



Evaluation of the 2015 Domestic Violence Evidence-in-Chief (DVEC) reforms

Steve Yeong & Suzanne Poynton

APPENDIX A

Court appearance level analysis: Robustness checks

Tables A1 and A2 present results from our main robustness checks on the probability that a defendant has at least one proven offence (a conviction) at their court appearance using Ordinary Least Squares (OLS) and Two-Stage Least Squares (2SLS) Instrumental Variables (IV) estimation methods, respectively. With respect to both Tables, Columns 1 and 2 build on our primary specification by including Local Area Command (LAC) and court specific linear trends, respectively. Column 3 restricts the sample to include only a defendant's first court appearance in our sample. That is, if a defendant appears more than once for a different DV event in our sample, we look only at the first appearance. Column 4 restricts our sample to include only court appearances in which the defendant is a first time offender. Finally, Column 5 restricts our sample to include only courts that comprise more than 1 per cent of our total sample.

Overall Tables A1 and A2 are in line with our main results. When estimated through OLS, DVEC increases the probability of conviction by about two percentage points. However, when estimated through IV the effect is negative and insignificant. The 'distance' or 'endogeneity' test indicates that we should prefer our OLS estimates. Thus on balance we conclude that there is limited evidence of a significant impact of DVEC on the probability of a conviction, as significance is retained within but not across estimation method.

In the main results for the court appearance level analysis the endogeneity tests for the guilty plea and plea delay regressions indicated that we should employ OLS. After running both IV and OLS regressions we conclude that there is no meaningful difference between our results across estimation method. We therefore provide only the (more generous) OLS estimates in this Appendix. Results from the IV regressions are available upon request.

Table A3 presents results from specifications (Columns) identical to those in Tables A1 and A2. The impact of DVEC on the probability of a guilty plea is insignificant and the coefficient is almost zero in each specification. This is robust evidence to indicate that DVEC has had no significant impact on the probability of a guilty plea.

Table A4 presents results from specifications that are identical to those in Tables A1-A3. The impact of a DVEC statement on plea delay is consistently negative, although still insignificant in each specification.

Next we iteratively include and exclude various sets of Fixed Effects (FEs) for each of our dependent variables. Tables A5 and A6 present these checks for the probability of a conviction when estimated using OLS and IV, respectively. Tables A7 and A8 present these checks estimated through OLS for the probability of a guilty plea and plea delay, respectively. Column 1 presents estimates with no FEs, Column 2 includes time FEs, Column 3 includes LAC FEs, Column 4 includes court FEs, Column 5 includes both LAC and court FEs, Column 6 includes time and court FEs, and finally, Column 7 includes time and LAC FEs.

Tables A5 and A6 illustrate the robustness of our main finding for the probability of a conviction. These Tables highlight the fact that our results are robust within but not across specification. From Table A5 we can see that the impact of a DVEC statement is consistent in sign, significance and approximate size when estimated through OLS. Contrastingly, Table A6 shows us that in Column 1 the presence of a DVEC statement increases the probability of a conviction by a significant 11.4 percentage points. However, when we control for LAC or court FEs, not only does the size of the coefficient reduce substantially, but the standard error does too. Taken together this indicates that inclusion of the FEs both alleviates bias and increases the precision of our estimates.

We can see from Table A7 that the LAC and court FEs are important for explaining variation in the probability of a guilty

plea. Before the inclusion of either FE, DVEC appears to have a significant two percentage point increase on the probability of a guilty plea. However after we include the court and/or LAC FEs this effect drops down to zero and becomes insignificant.

Table A8 presents some interesting results for the impact of DVEC on plea delay. With no FEs, our model estimates a significant four day reduction in plea delay as a result of DVEC. However, when we control for time FEs the size of this effect drops substantially and we lose significance. The significance of the effect appears to be robust to both court and LAC FEs. This indicates that the time FEs are driving the (in)significance of our results.

Tables A9 and A10 present the next battery of robustness checks from OLS and 2SLS IV regressions on the probability of a conviction, respectively. With respect to both Tables, Column 1 restricts the control vector to include only variables that were significant in our OLS specification. Column 2 restricts the sample to include only appearances in which the most serious charge is a common assault. Columns 3 and 4 restrict the sample to include only appearances in which the most serious charge is an Actual Bodily Harm (ABH) or Grievous Bodily Harm (GBH) charge, respectively. Two points are of note with respect to these Tables. First on Table A9, we can see that the impact of DVEC is significant and approximately consistent across Columns 1 and 2. However, the significance of the coefficient disappears when we restrict the sample to ABH and GBH appearances. Second, no specification is significant in Table 10A. Taken together we can conclude that if DVEC is having an impact on the probability of a conviction, it is likely through common assaults.

Table A11 estimates the impact of a DVEC statement on the probability that the defendant pleads guilty to at least one charge at their court appearance. Table A11 employs the same specifications as Table A9. We can see that DVEC has no significant impact on the probability of a guilty plea. This is consistent with our main results.

Table A12 presents OLS estimates for the impact of DVEC on plea delay using the same specifications as in Tables A9 and A11. Note that there are not enough observations to support our primary model when we restrict the sample to only GBH appearances. Table A12 is consistent with our main results in that DVEC has had no significant impact on plea delay.

Tables A13-A16 present the results from various standard errors applied to each of our three outcome measures. With respect to these Tables, Column 1 presents classical standard errors that assume homoscedasticity, Column 2 presents standard errors that are robust to arbitrary forms of heteroskedasticity, Column 3 presents heteroskedasticity robust standard errors clustered at the LAC level, and finally, Column 4 presents heteroskedasticity

robust standard errors clustered at both the court and LAC level. Tables A13 and A14 present the results from various standard errors applied to the conviction regression estimated through OLS and 2SLS IV, respectively. Once again, the significance of DVEC is retained within, but not across estimation method. Tables A15 and A16 demonstrate the robustness of the insignificance of our estimates to the type of standard error employed with respect to the guilty plea and plea delay regressions, respectively.

