

## Online Appendix A: Results

**Table A1: Security impacts on non-hotspots <250m from treatment (N=399)**

Dependent variable	Control mean	Impact of spillovers <250m:			Sum of (1), (2), and (3)
		Any intensive policing	Any municipal services	Both interventions	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Insecurity index, z-score (+ more insecure)	-0.290	0.112 <i>0.415</i>	-0.002 <i>0.966</i>	-0.255 <i>0.269</i>	-0.145 <i>0.435</i>
Perceived risk, z-score (+ riskier)	-0.099	0.018 <i>0.925</i>	-0.131 <i>0.470</i>	-0.136 <i>0.616</i>	-0.249 <i>0.156</i>
Crime incidence, z-score (+ more crime)	-0.383	0.169 <i>0.134</i>	0.129 <i>0.372</i>	-0.289 <i>0.154</i>	0.009 <i>0.822</i>
Perceived incidence of crime, z-score	-0.152	0.185 <i>0.219</i>	0.140 <i>0.478</i>	-0.270 <i>0.304</i>	0.055 <i>0.741</i>
# crimes reported to police on street segment	0.271	0.096 <i>0.336</i>	0.076 <i>0.407</i>	-0.253 <i>0.167</i>	-0.081 <i>0.826</i>

Table A1 uses our survey data estimates non-experimental spillovers within 250m using equation (2). This sample of 399 streets is too small to estimate non-experimental spillovers precisely, but the patterns are generally consistent with what we see in the large-sample dataset on reported crimes, in Table 1. The coefficients on intensive policing are positive. The coefficients on municipal services vary, but the sign on the index of overall insecurity is negative (and extremely close to zero). Unlike the effects on reported crime in the large sample, the coefficients on the interaction terms are generally negative.