

PLOS ONE

Racial and ethnic disparities in "stop-and-frisk" experience among young sexual minority men in New York City --Manuscript Draft--

Manuscript Number:	PONE-D-20-40991
Article Type:	Research Article
Full Title:	Racial and ethnic disparities in "stop-and-frisk" experience among young sexual minority men in New York City
Short Title:	Racial and ethnic disparities in "stop-and-frisk" experience among young sexual minority men in New York City
Corresponding Author:	Maria R. Khan, PhD, MPH New York University School of Medicine New York, NY UNITED STATES
Keywords:	stop and frisk; racial disparities; ethnic disparities; young sexual minority men
Abstract:	<p>Although racial/ethnic disparities in police contact are well documented, less is known about other dimensions of inequity in policing. Sexual minority groups may face disproportionate police contact. We used data from the P18 Cohort Study (Version 2), a study conducted to measure determinants of inequity in STI/HIV risk among young sexual minority men (YSMM) in New York City, to measure across-time trends, racial/ethnic disparities, and correlates of self-reported stop-and-frisk experience over the cohort follow-up (2014-2019). Over the study period, 43% reported stop-and-frisk with higher levels reported among Black (47%) and Hispanic/Latinx (45%) than White (38%) participants. Stop-and-frisk levels declined over follow-up for each racial/ethnic group. The per capita rates among P18 participants calculated based on self-reported stop-and-frisk were much higher than rates calculated based on New York City Police Department official counts. We stratified respondents' ZIP codes of residence into tertiles of per capita stop rates and observed pronounced disparities in Black versus White stop-and-frisk rates, particularly in neighborhoods with low or moderate levels of stop-and-frisk activity. YSMM facing the greatest economic vulnerability and mental disorder symptoms were most likely to report stop-and-frisk. Among White respondents levels of past year stop-and-frisk were markedly higher among those who reported past 30 day marijuana use (41%) versus those reporting no use (17%) while among Black and Hispanic/Latinx respondents stop-and-frisk levels were comparable among those reporting marijuana use (38%) versus those reporting no use (31%). These findings suggest inequity in policing is observed not only among racial/ethnic but also sexual minority groups and that racial/ethnic YSMM, who are at the intersection of multiple minority statuses, face disproportionate risk. Because the most socially vulnerable experience disproportionate stop-and-frisk risk, we need to reach YSMM with community resources to promote health and wellbeing as an alternative to targeting this group with stressful and stigmatizing police exposure.</p>
Order of Authors:	<p>Maria R. Khan, PhD, MPH</p> <p>Farzana Kapadia</p> <p>Amanda Geller</p> <p>Medha Mazumdar</p> <p>Joy Scheidell</p> <p>Kristen Krause</p> <p>Richard Martino</p> <p>Charles Cleland</p> <p>Typhanye Dyer</p> <p>Danielle Ompad</p> <p>Perry Halkitis</p>

Additional Information:	
Question	Response
<p>Financial Disclosure</p> <p>Enter a financial disclosure statement that describes the sources of funding for the work included in this submission. Review the submission guidelines for detailed requirements. View published research articles from PLOS ONE for specific examples.</p> <p>This statement is required for submission and will appear in the published article if the submission is accepted. Please make sure it is accurate.</p> <p>Unfunded studies Enter: <i>The author(s) received no specific funding for this work.</i></p> <p>Funded studies Enter a statement with the following details:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Initials of the authors who received each award • Grant numbers awarded to each author • The full name of each funder • URL of each funder website • Did the sponsors or funders play any role in the study design, data collection and analysis, decision to publish, or preparation of the manuscript? • NO - Include this sentence at the end of your statement: <i>The funders had no role in study design, data collection and analysis, decision to publish, or preparation of the manuscript.</i> • YES - Specify the role(s) played. <p>* typeset</p>	<p>Funding: This research was funded by grants from the National Institute on Drug Abuse (R01DA044037, PI: MR Khan; R01DA0225537, PI: PN Halkitis; R01DA025537, PI: PN Halkitis). MRK, JDS, CMC, and DCO were supported by the New York University Center for Drug Use and HIV Research (P30 DA011041). MRK and JDS additionally were supported by the New York University-City University of New York (NYU-CUNY) Prevention Research Center (U48 DP005008). TVD was supported by the University of Maryland Prevention Research Center (U48 DP006382). The funders had no role in study design, data collection and analysis, decision to publish or preparation of the manuscript.</p>
<p>Competing Interests</p> <p>Use the instructions below to enter a competing interest statement for this submission. On behalf of all authors, disclose any competing interests that could be perceived to bias this work—acknowledging all financial support and any other relevant financial or non-financial competing interests.</p>	<p>The authors have declared that no competing interests exist.</p>

