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August 27, 2024

Dear Editor,

On April 26, 2024, we received a letter (attached) from editor **Dr. Stephen Ross** indicating interest in our manuscript, “The Unintended Consequences of Policing Technology: Evidence from ShotSpotter,” but suggesting that more analysis was necessary to understand the overall benefits and costs of ShotSpotter Technology to be considered at *AEJ: Policy*. The manuscript was thus given a reject and resubmit decision.

Since this initial letter, we have made significant revisions to the paper to better understand the impacts of ShotSpotter Technology. Specifically, we have collected city-wide data on aggregate counts of gun-related arrests, victimization, and clearance to analyze whether this technology provides operational benefits to the Chicago Police Department. Using an event-study model as suggested, we find little evidence that the implementation of ShotSpotter affects these outcomes—further corroborating results from two recent descriptive studies (Manes, 2021;Ferguson and Witzburg, 2021), and another more quantitative study on ShotSpotter’s effectiveness in Chicago (Connealy et al., 2024). These results are detailed explicitly in Section 6.2, and we have also highlighted these results in both the introduction and conclusion to show that this reallocation of resources does not appear to produce a first-order benefit. Additionally, we have substantially rewritten the introduction and conclusion to integrate these new findings and reflect the recent corroborating literature (Manes, 2021;Ferguson and Witzburg, 2021; Connealy et al., 2024).

Furthermore, although not explicitly requested in your letter, we have also expanded the analysis of the 911 arrest data in Section 5.3. In particular, we utilize additional data from the 911 call dispositions and find evidence that officers are reporting dispositions consistent with slower response times. We have also included further robustness tests for these main arrest results, including event studies and re-estimating the effects using the Gardner (2021) estimator. Our main findings remain consistent.

We would like to thank you for this reconsideration of our manuscript and hope that you find these additions significantly enhance the paper. We are grateful for your constructive feedback and believe that the study has been greatly improved.

Sincerely,

Michael Topper