Tables A17-A19 address possible questions regarding our recoding of the instrument into a binary variable as discussed immediately following Equation 2. With respect to all three Tables, Column 1 presents estimates that recode our instrument into a binary variable, Column 2 uses the full continuous form of the instrument, and finally, Column 3 recodes the instrument into a set of binary variables each representing a quartile of the DVEC uptake rates' distribution. Tables A17-A19 are broadly consistent with our main results in that, overall, the insignificance of the estimated coefficient is retained across columns on each Table. However, two points are of note with respect to Tables A17 and A18. While the First Stage F and identification statistics lead us to a similar conclusion as presented in the main analysis, the C-Statistic's p-value from Column 3 on these Tables indicate that we cannot treat DVEC as conditionally exogenous and should thus prefer our IV estimates. For the conviction regressions, this adds more strength to the argument that DVEC has had no significant impact on the probability of a conviction. For the guilty plea regressions, the effect is now a statistically significant 1.16 percentage point reduction in the probability of a guilty plea. This indicates that DVEC may have actually had a detrimental effect on court outcomes; however, the significance of this estimate is not robust enough to draw a definitive conclusion.

Table A1. Robustness check for probability of a proven offence estimated through OLS

Dependent variable: Conviction status	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Estimation method: OLS	LAC Trend	Court Trend	First Appearance	No Prior Appearances	Courts
Has DVEC	0.0196*** (0.00655)	0.0195*** (0.00654)	0.0218*** (0.00679)	0.0262* (0.0137)	0.0287*** (0.00694)
LAC trend	0.000152 (0.000403)				
Court trend		-9.59e-05 (0.000384)			
Constant	0.577*** (0.134)	0.578*** (0.135)	0.528*** (0.140)	0.641*** (0.191)	1.082*** (0.107)
Observations	17,115	17,115	16,204	5,457	12,388
Time FE	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
LAC FE	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Court FE	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Number of clusters	137	137	137	129	31

Note. OLS = Ordinary Least Squares, DVEC = Domestic Violence Evidence-in-Chief, LAC = Local Area Command, FE = Fixed Effects, clusters refer to courts, cluster robust standard errors in parentheses.
 *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Table A2. Robustness check for probability of a proven offence estimated through IV

Dependent variable: Conviction status	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Estimation method: 2SLS IV	LAC Trend	Court Trend	First Appearance	No Prior Appearances	Courts
Has DVEC	-0.0282 (0.0392)	-0.0268 (0.0393)	-0.0224 (0.0431)	-0.00736 (0.0838)	-0.0452 (0.0517)
LAC trend	-0.000734* (0.000423)				
Court trend		0.000386 (0.000363)			
Observations	14,582	14,582	13,897	4,601	10,538
Time FE	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
LAC FE	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Court FE	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Number of clusters	137	137	136	127	31
First Stage F-Statistic	365.1	363.3	326.7	119.0	244.7
Identification Statistic	39.56	39.60	41.07	29.33	22.85
C-Statistic p-value	0.250	0.266	0.317	0.699	0.178

Note. OLS = Ordinary Least Squares, DVEC = Domestic Violence Evidence-in-Chief, LAC = Local Area Command, FE = Fixed Effects, 2SLS IV = Two Stage Least Squares Instrumental Variables, clusters refer to courts, cluster robust standard errors in parentheses.
 *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Table A3. Robustness check for probability of a guilty plea estimated though OLS

Dependent variable:	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Guilty Plea Status				No Prior	
Estimation method: OLS	LAC Trend	Court Trend	First Appearance	Appearances	Courts
Has DVEC	0.000376 (0.00746)	0.000468 (0.00752)	0.000246 (0.00775)	0.00707 (0.0178)	0.00730 (0.00851)
LAC trend	0.00130** (0.000523)				
Court trend		0.000445 (0.000414)			
Constant	0.231** (0.114)	0.239** (0.114)	0.134 (0.123)	-0.0296 (0.272)	0.532 (0.347)
Observations	17,115	17,115	16,204	5,457	12,388
Time FE	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
LAC FE	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Court FE	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Number of clusters	137	137	137	129	31

Note. OLS = Ordinary Least Squares, DVEC = Domestic Violence Evidence-in-Chief, LAC = Local Area Command, FE = Fixed Effects, clusters refer to courts, cluster robust standard errors in parentheses.
 *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Table A4. Robustness check for plea delay (in days) estimated though OLS

Dependent variable:	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Plea delay				No Prior	
Estimation method: OLS	LAC Trend	Court Trend	First Appearance	Appearances	Courts
Has DVEC	-1.370 (1.822)	-1.350 (1.817)	-0.690 (1.852)	-0.0189 (2.349)	-1.124 (2.401)
LAC trend	-0.0233 (0.113)				
Court trend		0.0737 (0.122)			
Constant	125.6** (61.56)	125.2** (61.57)	143.8* (77.29)	283.6*** (97.34)	416.1*** (28.24)
Observations	8,864	8,864	8,503	3,060	6,169
Time FE	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
LAC FE	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Court FE	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Number of clusters	136	136	134	124	31

Note. OLS = Ordinary Least Squares, DVEC = Domestic Violence Evidence-in-Chief, LAC = Local Area Command, FE = Fixed Effects, clusters refer to courts, cluster robust standard errors in parentheses.
 *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Table A5. Fixed effect robustness check for probability of a proven offence estimated though OLS

Dependent variable:	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
Conviction status					LAC-Court	Time-Court	Time - LAC
Estimation method: OLS	No FE	Time FE	LAC FE	Court FE	FE	FE	FE
Has DVEC	0.0454*** (0.0117)	0.0468*** (0.0117)	0.0193*** (0.00650)	0.0206*** (0.00621)	0.0193*** (0.00646)	0.0211*** (0.00635)	0.0197*** (0.00654)
Constant	1.081*** (0.0262)	1.071*** (0.0256)	1.039*** (0.0272)	0.706*** (0.0244)	0.598*** (0.136)	0.681*** (0.0249)	1.023*** (0.0273)
Observations	17,115	17,115	17,115	17,115	17,115	17,115	17,115
Time FE	NO	YES	NO	NO	NO	YES	YES
LAC FE	NO	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES
Court FE	NO	NO	NO	YES	YES	YES	NO
Number of clusters	137	137	137	137	137	137	137

Note. OLS = Ordinary Least Squares, DVEC = Domestic Violence Evidence-in-Chief, LAC = Local Area Command, FE = Fixed Effects, clusters refer to courts, cluster robust standard errors in parentheses.
 *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Table A6. Fixed effect robustness check for probability of a proven offence estimated though IV