This statement **will appear in the published article** if the submission is accepted. Please make sure it is accurate. View published research articles from [PLOS ONE](#) for specific examples.

NO authors have competing interests

Enter: *The authors have declared that no competing interests exist.*

Authors with competing interests

Enter competing interest details beginning with this statement:

I have read the journal's policy and the authors of this manuscript have the following competing interests: [insert competing interests here]

* typeset

Ethics Statement

N/A

Enter an ethics statement for this submission. This statement is required if the study involved:

- Human participants
- Human specimens or tissue
- Vertebrate animals or cephalopods
- Vertebrate embryos or tissues
- Field research

Write "N/A" if the submission does not require an ethics statement.

General guidance is provided below. Consult the [submission guidelines](#) for detailed instructions. **Make sure that all information entered here is included in the Methods section of the manuscript.**

Format for specific study types

Human Subject Research (involving human participants and/or tissue)

- Give the name of the institutional review board or ethics committee that approved the study
- Include the approval number and/or a statement indicating approval of this research
- Indicate the form of consent obtained (written/oral) or the reason that consent was not obtained (e.g. the data were analyzed anonymously)

Animal Research (involving vertebrate animals, embryos or tissues)

- Provide the name of the Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee (IACUC) or other relevant ethics board that reviewed the study protocol, and indicate whether they approved this research or granted a formal waiver of ethical approval
- Include an approval number if one was obtained
- If the study involved *non-human primates*, add *additional details* about animal welfare and steps taken to ameliorate suffering
- If anesthesia, euthanasia, or any kind of animal sacrifice is part of the study, include briefly which substances and/or methods were applied

Field Research

Include the following details if this study involves the collection of plant, animal, or other materials from a natural setting:

- Field permit number
- Name of the institution or relevant body that granted permission

Data Availability

Authors are required to make all data underlying the findings described fully available, without restriction, and from the time of publication. PLOS allows rare exceptions to address legal and ethical concerns. See the [PLOS Data Policy](#) and [FAQ](#) for detailed information.

Yes - all data are fully available without restriction

A Data Availability Statement describing where the data can be found is required at submission. Your answers to this question constitute the Data Availability Statement and **will be published in the article**, if accepted.

Important: Stating 'data available on request from the author' is not sufficient. If your data are only available upon request, select 'No' for the first question and explain your exceptional situation in the text box.

Do the authors confirm that all data underlying the findings described in their manuscript are fully available without restriction?

Describe where the data may be found in full sentences. If you are copying our sample text, replace any instances of XXX with the appropriate details.

- If the data are **held or will be held in a public repository**, include URLs, accession numbers or DOIs. If this information will only be available after acceptance, indicate this by ticking the box below. For example: *All XXX files are available from the XXX database (accession number(s) XXX, XXX).*
- If the data are all contained **within the manuscript and/or Supporting Information files**, enter the following:
All relevant data are within the manuscript and its Supporting Information files.
- If neither of these applies but you are able to provide **details of access elsewhere**, with or without limitations, please do so. For example:

Data cannot be shared publicly because of [XXX]. Data are available from the XXX Institutional Data Access / Ethics Committee (contact via XXX) for researchers who meet the criteria for access to confidential data.

The data underlying the results presented in the study are available from (include the name of the third party

All relevant data are within the manuscript and its Supporting Information files.

and contact information or URL).

- This text is appropriate if the data are owned by a third party and authors do not have permission to share the data.

