


Figure 1. Petitioner Vote Share by SG Amicus Status and Chief Justice


Bar heights show the observed proportion of votes for the petitioner among Burger, Rehnquist, and Roberts.



Notes: Figure reports observed (unmodeled) petitioner–vote shares by SG amicus participation status for the three chief justices.

Figure 2. Petitioner Vote Share by Pitch Differential Group and Court Period


Pitch differential is split at the sample mean; bars show observed petitioner–vote shares within each court period.



Notes: Figure reports observed (unmodeled) petitioner–vote shares for below–average vs above–average pitch differential groups. Court periods: Burger (1969–1985), Rehnquist (1986–2004), Roberts (2005+).

Figure 3. Predicted Petitioner Vote Probability by Pitch Differential and Court Period


Predictions from interaction model: $\text{petitioner_vote} \sim \text{pitch_diff} * \text{court_period} + \text{pr_petitioner_pos}$.



Notes: Lines show model-predicted values with pr_petitioner_pos held at its sample mean. This is the baseline court-period interaction specification used in Section 3.3. Court periods: Burger (1969–1985), Rehnquist (1986–2004), Roberts (2005+).

Figure 4. Predicted Petitioner Vote Probability by Pitch Differential and Court Period (Model 5)


Predictions from progressive Model 5: $\text{petitioner_vote} \sim \text{pitch_diff} * \text{court_period} + \text{pr_petitioner_pos} + \text{sgpetac}$.



Notes: Lines show Model 5 predictions with pr_petitioner_pos and sgpetac held at their sample means. Figure 4 differs from Figure 3 by adding sgpetac to the specification. Court periods: Burger (1969–1985), Rehnquist (1986–2004), Roberts (2005+).

Figure 5. Predicted Petitioner Vote Probability by Pitch Differential and Petitioner Positivity


Predictions from progressive Model 6 with pitch_diff * pr_petitioner_pos interaction. Court period held at: Roberts



Notes: Lines show Model 6 predictions evaluated at representative pr_petitioner_pos values (-2, -1, 0, 1, 2), with sgpetac held at its sample mean and court period fixed at the modal category. Court periods: Burger (1969–1985), Rehnquist (1986–2004), Roberts (2005+).

Figure 6. Influence Diagnostics: Leverage vs |DFFITS|

Outlier screening for the final regression model; dashed lines mark assignment thresholds.



Notes: Points are flagged as outliers when any assignment threshold is exceeded (studentized residual, leverage, Cook's D, or |DFFITS|). Labels mark observations exceeding all thresholds.