Dependent variable:	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
Conviction status					LAC-Court	Time-Court	Time - LAC
Estimation method: : 2SLS IV	No FE	Time FE	LAC FE	Court FE	FE	FE	FE
Has DVEC	0.114** (0.0512)	0.134** (0.0583)	-0.0069 (0.0335)	-0.00149 (0.0248)	-0.00906 (0.0310)	-0.0108 (0.0329)	-0.0227 (0.0408)
Constant	1.069*** (0.0328)						
Observations	14,582	14,582	14,582	14,582	14,582	14,582	14,582
Time FE	NO	YES	NO	NO	NO	YES	YES
LAC FE	NO	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES
Court FE	NO	NO	NO	YES	YES	YES	NO
Number of clusters	137	137	137	137	137	137	137
First Stage F-Statistic	473.7	395.2	361.2	486.3	368.8	475.0	360.1
Identification Statistic	49.67	41.22	47.41	40.71	47.70	32.17	40.16
C-Statistic p-value	0.0990	0.0788	0.438	0.393	0.371	0.350	0.323

Note. OLS = Ordinary Least Squares, DVEC = Domestic Violence Evidence-in-Chief, LAC = Local Area Command, FE = Fixed Effects, 2SLS IV = Two Stage Least Squares Instrumental Variables, clusters refer to courts, cluster robust standard errors in parentheses.
 *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Table A7. Fixed effect robustness check for probability of a guilty plea estimated through OLS

Dependent variable:	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
Guilty Plea Status					LAC-Court	Time-Court	Time - LAC
Estimation method: OLS	No FE	Time FE	LAC FE	Court FE	FE	FE	FE
Has DVEC	0.0242** (0.00973)	0.0228** (0.00970)	0.00310 (0.00781)	0.00467 (0.00768)	0.00349 (0.00783)	0.00182 (0.00730)	0.000199 (0.00736)
Constant	0.783*** (0.0318)	0.765*** (0.0381)	0.720*** (0.0425)	0.346*** (0.0305)	0.263** (0.114)	0.320*** (0.0364)	0.695*** (0.0479)
Observations	17,115	17,115	17,115	17,115	17,115	17,115	17,115
Time FE	NO	YES	NO	NO	NO	YES	YES
LAC FE	NO	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES
Court FE	NO	NO	NO	YES	YES	YES	NO
Number of clusters	137	137	137	137	137	137	137

Note. OLS = Ordinary Least Squares, DVEC = Domestic Violence Evidence-in-Chief, LAC = Local Area Command, FE = Fixed Effects, clusters refer to courts, cluster robust standard errors in parentheses.
 *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Table A8. Fixed effect robustness check for plea delay estimated through OLS

Dependent variable:	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
Plea delay					LAC-Court	Time-Court	Time - LAC
Estimation method: OLS	No FE	Time FE	LAC FE	Court FE	FE	FE	FE
Has DVEC	-3.516** (1.606)	-1.366 (1.663)	-2.940* (1.758)	-4.111** (1.833)	-3.988** (1.788)	-1.465 (1.822)	-0.543 (1.818)
Constant	40.95*** (6.923)	44.23*** (7.408)	37.57*** (8.150)	55.73*** (6.673)	128.3** (63.31)	55.74*** (7.199)	42.56*** (8.822)
Observations	8,864	8,864	8,864	8,864	8,864	8,864	8,864
Time FE	NO	YES	NO	NO	NO	YES	YES
LAC FE	NO	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES
Court FE	NO	NO	NO	YES	YES	YES	NO
Number of clusters	136	136	136	136	136	136	136

Note. OLS = Ordinary Least Squares, DVEC = Domestic Violence Evidence-in-Chief, LAC = Local Area Command, FE = Fixed Effects, clusters refer to courts, cluster robust standard errors in parentheses.
 *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Table A9. Offence restrictions for probability of a conviction estimated through OLS

Dependent variable:	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Conviction status	Restricted	Common	ABH	GBH
Estimation method: OLS	Controls			
Has DVEC	0.0186*** (0.00635)	0.0213*** (0.00669)	0.0220 (0.0139)	-0.0474 (0.114)
Constant	0.641*** (0.131)	0.688*** (0.139)	0.302** (0.143)	1.268*** (0.386)
Observations	18,060	11,141	5,698	276
Full Control Vector	NO	YES	YES	YES
Time FE	YES	YES	YES	YES
LAC FE	YES	YES	YES	YES
Court FE	YES	YES	YES	YES
Number of clusters	137	135	129	67

Note. ABH = Actual Bodily Harm, GBH = Grievous Bodily Harm, OLS = Ordinary Least Squares, DVEC = Domestic Violence Evidence-in-Chief, LAC = Local Area Command, FE = Fixed Effects, clusters refer to courts, cluster robust standard errors in parentheses.
 *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Table A10. Offence restrictions for probability of a conviction estimated through IV

Dependent variable:	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Conviction status	Restricted	Common	ABH	GBH
Estimation method: 2SLS IV	Controls			
Has DVEC	-0.0287 (0.0382)	-0.0670 (0.0523)	0.0704 (0.0705)	-0.694 (1.344)
Observations	15,400	9,463	4,875	244
Full Control Vector	YES	YES	YES	YES
Time FE	YES	YES	YES	YES
LAC FE	YES	YES	YES	YES
Court FE	YES	YES	YES	YES
Number of clusters	137	135	129	67
First Stage F-Statistic	374.4	238.0	130.7	0.404
Identification Statistic	40.60	37.17	31.34	0.875
C-Statistic p-value	0.243	0.102	0.479	0.596

Note. ABH = Actual Bodily Harm, GBH = Grievous Bodily Harm, OLS = Ordinary Least Squares, DVEC = Domestic Violence Evidence-in-Chief, LAC = Local Area Command, FE = Fixed Effects, 2SLS IV = Two Stage Least Squares Instrumental Variables, clusters refer to courts, cluster robust standard errors in parentheses. *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Table A11. Offence restrictions for probability of a guilty plea estimated through OLS

Dependent variable:	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Guilty Plea status	Restricted	Common	ABH	GBH
Estimation method: OLS	Controls			
Has DVEC	0.00222 (0.00735)	0.00258 (0.00966)	-0.00306 (0.0145)	-0.0457 (0.128)
Constant	0.353*** (0.103)	0.270* (0.138)	0.0584 (0.208)	0.852* (0.480)
Observations	18,060	11,141	5,698	276
Full Control Vector	NO	YES	YES	YES
Time FE	YES	YES	YES	YES
LAC FE	YES	YES	YES	YES
Court FE	YES	YES	YES	YES
Number of clusters	137	135	129	67