* typeset

Additional data availability information:

1 Racial and ethnic disparities in “stop-and-frisk” experience among
2 young sexual minority men in New York City
3

4 Maria R. Khan^{1,2}, Farzana Kapadia³, Amanda Geller⁴, Medha Mazumdar¹, Joy D. Scheidell^{1,2}, Kristen D.
5 Krause⁵, Richard J. Martino⁵, Charles M. Cleland^{1,2}, Typhanye V. Dyer⁶, Danielle C. Ompad^{2,3}, Perry N.
6 Halkitis^{5,7}

7
8 ¹Department of Population Health, New York University Grossman School of Medicine, 227 East 30th St, New
9 York, NY USA 10016

10
11 ²Center for Drug Use and HIV Research, School of Global Public Health, New York University, 665 Broadway,
12 11th Floor, New York, NY USA 10012

13
14 ³Department of Epidemiology, School of Global Public Health, New York University, 726 Broadway, New York,
15 NY USA 10012

16
17 ⁴Department of Sociology, New York University, 295 Lafayette Street, 4th Floor, New York, NY USA 10003

18
19 ⁵Center for Health, Identity, Behavior & Prevention Studies, Rutgers University, 683 Hoes Lane West,
20 Piscataway, NJ USA 08854

21
22 ⁶University of Maryland School of Public Health, Department of Epidemiology and Biostatistics, 4200 Valley
23 Drive, Suite 2242, College Park, MD USA 20742

24
25 ⁷Departments of Biostatistics and Epidemiology and Urban-Global Health, School of Public Health, Rutgers
26 University, 683 Hoes Lane West, Piscataway, NJ USA 08854
27

28 *Corresponding Author

29 Maria R Khan, PhD MPH

30 Email: maria.khan@nyulangone.org (MK)

39 **Abstract**

40 Although racial/ethnic disparities in police contact are well documented, less is known about other dimensions
41 of inequity in policing. Sexual minority groups may face disproportionate police contact. We used data from the
42 P18 Cohort Study (Version 2), a study conducted to measure determinants of inequity in STI/HIV risk among
43 young sexual minority men (YSMM) in New York City, to measure across-time trends, racial/ethnic disparities,
44 and correlates of self-reported stop-and-frisk experience over the cohort follow-up (2014-2019). Over the study
45 period, 43% reported stop-and-frisk with higher levels reported among Black (47%) and Hispanic/Latinx (45%)
46 than White (38%) participants. Stop-and-frisk levels declined over follow-up for each racial/ethnic group. The
47 per capita rates among P18 participants calculated based on self-reported stop-and-frisk were much higher
48 than rates calculated based on New York City Police Department official counts. We stratified respondents' ZIP
49 codes of residence into tertiles of per capita stop rates and observed pronounced disparities in Black versus
50 White stop-and-frisk rates, particularly in neighborhoods with low or moderate levels of stop-and-frisk activity.
51 YSMM facing the greatest economic vulnerability and mental disorder symptoms were most likely to report
52 stop-and-frisk. Among White respondents levels of past year stop-and-frisk were markedly higher among those
53 who reported past 30 day marijuana use (41%) versus those reporting no use (17%) while among Black and
54 Hispanic/Latinx respondents stop-and-frisk levels were comparable among those reporting marijuana use
55 (38%) versus those reporting no use (31%). These findings suggest inequity in policing is observed not only
56 among racial/ethnic but also sexual minority groups and that racial/ethnic YSMM, who are at the intersection of
57 multiple minority statuses, face disproportionate risk. Because the most socially vulnerable experience
58 disproportionate stop-and-frisk risk, we need to reach YSMM with community resources to promote health and
59 wellbeing as an alternative to targeting this group with stressful and stigmatizing police exposure.

