

TABLE ONE:
STUDIES REFERENCED IN 2017 SMART OFFICE REPORT

#	Rep Pg	Study	The Smart Office Report's Own Description of Study	Notes
		<i>1. STUDIES THE REPORT DESCRIBES AS FINDING NO EFFECT OF THE REGISTRY OR THE PUBLIC WEBSITE</i>		
		<i>Peer-Reviewed Studies</i>		
1	196	Prescott & Rockoff, <i>Do Sex Offender Registration and Notification Laws Affect Criminal Behavior?</i> , 54 J.L. Econ. 161 (2011)	“Community notification did not appear to reduce recidivism for identified sex offenders.” Registration (not website notification) did reduce nonstranger victimization and recidivism.	
2	196	Walker et. al., <i>The Influence of Sex Offender Registration and Notification Laws in the United States: A Time-Series Analysis</i> , 54 Crime & Delinq. 175 (2008)	Data from the Uniform Crime Statistics Reports (UCR) showed “[n]o systematic influence of SORN implementation on the rate of reported rape.”	
3	197	Letourneau et al., <i>Effects of South Carolina’s Sex Offender Registration and Notification Policy on Adult Recidivism</i> , 21 Crim. Just. Pol’y Rev. 435 (2010)	Examined “registration status for 6,064 male offenders convicted of at least one sex crime in [S.C.] between 1990 and 2004. The study found that registration status did not predict recidivism.”	

4	197	Sandler et al., <i>Does a watched pot boil? A time-series analysis of New York State's sex offender registration and notification law</i> , 14 Psych. Pub. Pol'y & L. 284 (2008)	Analysis of sex crime, assault, robbery, burglary, and larceny arrests in NY from 1986 through 2006 found that "sex offender registry did not decrease the rearrest rate for convicted sex offenders, deter nonregistered offenders from offending, or decrease the overall rate of sex crimes."	Also found that 94.1% of those arrested for child molestation had no prior offenses.
5	197	Letourneau et. al, <i>The Influence of Sex Offender Registration on Juvenile Sexual Recidivism</i> , 20 Crim. Just. Pol'y Rev. 136 (2009)	"[R]egistration was not associated with [sexual] recidivism; however, nonsexual, nonassault recidivism ... significantly decreased for those on the registry."	Year of publication mistakenly listed as 2010.
6	198	Zevitz, <i>Sex Offender Community Notification: Its Role in Recidivism and Offender Reintegration</i> , 19 Crim. Just. Stud. 193 (2006)	Compared "recidivism rates of [Wisconsin] sex offenders subject to registration and extensive notification between 1997 and 1999 ($n = 47$) ...with those of sex offenders who had limited notification requirements ($n = 166$). No statistically significant differences in sex crime rearrest rates over a four-year follow-up period were found, as 19 percent of the extensive notification group sexually recidivated, compared to	

			12 percent for the limited notification group.”	
7	198	Freeman, <i>The Public Safety Impact of Community Notification Laws: Rearrest of Convicted Sex Offenders</i> , 58 Crime & Delinq. 539 (2012)	This “study of New York sex offenders pre- and postcommunity notification ($N = 10,592$) ... found no significant differences in sexual (7 percent) or general (46.6 percent) rearrest rates based on an 8.2-year follow-up period.”	
		<i>Studies That Were Not Peer-Reviewed</i>		
8	196	Holmes, <i>An Empirical Analysis of Registration and Notification Laws for Juvenile Sex Offenders</i> (Working Paper, 2009)	UCR sex crime data from 47 states found that registering juveniles convicted as an adult produced no “statistically significant decrease in the rate of sex crime arrest,” nor did public notification of those registered.	This working paper is no longer on SSRN, where it was retrieved by the SMART Office, and a wider search found no published paper by this author that has this title or any similar title.
9	198	Adkins et al., Iowa Dep’t of Hum. Rts., <i>The Iowa Sex Offender Registry and Recidivism</i> (2000), available at https://publications.iowa.gov/1516/1/SexOffender-Report.pdf	Group of 233 sex offenders subject to registry compared with matched group of 203 who were not; no statistically significant difference in recidivism at 4.3 year follow-up	
10	198	Zgoba & Bachar, U.S. Dep’t of Just., Bureau of Just. Stat., <i>Sex Offender Registration and Notification: Limited Effects in New Jersey</i> (2009), available at https://-	These two studies by Zgoba were discussed and referenced together. “[R]esearchers compared the recidivism rates of offenders subject to SORN with those of	