Note. ABH = Actual Bodily Harm, GBH = Grievous Bodily Harm, OLS = Ordinary Least Squares, DVEC = Domestic Violence Evidence-in-Chief, LAC = Local Area Command, FE = Fixed Effects, clusters refer to courts, cluster robust standard errors in parentheses. *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Table A12. Offence restrictions for plea delay estimated through OLS

Dependent variable: Plea delay	(1)	(2)	(3)
Estimation method: OLS	Restricted Controls	Common	ABH
Has DVEC	-1.278 (1.801)	-1.375 (2.467)	-2.766 (3.454)
Constant	135.7** (56.41)	143.7* (73.23)	-22.43 (73.27)
Observations	9,318	6,138	2,656
Full Control Vector	NO	YES	YES
Time FE	YES	YES	YES
LAC FE	YES	YES	YES
Court FE	YES	YES	YES
Number of clusters	137	135	129

Note. ABH = Actual Bodily Harm, OLS = Ordinary Least Squares, DVEC = Domestic Violence Evidence-in-Chief, LAC = Local Area Command, FE = Fixed Effects, clusters refer to courts, cluster robust standard errors in parentheses. *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Table A13. Different standard errors for conviction status estimated through OLS

Dependent variable: Conviction status Estimation method: OLS	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
	None	Robust	LAC	Court-LAC
Has DVEC	0.0196*** (0.00708)	0.0196*** (0.00704)	0.0196*** (0.00693)	0.0196** (0.00922)
Constant	0.578*** (0.156)	0.578*** (0.129)	0.578*** (0.0847)	0.578*** (0.0893)
Observations	17,115	17,115	17,115	17,115
Time FE	YES	YES	YES	YES
LAC FE	YES	YES	YES	YES
Court FE	YES	YES	YES	YES
Number of clusters			76	.

Note. OLS = Ordinary Least Squares, DVEC = Domestic Violence Evidence-in-Chief, LAC = Local Area Command, FE = Fixed Effects, clusters refer to courts, cluster robust standard errors in parentheses.
*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Table A14. Different standard errors for conviction status estimated through IV

Dependent variable: Conviction status Estimation method: 2SLS IV	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
	None	Robust	LAC	Court-LAC
Has DVEC	-0.0273 (0.0428)	-0.0273 (0.0433)	-0.0273 (0.0402)	-0.0273 (0.0375)
Observations	14,582	14,582	14,582	14,582
Time FE	YES	YES	YES	YES
LAC FE	YES	YES	YES	YES
Court FE	YES	YES	YES	YES
First Stage F-Statistic	481.1	429.8	291.8	278.8
Identification Statistic	473.1	401.5	54.82	32.66
C-Statistic p-value	0.269	0.275	0.260	0.239
Number of clusters			76	.

Note. OLS = Ordinary Least Squares, DVEC = Domestic Violence Evidence-in-Chief, LAC = Local Area Command, FE = Fixed Effects, 2SLS IV = Two Stage Least Squares Instrumental Variables, clusters refer to courts, cluster robust standard errors in parentheses.
*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Table A15. Different standard errors for guilty plea status estimated through OLS

Dependent variable: Guilty Plea status Estimation method: OLS	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
	None	Robust	LAC	Court-LAC
Has DVEC	0.000301 (0.00821)	0.000301 (0.00822)	0.000301 (0.00737)	0.000301 (0.00963)
Constant	0.240 (0.181)	0.240 (0.163)	0.240** (0.105)	0.240*** (0.0615)
Observations	17,115	17,115	17,115	17,115
Time FE	YES	YES	YES	YES
LAC FE	YES	YES	YES	YES
Court FE	YES	YES	YES	YES
Number of clusters			76	.

Note. OLS = Ordinary Least Squares, DVEC = Domestic Violence Evidence-in-Chief, LAC = Local Area Command, FE = Fixed Effects, clusters refer to courts, cluster robust standard errors in parentheses.
*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Table A16. Different standard errors for plea delay estimated through OLS

Dependent variable: Plea delay	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Estimation method: OLS	None	Robust	LAC	Court-LAC
Has DVEC	-1.368 (1.674)	-1.368 (1.625)	-1.368 (1.585)	-1.368 (2.261)
Constant	125.5*** (39.13)	125.5** (56.41)	125.5*** (41.10)	125.5** (50.21)
Observations	8,864	8,864	8,864	8,864
Time FE	YES	YES	YES	YES
LAC FE	YES	YES	YES	YES
Court FE	YES	YES	YES	YES
Number of clusters			76	.

Note. OLS = Ordinary Least Squares, DVEC = Domestic Violence Evidence-in-Chief, LAC = Local Area Command, FE = Fixed Effects, clusters refer to courts, cluster robust standard errors in parentheses.
 *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Table A17. Different instrument specifications for probability of a proven offence

Dependent variable: Conviction status	(1)	(2)	(3)
Estimation method: 2SLS IV	Binary	Continuous	Quartiles
Has DVEC	-0.0273 (0.0392)	-0.0186 (0.0299)	-0.0339 (0.0305)
Observations	14,582	14,582	17,115
Time FE	YES	YES	YES
LAC FE	YES	YES	YES
Court FE	YES	YES	YES
Number of clusters	137	137	137
First Stage F-Statistic	363.9	1038	211.7
Identification Statistic	39.61	44.10	44.50
C-Statistic p-value	0.259	0.209	0.0303

Note. OLS = Ordinary Least Squares, DVEC = Domestic Violence Evidence-in-Chief, LAC = Local Area Command, FE = Fixed Effects, 2SLS IV = Two Stage Least Squares Instrumental Variables, clusters refer to courts, cluster robust standard errors in parentheses.
 *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Table A18. Different instrument specifications for probability of a guilty plea

Dependent variable: Guilty Plea status	(1)	(2)	(3)
Estimation method: 2SLS IV	Binary	Continuous	Quartiles
Has DVEC	-0.0461 (0.0439)	-0.0551 (0.0354)	-0.116*** (0.0388)
Observations	14,582	14,582	17,115
Time FE	YES	YES	YES
LAC FE	YES	YES	YES
Court FE	YES	YES	YES
Number of clusters	137	137	137
First Stage F-Statistic	363.9	1038	211.7
Identification Statistic	39.61	44.10	44.50
C-Statistic p-value	0.240	0.0905	0.00646

Note. OLS = Ordinary Least Squares, DVEC = Domestic Violence Evidence-in-Chief, LAC = Local Area Command, FE = Fixed Effects, 2SLS IV = Two Stage Least Squares Instrumental Variables, clusters refer to courts, cluster robust standard errors in parentheses.
 *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Table A19. Different instrument specifications for plea delay