61 **Introduction**

62 Police-community relations in New York City have long been a topic of contentious debate (see Fagan
63 et al, 2010 for a review), with investigative stops, alternatively known as “stop-and-frisk,” “*Terry* stops,” or “stop
64 question and frisk” activity, a practice of particular prominence in public discourse and litigation since the 1990s

[1-4]. Implemented by the New York City Police Department (NYPD) as a method of *Broken Windows* policing [5], stop-and-frisk was promoted as a tactic for enforcement of laws aimed against low-level social disorder with a parallel focus on the proactive detection and seizure of illegal guns [6]. However, despite officers recording more than 4 million stops over a ten-year period from 2004-2013 [7], the vast majority of these stops did not lead to arrest or the detection of illegal activity. Stop-and-frisk encounters are a source of stress and disempowerment [8-10] and carry the possibility of escalating to violence, raising the risk of physical injury and mortality [9, 10]. A single encounter with the police may be an acute stressor; moreover, individuals who are stopped repeatedly or live in high-stop neighborhoods, may experience this police presence as a chronic stressor.

The NYPD's stop-and-frisk program was found to violate 4th Amendment protections against unlawful searches and seizures, and these practices were further found to violate 14th Amendment protections [2, 11]; nearly 90% of individuals who were stopped were Black and Hispanic/Latinx, a disparity that exceeded what might be predicted either by race differences in either population or neighborhood crime patterns [12]. Black men and women face unacceptable brutality and death at the hands of law enforcement [13]. In response to legal action taken against the NYPD stop-and-frisk program, reported stop activity has declined by more than 90% since its 2011 peak [7]. The decline reflects both a change in policing practices and recording practices [14]. However, the independent police monitor overseeing police stops has cited underreporting of stops as a serious problem [14], and it is widely recognized that New Yorkers face far more invasive policing than official statistics indicate [14]. The magnitude of the underreporting is unclear given a dearth of research on the magnitude of stop-and-frisk in the city.

While racial disparities in policing are well documented, we know little about other dimensions of inequity in policing. There is evidence that sexual minority groups face disproportionate risk of policing; in a 2013 study conducted among approximately 2,000 LGBTQ persons, almost three-quarters had had contact with the police in the past five years [15]. Within that sample, approximately 20% reported that the police had a hostile attitude, with about 10% being physically searched and 14% being verbally assaulted; those who identified as a person of color were about two times more likely to report these experiences [15]. There has been scant research on the burden of police contact faced by sexual minority men. Given evidence of the disproportionate burden of police exposure among sexual minority groups, a study measuring levels of stop-

93 and-frisk experience that also assesses risk of police exposure among those at the intersection of both sexual
94 and racial/ethnic minority status is warranted.

95 The purpose of the current study was to describe levels of and factors associated with self-reported
96 stop-and-frisk experience in young sexual minority men (YSMM) in New York City. We used data collected
97 during the P18 Cohort Study (Version 2), a study conducted to measure determinants of inequity in STI/HIV
98 risk in a racially and ethnically diverse cohort of young sexual minority men (YSMM) in New York City. To
99 address the gap in the literature on burden of stop-and-frisk in YSMM, we aimed to describe levels and trends
100 of stop-and-frisk experience over the cohort follow-up period (2014 to 2019). We hypothesized we would
101 observe a substantial proportion of YSMM have a history of stop-and-frisk experience, with a disproportionate
102 burden in racial/ethnic YSMM. We also hypothesized we would observe decreases in stop-and-frisk over time
103 consistent with the decreases in reported stop-and-frisk activity by NYPD yet that across-time racial/ethnic
104 disparities in stop-and-frisk would persist. To address concerns that official counts of stop-and-frisk in NYC
105 based on NYPD records do not reflect the experience of stop-and-frisk burden in the population we aimed to
106 compare rates of self-reported stop-and-frisk in the P18 cohort compared with stop-and-frisk rates among
107 young men based on NYPD official reports, hypothesizing rates of police contact would be higher in the P18
108 sample. To better understand racial/ethnic disparities in stop-and-frisk of YSMM and where in NYC
109 racial/ethnic and sexual minority men faced the greatest inequity in police exposure, we sought to describe the
110 geographic distribution of police exposure and disparities therein. We hypothesized that respondents of all
111 racial/ethnic backgrounds living in higher-stop areas would have had high risk of prior contact with the police [2],
112 while racial/ethnic disparities in stop-and-frisk would be pronounced in neighborhoods where stop-and-frisk
113 activity was less prevalent overall. Finally, to best understand the social and health needs of YSMM who come
114 into contact with the police, we also assessed socio-demographic, psychosocial vulnerability, and behavioral
115 correlates of stop-and-frisk. We hypothesized YSMM with the greatest social vulnerability (poverty, mental
116 health symptoms) would have had greatest risk of contact with the police. We also hypothesized drug use
117 would be a strong correlate of stop-and-frisk among White YSMM but not among minority YSMM given
118 disproportionate stop-and-frisk risk in minority YSMM including among those who do not endorse drug use.

