CI for the counterfactual.