Dependent variable: Plea delay	(1)	(2)	(3)
Estimation method: 2SLS IV	Binary	Continuous	Quartiles
Has DVEC	0.0477 (9.706)	-5.386 (8.097)	-9.526 (9.769)
Observations	7,496	7,496	8,864
Time FE	YES	YES	YES
LAC FE	YES	YES	YES
Court FE	YES	YES	YES
Number of clusters	135	135	136
First Stage F-Statistic	214.6	699.0	128.0
Identification Statistic	40.21	48.99	46.89
C-Statistic p-value	0.802	0.674	0.948

Note. OLS = Ordinary Least Squares, DVEC = Domestic Violence Evidence-in-Chief, LAC = Local Area Command, FE = Fixed Effects, 2SLS IV = Two Stage Least Squares Instrumental Variables, clusters refer to courts, cluster robust standard errors in parentheses.
 *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

APPENDIX B

Aggregate analysis: Robustness checks

Tables B1 and B2 present results from our first battery of robustness checks for the aggregate analysis. With respect to both Tables, Column 1 presents estimates using one-step Generalized Method of Moments (GMM) estimation.¹ Column 2 presents estimates from a regression where we collapse the instrument matrix into a column vector.² Column 3 employs Principle Component Analysis in order to reduce the instrument count in a minimally arbitrary way.³ Column 4 differs from our primary specification by employing the Forward Orthogonal Deviation (FOD) transformation, but not employing the Backward Orthogonal Deviation (BOD) transformation on the instruments. Column 5 employs system GMM using both the FOD and BOD transformations. Column 6 employs System GMM with only the FOD transformation, Column 7 employs standard Difference GMM and finally, Column 8 employs standard System GMM. The coefficient on the DVEC uptake rate is insignificant across all specifications on Tables B1 and B2. This is consistent with the main results and supports our finding that the DVEC uptake rate has had no significant impact on a LAC’s expected monthly conviction or guilty plea rate.

Tables B3 and B4 investigate the possibility that an increase in the DVEC uptake rate in one period may not affect the conviction or guilty plea rate until one or more periods later. With respect to both Tables, we investigate (monthly) lags 1-6 inclusive. Results from Table B1 indicate no significant impact of the DVEC uptake rate on conviction rates. Overall Table B2 tells a similar story for guilty plea rates.

Tables B5 and B6 present estimates from our preferred specification after we iteratively exclude different time Fixed

Effects (FEs). With respect to both Tables, Column 1 presents estimates with only LAC FEs, Column 2 presents estimates with both LAC and year FEs, Column 3 presents estimates with month, year and LAC FEs, and finally, Column 4 builds include an interaction between the year and month FEs. Under no specification in either Table does the DVEC uptake rate have a significant impact on the monthly conviction or guilty plea rate.

Tables B7 and B8 present our next set of robustness checks for the aggregate analysis. With respect to both Tables; in Column 1 we restrict the sample to include only a 12 month interval on either side of the policy. In Column 2 we restrict the sample to include only a 6 month interval on either side of the policy. In Column 3 we restrict the sample to include only periods after the introduction of the policy, in Column 4 we use the natural log transformation on both the dependent variable and the DVEC uptake rate,⁴ and finally, in Column 5 we switch the time dimension of our analysis from monthly to quarterly. Results from all columns on both tables support the insignificance of our main results.

Tables B9 and B10 relax the restriction of using only the second lag of the endogenous variables as instruments. With respect to both Tables, in Column 1 uses all available lags as instruments, in Column 2 we use lags 2-3, in Column 3 we use lags 2-4, in Column 4 we use lags 2-5, in Column 5 we use lags 3-3, in Column 6 we use lags 3-4 and finally, in Column 7 we use lags 3-5. Overall results from these checks are consistent with our main findings.

Tables B11 and B12 investigate the impact of employing different standard errors on the insignificance of our main results. With respect to both Tables, Column 1 employs finite sample corrected standard errors, Column 2 employs

Table B1. GMM style robustness check for DVEC uptake rate on conviction rate

Dependent variable:	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Conviction rate			Principle		System	System	Difference	System
Estimation method: GMM	One Step	Collapse	Components	FD-FOD	FOD-BOD	FOD	GMM	GMM
L.Conviction rate	0.155 (0.120)	-0.125 (0.176)	0.121* (0.0648)	0.320 (0.245)	0.288** (0.126)	0.307** (0.154)	-0.248*** (0.0920)	0.261** (0.129)
DVEC Uptake	-0.0256 (0.0736)	-0.00926 (0.0960)	0.0194 (0.0178)	0.0119 (0.0153)	0.0233 (0.0350)	0.0175 (0.0174)	-0.00735 (0.0424)	0.0137 (0.0235)
Constant								0.557*** (0.102)
Observations	2,056	2,056	2,056	2,056	2,132	2,132	2,029	2,132
Number of LACs	76	76	76	76	76	76	76	76
Time FE	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
LAC FE	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Instrument Count	54	54	542	55	100	101	55	101
Hansen p-value	0.771	0.752	1	0.236	0.919	0.949	0.728	0.987
AR(1) p- value	8.14e-05	0.0247	3.25e-08	0.00509	1.23e-05	8.51e-05	0.00162	3.24e-05
AR(2) p- value	0.230	0.587	0.164	0.226	0.0668	0.0909	0.0404	0.0999

Note. L = First lag of relevant variable, DVEC = Domestic Violence Evidence-in-Chief, LAC = Local Area Command, FE = Fixed Effects, GMM = Generalised Method of Moments, FD = First Difference, FOD = Forward Orthogonal Deviation, BOD = Backward Orthogonal Deviation, finite sample adjusted robust standard errors in parentheses.