120 **Methods**

121 **Data**


122 **P18 Cohort data**

123 We used data from the second wave of the Project 18 Cohort study [16, 17], a cohort (N=665)
124 established in the New York City metropolitan area to evaluate determinants of STI/HIV, drug use, and mental
125 health burden and the confluence of these health conditions as per a model of syndemics in YSMM [18, 19].
126 Approximately half of the participants who took part in the first wave of the P18 Cohort Study (2009-2014) were
127 included in the second wave (n=274). We then recruited additional participants (n=391) matched to the age of
128 those from wave 1 who met the following criteria: were age 22-26 years, were assigned male sex at birth,
129 reported sex with a man in the prior six months, reported negative or unknown HIV status, reside in New York
130 City metropolitan area, and provided written informed consent. Prescreening to determine eligibility was
131 performed either in person or over the telephone. At baseline and at the six-, 12-, 18-, 24-, and 36-month
132 follow-up visits, participants completed an audio computer-assisted self-interview (ACASI) survey that
133 assessed socio-demographic factors, stop-and-frisk experiences, psychosocial vulnerability factors, symptoms
134 of depression and anxiety, and behavioral factors. The interquartile ranges for years when surveys were
135 administered were: baseline (2014-2015), 12-month (2015-2016), 24-month (2016-2017), and 36-month (2017-
136 2018) follow-up. The final 36-month survey was administered in 2019. Institutional review boards at New York
137 University (School of Medicine and College of Global Public Health) approved this secondary data analysis
138 study using P18 data.

139 **Administrative data**

140 Comparative Analyses: Stop-and-frisk in YSMM versus the General Population: We used 2014-2018
141 data from the New York City Police Department (NYPD) Stop, Question, and Frisk database [7] with population
142 data from the 2014-2018 American Community Survey to calculate per capita stop-and-frisk rates in the
143 general-population of males in New York City [20]. In New York City, the expectation by the NYPD is that each
144 time law enforcement stops an individual, the officer is to complete a hand-written record of the stop. Each stop
145 is to be manually entered into an NYPD database which is released annually to the public. The American

Community Survey, implemented by the US Census Bureau, provides annual population estimates for US cities and towns to enable communities to track changes in population distributions.

 Contextual Analyses: Racial/ethnic Disparities in Stop-and-frisk in YSMM, by Neighborhood-level Stop Activity: Spatial data indicating the boundaries of each of the 77 NYPD police precincts were imported from the New York City Department of Planning [21]. P18 participants were assigned to their precinct of residence based on the centroid of their self-reported ZIP code.

Measures

P18 Cohort: stop-and-frisk experience

At each study visit participants were asked “How many times have you been stopped, questioned, and/or frisked in the past year?” Because the question assessed past year experience, we analyzed the data collected annually, at baseline and the 12-, 24-, and 36-month follow-up visits. Using this questionnaire item we examined a range of stop-and-frisk indicators including a dichotomous indicator of whether a participant reported any past year stop-and-frisk experience, and the number of incidents each participant reported experiencing. The latter measure was coded into a dichotomous indicator of repeat (two or greater) stop-and-frisk experience, and was used to compute a group-level stop-and-frisk rate, calculated as the total number of stop-and-frisk events reported by Black, Hispanic, and White participants, respectively, divided by the number of P18 study participants in each group. The reported number of incidents was also used to compute a race by neighborhood stratum rate, based on the number of incidents reported, and number of Black, Hispanic and White participants living in low, medium, and high-stop neighborhoods.