		www.ojp.gov/pdffiles1/nij/225402.pdf	
11	198	Zgoba et al., U.S. Dep't of Just., Bureau of Just. Stat., <i>Megan's Law: Assessing the Practical and Monetary Efficacy</i> (2008), https://-www.ojp.gov/pdffiles1/nij/grants/-225370.pdf	offenders who were not subject to this strategy ($n = 550$). Based on a 6.5-year follow-up period, offenders subject to SORN recidivated at a rate of 7 percent, compared to 11 percent for offenders who were not subject to SORN; however, these differences were not found to be statistically significant.”
12	198	Schram & Milloy, Wash. State Inst. for Pub. Pol'y, <i>Community Notification: A Study of Offender Characteristics and Recidivism</i> (1995)	“[R]ecidivism rates of sex offenders subject to SORN ($n = 139$) were compared with those of sex offenders not subject to SORN. Based on a 54-month follow-up, sex offenders subject to SORN were found to have a sex crime rearrest rate of 19 percent while the rate for the non-SORN group was 22 percent, a difference that is not statistically significant.”

2. STUDIES THE REPORT CORRECTLY DESCRIBES AS FINDING AN EFFECT				
13	197	Wash. State Inst. for Pub. Pol’y, <i>Sex Offender Sentencing in Washington State: Has Community Notification Reduced Recidivism?</i> (2005), available at www.wsipp.wa.gov/rpt-files/05-12-1202.pdf	Study of 8,359 Washington sexual offenders found that those “subject to SORN sexually recidivated (defined as a new Washington state conviction for a felony sex crime) at a 2 percent rate, while the pre-SORN group recidivated at a 7 percent rate.”	Washington tiers offenders by individualized risk assessment relying primarily on the Static 99R. Tier I offenders, a majority, are not placed on the website, https://www.waspc.org/sex-offender-information . The authors cautioned that the study’s methodological limitations prevented it from identifying the cause of the decline in recidivism rates, which could have resulted, in whole or part, from factors other than SORN, such as the concurrent decline in crime rates generally and the concurrent increase in incarceration rates.
14	198	Duwe & Donnay, <i>The Impact of Megan’s Law On Sex Offender Recidivism: The Minnesota Experience</i> , 46 <i>Criminology</i> 411 (2008)	Study of 280 sexual offenders found that those subject to community notification (including the public website) had a statistically significant lower reconviction rate after three years.	Minnesota limits public notification to the 4.5% of registrants it classifies as high recidivism risk on the basis of individual assessments employing an actuarially

				<p>validated risk assessment tool similar to the Static 99R. Minn. Stat. § 244.052(4)(b); Minn. Bureau of Criminal Apprehension, <i>Predatory Offender Registry Data</i>, https://dps.mn.gov/divisions/bca/bca-divisions/investigative-services/specialized-investigative-services/predatory-crimes/por/-por-data (last accessed July 2, 2025)</p>
		3. STUDIES MISTAKENLY DESCRIBED IN REPORT AS FINDING AN EFFECT		
15	197	<p>Letourneau et. al., <i>Effects of South Carolina's Sex Offender Registration and Notification Policy on Deterrence of Adult Sex Crimes</i>, 37 Crim. Just. & Behav. 537 (2010)</p>	<p>“[S]tudy found that the sex crime rate declined by 11 percent from pre- to post-SORN while the rates of assault and robbery did not, suggesting the possibility that SORN was a deterrent to sex crimes.”</p>	<p>This statement described data on the effect of South Carolina's 1995 adoption of a registry without mentioning the study's separate analysis of the effect of S.C.'s 1999 adoption of a public website listing offenders. It found the website had <i>no</i> deterrent effect on sex crimes. “No results, however, suggested a general deterrent effect by the modification of South Carolina's policy [to] require[e] Internet-based notification.”</p>

16	197	<p>Veysey et al., <i>A preliminary step towards evaluating the impact of Megan's Law: A trend analysis of sexual offenses in New Jersey from 1985 to 2005</i>, 10 Just. Rsch. & Pol'y 1 (2008)</p>	<p>A “downward trend [in New Jersey] in the sex assault rate was observed both pre- and post-Megan's Law (SORN), but the rate of decline increased after Megan's Law was implemented.”</p> <p>However, later on this same page the SMART report notes that the study's authors caution that this result might be a spurious statistical effect caused by “aggregation” effects in the data analysis.</p>	<p>This article (titled a “preliminary step” in evaluating Megan's Law) was superseded by the later peer-reviewed article by the same authors, which employed a more sophisticated multivariate analysis to separate the impact of notification from concurrent confounding factors. The later article—published seven years before the SMART Office report—concluded that public notification has <i>no</i> effect on sexual reoffending: “[T]here is little evidence to date, including this study, to support a claim that Megan's Law is effective in reducing either new first-time sex offenses or sexual re-offenses.” Zgoba et al., <i>An Analysis of the Effectiveness of Community Notification and Registration</i> 27 Just. Q. 667 (2010).</p>
----	-----	--	--	--