*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Table B2. GMM style robustness check for DVEC uptake rate on guilty plea rate

Dependent variable:	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Guilty Plea rate			Principle		System	System	Difference	System
Estimation method: GMM	One Step	Collapse	Components	FD-FOD	FOD-BOD	FOD	GMM	GMM
L.Guilty Plea Rate	0.0476 (0.177)	-0.106 (0.151)	-0.0183 (0.102)	0.134 (0.184)	0.148 (0.129)	0.0645 (0.131)	-0.460*** (0.173)	0.0115 (0.127)
DVEC Uptake Rate	-0.0912 (0.0979)	-0.0513 (0.156)	0.0185 (0.0329)	-0.0219 (0.0289)	0.0247 (0.0485)	-0.00913 (0.0290)	-0.0303 (0.0811)	0.00598 (0.0322)
Constant								0.575*** (0.0758)
Observations	2,056	2,056	2,056	2,056	2,132	2,132	2,029	2,132
Number of LACs	76	76	76	76	76	76	76	76
Time FE	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
LAC FE	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Instrument Count	54	54	542	55	100	101	55	101
Hansen p-value	0.460	0.401	1	0.205	0.981	0.853	0.143	0.962
AR(1) p- value	0.00188	0.00948	9.12e-05	0.00369	0.000142	0.000541	0.240	0.000754
AR(2) p- value	0.829	0.461	0.753	0.585	0.434	0.769	0.0138	0.959

Note. L = First lag of relevant variable, DVEC = Domestic Violence Evidence-in-Chief, LAC = Local Area Command, FE = Fixed Effects, GMM = Generalised Method of Moments, FD = First Difference, FOD = Forward Orthogonal Deviation, BOD = Backward Orthogonal Deviation, finite sample adjusted robust standard errors in parentheses.

*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

heteroskedasticity robust standard errors, and finally, Column 3 employs classical standard errors that assume homoscedasticity. The insignificance of DVEC’s impact on the conviction rate is retained across all three specifications in Table B11. However, the coefficient on the DVEC uptake rate is significant across all specifications on Table B12. This indicates that the combination of heteroskedasticity robust standard errors with the finite sample correction is driving the insignificance of our result.

Tables B13 and B14 present results from a Choi (2001) test for stationarity in panel data for conviction and guilty plea rates, respectively. Both Tables report the results from four different

variations on this test. The null hypothesis in each test is that all panels contain at least one unit root and are therefore not stationary. These tests reveal that at least one panel is stationary for both variables, thus supporting the use of the difference over system GMM estimation method.

Table B15 presents the results from the Wooldridge (2002) test for autocorrelation in the idiosyncratic disturbances. The null hypothesis is no autocorrelation. Table B15 therefore allows us to conclude that both conviction and guilty plea rates exhibit significant autocorrelation thus supporting the use of our specification over a traditional FE model.

Table B3. Lagged effect of DVEC on the conviction rate

Dependent variable:	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Conviction rate						
Estimation method: GMM	1 lag	2 lags	3 lags	4 lags	5 lags	6 lags
L.Conviction rate	0.136 (0.109)	0.0343 (0.122)	0.110 (0.130)	0.0834 (0.133)	0.0543 (0.126)	-0.0560 (0.138)
DVEC Uptake Rate	-0.00840 (0.0782)	-0.0744 (0.111)	0.0199 (0.0751)	0.0575 (0.0736)	0.00673 (0.0810)	0.0113 (0.0712)
L.DVEC Uptake Rate	-0.00590 (0.0741)	0.102 (0.0940)	0.0239 (0.0633)	-0.00541 (0.0559)	-0.00375 (0.0675)	-0.0103 (0.0626)
L2.DVEC Uptake Rate		0.0449 (0.0560)	0.0201 (0.0367)	0.0180 (0.0307)	0.0165 (0.0365)	0.00683 (0.0356)
L3.DVEC Uptake Rate			-0.0383 (0.0302)	-0.0424 (0.0435)	-0.0386 (0.0411)	-0.0359 (0.0410)
L4.DVEC Uptake Rate				-0.00413 (0.0496)	0.00712 (0.0477)	-0.0158 (0.0444)
L5.DVEC Uptake Rate					0.0137 (0.0405)	0.0179 (0.0410)
L6.DVEC Uptake Rate						-0.00643 (0.0477)
Observations	2,056	1,960	1,871	1,785	1,700	1,616
Number of LACSS	76	76	76	76	76	76
Time FE	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
LAC FE	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Instrument Count	70	84	97	109	120	130
Hansen p-value	0.783	0.693	0.981	0.999	1.000	1.000
AR(1) p- value	2.82e-05	0.000385	0.000285	0.000514	0.000585	0.00501
AR(2) p- value	0.265	0.705	0.507	0.710	0.847	0.598

Note. L = First lag of relevant variable, L2 = Second lag of relevant variable and so on, DVEC = Domestic Violence Evidence-in-Chief, LAC = Local Area Command, FE = Fixed Effects, GMM = Generalised Method of Moments, finite sample adjusted robust standard errors in parentheses.
 *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Table B4. Lagged effect of DVEC on the guilty plea rate

Dependent variable: Guilty Pea rate	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Estimation method: GMM	1 lag	2 lags	3 lags	4 lags	5 lags	6 lags
L. Guilty Plea Rate	-0.0137 (0.132)	-0.104 (0.158)	-0.0878 (0.139)	-0.0651 (0.130)	-0.0470 (0.143)	-0.0657 (0.130)
DVEC Uptake Rate	-0.189* (0.114)	-0.231** (0.116)	-0.146 (0.121)	-0.140 (0.119)	-0.0772 (0.114)	-0.142 (0.120)
L.DVEC Uptake Rate	0.124 (0.115)	0.167 (0.101)	0.127 (0.0939)	0.132 (0.114)	0.0584 (0.107)	0.0483 (0.120)
L2.DVEC Uptake Rate		0.0524 (0.0562)	0.0396 (0.0687)	0.0198 (0.0648)	0.00776 (0.0692)	-0.0172 (0.0652)
L3.DVEC Uptake Rate			-0.0495 (0.0450)	-0.0548 (0.0479)	-0.0324 (0.0474)	-0.0328 (0.0510)
L4.DVEC Uptake Rate				-0.00420 (0.0460)	-0.0231 (0.0531)	-0.00275 (0.0466)
L5.DVEC Uptake Rate					-0.0143 (0.0648)	-0.00994 (0.0736)
L6.DVEC Uptake Rate						0.0103 (0.0564)
Observations	2,056	1,960	1,871	1,785	1,700	1,616
Number of LACs	76	76	76	76	76	76
Time FE	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
LAC FE	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Number of Instruments	70	84	97	109	120	130
Hansen p-value	0.542	0.658	0.893	0.997	0.999	1.000
AR(1) p-value	0.00185	0.0122	0.00569	0.00236	0.00379	0.00311
AR(2) p-value	0.921	0.501	0.471	0.512	0.676	0.591