P18 Cohort: socio-demographic, psychosocial, and behavioral factors

We examined levels of stop-and-frisk experience by race/ethnicity, by ZIP code, and across study year. Because Black race is strongly associated with disproportionate policing, those who identified as Black including Black YSMM who also endorsed Hispanic/Latinx ethnicity were categorized as Black.

We measured correlations between baseline report of any past year stop-and-frisk and repeat stop-and-frisk and the following factors also measured at baseline: gender (male, female, transgender, gender queer); age; New York City borough of residence and borough reported as the place respondent is most likely to hang out; sexual identity (heterosexual, gay/lesbian, bisexual); education; employment; income; unstable

housing; psychosocial vulnerability factors including internalized homophobia (Range: 4-20; dichotomized at ≥ 44) [22], depression measured using the Beck Depression Inventory (Range: 0-55, categorized as minimal (<14), mild (14-20), moderate (21-28), severe (≥ 29)) [23], Beck's Anxiety Inventory (Range: 0-63; categorized as minimal (<10), mild (10-18), moderate (19-29), severe (≥ 30)) [24]; post-traumatic stress disorder measured using the 17-item PCL-C checklist (Range: 17-84; dichotomized at ≥ 44) [25], self-report of neglect by the time the participant started 6th grade; any physical and/or sexual abuse in childhood; self-reported past 30 day substance use including binge drinking, use of marijuana, and any "hard" drugs (i.e., cocaine, crack, methamphetamine, opioid, stimulants, Rohypnol, or GHB) measured using the timeline follow-back method.

New York City young male stop-and-frisk rate

Trends in race-specific YSMM rates of stop-and-frisk per 1,000 population over P18 cohort follow-up (at baseline and the 12-, 24-, and 36-month follow-ups, which took place from 2014-2019 with the majority of 36 month follow-ups occurring from 2015-2018) were compared to trends in race-specific general-population young male stop-and-frisk rates from 2014-2018. Annual race-specific, population-level rates of stop-and-frisk per 1,000 population, were calculated as the annual race-specific number of stop-and-frisk events recorded by the NYPD divided by the race-specific American Community Survey New York City estimate of the male population aged 20-29 years, multiplied by 1,000; the population was restricted given the younger age range of the P18 sample (age range: 21-26, at baseline).

Contextual factor: neighborhood-level stop-and-frisk activity

We examined whether racial/ethnic disparities in stop-and-frisk levels among P18 participants varied depending on whether the respondent lived in a neighborhood with a low, moderate, or high rate of stop activity. To calculate neighborhood-level stop activity, P18 participant ZIP code was translated to latitude and longitude, which was then used to identify the New York City Police Department (NYPD) precinct in which the respondent lived. NYPD precinct-level stop-and-frisk rates were calculated as the 2014 NYPD recorded number of stop-and-frisk events divided by the precinct population of male residents aged 20-29 years old, restricted given the younger age range of the P18 sample (age range: 21-26, at baseline). The precinct population was estimated using population of the census tract, determined by the 2014 American Community Survey, that had the greatest spatial overlap with the precinct; population estimates for each census tract of

200 New York City were calculated after restricting the sample to males aged 20-29 years. Each of the 77 precincts
201 were categorized into three group groups based on the precinct-level stop-and-frisk tertile, which served as an
202 indicator of neighborhoods with low, moderate, and high levels of stop activity. Within each tertile, race-specific
203 P18 stop-and-frisk rates were calculated as the race-specific number of stop-and-frisk events reported by P18
204 participants divided by the race-specific P18 study population.

205 **Statistical analysis**

206 We summarized the prevalence of self-reported police contact and reported stop-and-frisk rate by
207 race/ethnicity at baseline and the 12, 24, and 36-month follow-up visits. Using Poisson regression, we
208 estimated unadjusted rate ratios (RRs) and 95% confidence intervals for association between race
209 (Hispanic/Latinx and Black vs White, the referent) and contact rate. To compare levels of stop-and-frisk among
210 YSMM to other men of comparable age in New York City, we plotted trends in stop-and-frisk rates in the P18
211 sample versus the New York City young male stop-and-frisk rate. Using participant ZIP code, we mapped the
212 spatial distribution of P18 participants by past year stop-and-frisk frequency; maps were created separately by
213 race/ethnicity to allow for comparison of the spatial differences in stop-and-frisk experience across groups.

214 We further investigated racial/ethnic disparities in stop-and-frisk levels by measuring whether
215 racial/ethnic disparities in stop-and-frisk levels among P18 participants varied depending on whether the
216 respondent lived in a neighborhood with a low, moderate, or high rate of stop activity. Using Poisson
217 regression, we estimated unadjusted RRs and 95% confidence intervals for association between race
218 (Hispanic/Latinx and Black vs White, the referent) within each tertile. To understand the factors that might
219 place participants at risk for police contact, we used logistic regression to estimate adjusted odds ratios (ORs)
220 and 95% confidence intervals for associations between participant characteristics and past year history of any
221 prior and repeat stop-and-frisk experience.

222

223 **Results**

224 **Levels of stop-and-frisk by race/ethnicity among YSMM**

Over the study period, 43% of P18 participants reported a history of stop-and-frisk experience in the prior year, with higher levels among Black (47%) and Hispanic/Latinx (45%) than White (38%) participants.

As shown in **Fig 1a**, at baseline, the prevalence of any self-reported stop-and-frisk experience for the 12-months preceding study interview was higher among Black (35%) and Hispanic/Latinx (34%) YSMM compared to their White (31%) counterparts; in the sample overall 33% experienced stop-and-frisk in the past year. While there were declines in the prevalence of stop-and-frisk encounters for all groups between the baseline and 12-month follow-up visit, the racial disparities in stop-and-frisk evident at the baseline visit remained at the 12-month follow-up visit and persisted over the remaining study period despite declines in all three groups. Specifically, for White and Hispanic/Latinx YSMM, there was almost a 65% (31% to 11% and 34% to 12%, respectively) decrease in stop-and-frisk over the study period. However, among Black YSMM, the decline in stop-and-frisk encounters was only 54% (35% to 16%). Most importantly, at every visit during the study period, prevalence of any stop-and-frisk reports were higher among Black YSMM than among Hispanic/Latinx and White YSMM, with Black-White differences consistently statistically significant. There was substantial heterogeneity in the levels of past year stop-and-frisk among those who endorsed stop-and-frisk over time. The maximum number of stops per person was markedly higher among Black and Hispanic/Latinx vs White respondents (Black: 20, Hispanic: 23, White: 12 stops) and remained disparate over follow-up through the 36-month follow-up visit (Black: 66, Hispanic: 5, White: 2 stops).

Fig 1a. Race differences in past year stop-and-frisk prevalence of past year stop-and-frisk* among P18 participants over cohort follow-up (2014-2019; N=591 at baseline)

**P18 questionnaire item: "How many times have you been stopped, questioned, and/or frisked in the past year?" We coded a dichotomous indicator of any prior stop-and-frisk in the past year. In the sample overall, 32.3% reported being stopped-and-frisk at baseline and 21.5% reported being stopped-and-frisked at least once over the course of the follow-up.*

Next, we examined per-participant stop rates (i.e., the reported number of encounters per participant) across racial/ethnic groups. As shown in **Fig 1b**, participant experiences of stop-and-frisk decreased between the baseline visit and the 36-month follow-up visit. However, these decreases in rates of stop-and-frisk were not consistent across race/ethnicity. Specifically, among White YSMM, the rate of stop-and-frisk decreased by 83% from 0.6 to 0.1 from baseline to the end of the study period. A similar trend was observed among