Note. L = First lag of relevant variable, L2 = Second lag of relevant variable and so on, DVEC = Domestic Violence Evidence-in-Chief, LAC = Local Area Command, FE = Fixed Effects, GMM = Generalised Method of Moments, finite sample adjusted robust standard errors in parentheses.
 *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Table B5. Sensitivity of conviction rate results to various fixed effects

Dependent variable: Conviction rate	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Estimation method: GMM	No Time FE	Year FE	Month-Year FE	Month-Year Interaction
L.Conviction rate	0.0931 (0.116)	0.0975 (0.110)	0.0791 (0.119)	0.0791 (0.119)
DVEC Uptake Rate	-0.0184 (0.107)	0.0295 (0.102)	-0.0840 (0.0916)	-0.0840 (0.0916)
Observations	2,056	2,056	2,056	2,056
Number of LACs	76	76	76	76
Year FE	NO	YES	YES	YES
Month FE	NO	NO	YES	YES
Month-Year FE Interaction	NO	NO	NO	YES
LAC FE	YES	YES	YES	YES
Number of Instruments	43	45	56	56
Hansen p-value	0.516	0.547	0.796	0.796
AR(1) p-value	0.000130	5.91e-05	0.000164	0.000164
AR(2) p-value	0.437	0.412	0.451	0.451

Note. L = First lag of relevant variable, DVEC = Domestic Violence Evidence-in-Chief, LAC = Local Area Command, FE = Fixed Effects, GMM = Generalised Method of Moments, finite sample adjusted robust standard errors in parentheses.
 *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Table B6. Sensitivity of guilty plea rate results to various fixed effects

Dependent variable: Guilty Plea rate	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Estimation method: GMM	No Time FE	Year FE	Month-Year FE	Month-Year Interaction
L.Guilty Plea Rate	-0.0912 (0.189)	-0.118 (0.151)	-0.0425 (0.183)	-0.0425 (0.183)
DVEC Uptake Rate	-0.123 (0.0832)	0.0773 (0.0722)	0.0126 (0.116)	0.0126 (0.116)
Observations	2,056	2,056	2,056	2,056
Number of LACs	76	76	76	76
Year FE	NO	YES	YES	YES
Month FE	NO	NO	YES	YES
Month-Year FE Interaction	NO	NO	NO	YES
LAC FE	YES	YES	YES	YES
Number of Instruments	43	45	56	56
Hansen p-value	0.366	0.432	0.335	0.335
AR(1) p-value	0.0320	0.0126	0.0173	0.0173
AR(2) p-value	0.616	0.403	0.743	0.743

Note. DVEC = Domestic Violence Evidence-in-Chief, LAC = Local Area Command, FE = Fixed Effects, GMM = Generalised Method of Moments, finite sample adjusted robust standard errors in parentheses.
 *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Table B7. Sample restrictions: Conviction rate

Dependent variable:	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Conviction rate					
Estimation method: GMM	12 Month Interval	6 Month Interval	Post-Policy	Log-Log	Quarterly
L.Conviction rate	0.132 (0.159)	0.0967 (0.153)	0.300 (0.209)		0.384 (0.867)
DVEC Uptake Rate	-0.0363 (0.0905)	-0.0301 (0.0586)	0.0923 (0.107)		0.00525 (0.406)
ln(L.Conviction rate)				-0.0975 (0.262)	
ln(DVEC Uptake Rate)				0.0206 (0.145)	
Observations	1,762	966	879	816	608
Number of LACs	76	76	76	76	76
Time FE	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
LAC FE	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Number of Instruments	52	36	35	35	19
Hansen p-value	0.626	0.200	0.388	0.0756	0.0334
AR(1) p-value	0.00136	0.00129	0.00205	0.159	0.324
AR(2) p-value	0.414	0.517	0.188	0.542	0.487

Note. L = First lag of relevant variable, DVEC = Domestic Violence Evidence-in-Chief, LAC = Local Area Command, FE = Fixed Effects, GMM = Generalised Method of Moments, ln = Natural Logarithm, finite sample adjusted robust standard errors in parentheses.
 *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Table B8. Sample restrictions: Guilty plea rate

Dependent variable:	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Guilty Plea rate					
Estimation method: GMM	12 Month Interval	6 Month Interval	Post-Policy	Log-Log	Quarterly
L.Guilty Plea Rate	0.0730 (0.230)	0.175 (0.292)	0.0513 (0.307)		0.378 (0.316)
DVEC Uptake Rate	-0.160 (0.119)	-0.0506 (0.0658)	0.0905 (0.108)		0.0879 (0.279)
ln(Guilty Plea Rate)				-0.156 (0.253)	
ln(DVEC Uptake Rate)				-0.0393 (0.0421)	
Observations	1,762	966	879	800	608
Number of LACs	76	76	76	76	76
Time FE	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
LAC FE	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Number of Instruments	52	36	35	35	19
Hansen p-value	0.224	0.196	0.233	0.757	0.189
AR(1) p-value	0.0214	0.0380	0.0738	0.234	0.0125
AR(2) p-value	0.801	0.588	0.924	0.253	0.101

Note. L = First lag of relevant variable, DVEC = Domestic Violence Evidence-in-Chief, LAC = Local Area Command, FE = Fixed Effects, GMM = Generalised Method of Moments, ln = Natural Logarithm, finite sample adjusted robust standard errors in parentheses.
 *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Table B9. Lag restrictions: Conviction rate

Dependent variable:	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
Conviction rate							
Estimation method: GMM	All	2-3	2-4	2-5	3-3	3-4	3-5
L.Conviction rate	0.117 (0.0940)	0.113 (0.114)	0.0710 (0.110)	0.0574 (0.0976)	0.114 (0.129)	-0.0642 (0.137)	0.0471 (0.139)
DVEC Uptake Rate	-0.0123 (0.0461)	-0.0401 (0.0582)	0.0154 (0.0508)	-0.00589 (0.0510)	-0.164*** (0.0536)	0.00930 (0.0623)	0.0128 (0.0468)
Observations	2,056	2,056	2,056	2,056	2,056	2,056	2,056
Number of LACs	76	76	76	76	76	76	76
Time FE	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
LAC FE	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Number of Instruments	515	95	134	171	52	91	128
Hansen p-value	1	0.879	1	1	0.602	0.962	1.000
AR(1) p-value	1.13e-06	7.18e-05	4.51e-05	1.84e-05	0.000252	0.00345	0.000597
AR(2) p-value	0.243	0.344	0.509	0.527	0.353	0.780	0.681

Note. L = First lag of relevant variable, DVEC = Domestic Violence Evidence-in-Chief, LAC = Local Area Command, FE = Fixed Effects, GMM = Generalised Method of Moments, finite sample adjusted robust standard errors in parentheses.
 *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Table B10. Lag restrictions: Guilty plea rate

Dependent variable:	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
Guilty Plea rate							
Estimation method: GMM	All	2-3	2-4	2-5	3-3	3-4	3-5
L.Guilty Plea Rate	-0.0606 (0.0883)	-0.0260 (0.103)	0.00903 (0.0957)	0.0162 (0.102)	-0.0498 (0.114)	0.00620 (0.0996)	-0.0424 (0.116)
DVEC Uptake Rate	-0.0609 (0.0682)	-0.0944 (0.0654)	-0.0484 (0.0702)	-0.0371 (0.0675)	-0.100 (0.0748)	-0.0409 (0.0751)	-0.0656 (0.0549)
Observations	2,056	2,056	2,056	2,056	2,056	2,056	2,056
Number of LACs	76	76	76	76	76	76	76
Time FE	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
LAC FE	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Number of Instruments	515	95	134	171	52	91	128
Hansen p-value	1	0.936	1.000	1	0.189	0.695	1.000
AR(1) p-value	7.96e-05	0.000246	5.23e-05	6.87e-05	0.000487	8.43e-05	0.000809
AR(2) p-value	0.499	0.743	0.950	0.985	0.642	0.929	0.671

Note. L = First lag of relevant variable, DVEC = Domestic Violence Evidence-in-Chief, LAC = Local Area Command, FE = Fixed Effects, GMM = Generalised Method of Moments, finite sample adjusted robust standard errors in parentheses.
 *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Table B11. Different standard errors: Conviction rate

Dependent variable:	(1)	(2)	(3)
Conviction rate			
Estimation method: GMM	Finite Sample	Robust	None
L.Conviction rate	0.132*** (0.0466)	0.132 (0.115)	0.132*** (0.0461)
DVEC Uptake Rate	-0.0317 (0.0310)	-0.0317 (0.0747)	-0.0317 (0.0307)
Observations	2,056	2,056	2,056
Number of LACs	76	76	76
Year FE	NO	NO	NO
Month FE	YES	YES	YES
Month-Year Interaction	NO	NO	NO
LAC FE	YES	YES	YES
Number of Instruments	54	54	54
Hansen p-value	0.771	0.771	0.771
AR(1) p-value	3.64e-08	7.22e-05	3.64e-08
AR(2) p-value	0.108	0.292	0.108

Note. L = First lag of relevant variable, DVEC = Domestic Violence Evidence-in-Chief, LAC = Local Area Command, FE = Fixed Effects, GMM = Generalised Method of Moments, various standard errors in parentheses.
 *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Table B12. Different standard errors: Guilty plea rate

Dependent variable:	(1)	(2)	(3)
Guilty Plea rate			
Estimation method: GMM	Finite Sample	Robust	None
L.Guilty Plea Rate	0.0134 (0.0699)	0.0134 (0.186)	0.0134 (0.0692)
DVEC Uptake Rate	-0.191*** (0.0493)	-0.191** (0.0961)	-0.191*** (0.0489)
Observations	2,056	2,056	2,056
Number of LACs	76	76	76
Year FE	NO	NO	NO
Month FE	YES	YES	YES
Month-Year Interaction	NO	NO	NO
LAC FE	YES	YES	YES
Number of Instruments	54	54	54
Hansen p-value	0.460	0.460	0.460
AR(1) p-value	2.74e-06	0.0117	2.74e-06
AR(2) p-value	0.980	0.990	0.980

Note. L = First lag of relevant variable, DVEC = Domestic Violence Evidence-in-Chief, LAC = Local Area Command, FE = Fixed Effects, GMM = Generalised Method of Moments, various standard errors in parentheses.
 *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

**Table B13. Augmented Dickey Fuller test:
Conviction rate**

Test	Statistic	p-value
Inverse chi-squared (152)	619.6151	0.0000
Inverse normal	-16.5814	0.0000
Inverse logit t(384)	-18.8467	0.0000
Modified Inverse chi-squared	26.8196	0.0000
Panel means	YES	
Time trend	YES	
Drift Term	NO	
Number of Panels	76	
Mean number of periods	29.53	
ADF Lags	1	

**Table B14. Augmented Dickey Fuller test:
Guilty plea rate**

Test	Statistic	p-value
Inverse chi-squared (152)	748.9918	0.0000
Inverse normal	-19.0374	0.0000
Inverse logit t(384)	-23.2008	0.0000
Modified Inverse chi-squared	34.2398	0.0000
Panel means	YES	
Time trend	YES	
Drift Term	NO	
Number of Panels	76	
Mean number of periods	29.53	
ADF Lags	1	

**Table B15. Results from Wooldridge (2002)
autocorrelation test**

	F-Statistic	p-value
Conviction rate	306.606	0.0000
Guilty plea Rate	195.209	0.0000

NOTES

- 1 The main difference between one and two-step estimation is how the weighting matrix is constructed. Essentially, two-step estimators are more efficient however unlike one-step estimators, two-step standard errors have been shown to be bias downward in small samples. The (employed) Windmeijer (2005) finite sample correction is designed to alleviate such bias.
- 2 This means that a single instrument is generated for each variable and lag distance. The alternative is to generate an instrument for each period, variable and lag distance. The implication is that in large samples we lose efficiency but in small samples we mitigate the bias generated from having the number of instruments approaching the number of LACs.
- 3 Interested readers are directed to Bai & Ng (2010); Kapetanios & Marcellino (2010) for more details.
- 4 Note that this results in a substantial loss of information as the DVEC uptake rate is necessarily zero for all pre-policy periods.

REFERENCES

Bai, J., & Ng, S. (2010). Instrumental variable estimation in a data rich environment. *Econometric Theory*, 26, 1577-1606.

Choi, I. (2001). Unit root tests for panel data. *Journal of International Money and Finance*, 20(2), 249-272.

Kapetanios, G., & Marcellino, M. (2010). Factor-GMM estimation with large sets of possibly weak instruments. *Computational Statistics & Data Analysis*, 54(11), 2655-2675.

Windmeijer, F. (2005). A finite sample correction for the variance of linear efficient two-step GMM estimators. *Journal of Econometrics*, 126(1), 25-51.

Wooldridge, J. M. (2010). *Econometric Analysis of Cross Section and Panel Data*. MIT press.