253 Hispanic/Latinx YSMM with stop-and-frisk rates decreasing by 80% from 1 to 0.2 over the study period.
254 However, among Black YSMM, rates of stop-and-frisk encounters did not decline consistently over the study
255 period. Black participants experienced a comparable decline in per-participant stop rate (75% decline; from 1.2
256 to 0.3 encounters per person) through the 24-month follow-up, but a considerable uptick at the 36-month
257 interview (66% increase; from 0.3 to 0.9 encounters per person). This increase was driven in part by a small
258 number of respondents reporting very high stop rates (e.g., the aforementioned participant reporting 55 times
259 stopped in the prior year at the 36-month follow-up) but suggests that the decline was not sustained for Black
260 participants to the extent it was for those who were White or Hispanic/Latinx. Black participants had twice the
261 stop-and-frisk rate as White participants at the baseline visit (RR: 2.07, 95% CI: 1.66, 2.60) and 12-month visit
262 (RR: 2.11, 95% CI: 1.44, 3.14). By the 36-month follow-up the disparity grew to five times the rate (RR: 5.88,
263 95% CI: 3.62, 10.25); yet when we removed from the analysis one Black participant who reported 55 stop-and-
264 frisk experiences the stark disparity remained (RR: 3.15, 95%: 1.89, 5.59).

265 **Fig 1b. Race differences in past year stop-and-frisk rate* among P18 participants over cohort follow-up**
266 **(Above Bar Chart) and Unadjusted Rate Ratios (RRs) and 95% Confidence Intervals (CIs) for**
267 **Associations between Race and Stop-and-Frisk Rate (Below Table) (2014-2019; N=591 at baseline)**

268 **P18 questionnaire item: "How many times have you been stopped, questioned, and/or frisked in the past*
269 *year?"* P18 rates were calculated as the race-specific number of stop-and-frisk events reported by P18
270 participants/race-specific P18 study population times 1,000.

271 **Levels of self-reported stop-and-frisk among YSMM versus official** 272 **reports in the general population**

273 In **Fig 2** we compare rates of per capita stop-and-frisk experience among study participants to that of
274 young men in New York City at large. Notably, the overall decline in stop-and-frisk in our study sample parallel
275 the population-level decline in stop-and-frisk among males ages 20 – 29 years old during this same period.
276 Racial/ethnic disparities are similarly comparable to those at the population level, though the magnitudes of
277 these disparities are less extreme. However, the per capita rate of stops reported by P18 participants of all
278 races is significantly higher than that recorded citywide, in some cases by orders of magnitude.

279 **Fig 2. Stop-and-frisk rate per 1,000 population* reported by P18 participants vs recorded by the New**
280 **York City Police Department (NYPD), by race**

281 *P18 rates were calculated as the race-specific number of stop-and-frisk events reported by P18
282 participants/race-specific P18 study population. These were compared to rates in the general population,
283 calculated as the race-specific number of stop-and-frisk events recorded by the New York City Police
284 Department/race-specific American Community Survey New York City population estimates. Note: Rate among
285 Black P18 participants at the 36-month visit was driven by a high stop rate among one participant (66 stops in
286 the past year); when this participant was excluded from the analysis the stop rate was reduced to 58.6 per
287 1,000.

288 **Spatial distribution of stop-and-frisk in New York City among YSMM,**
289 **by race/ethnicity**

290 **Fig 3** provides the geographic distribution of P18 respondents based on their reported ZIP codes of
291 residence and indicates that at baseline, P18 participants residing throughout all five New York City boroughs
292 including Manhattan and the four outer boroughs (Brooklyn, Queens, the Bronx, and Staten Island) reported
293 stop-and-frisk. Observed racial disparities in self-reported stop-and-frisk experiences may have been driven in
294 neighborhood exposure. White P18 respondents were more likely to live in Manhattan than their Black and
295 Hispanic/Latinx counterparts, who were more likely to live in high-stop areas of the Brooklyn and the Bronx,
296 which are neighborhoods that have historically experienced high rates of aggressive policing [12]. Stop
297 experience among Black and Hispanic/Latinx participants was not limited to those living in high-stop
298 neighborhoods; those living outside of New York City also reported having been stopped.

299 **Fig 3. Geographic distribution of past year stop-and-frisk among P18 participants at cohort baseline,**
300 **by race:** P18 participants are mapped by participant ZIP code of residence. Those with a history of stop-and-
301 frisk are indicated by red circles (White race), green circles (Hispanic/Latinx/Latinx race/ethnicity), blue circles
302 (Black race) with increasing circle size indicating increasing number of stop-and-frisk events, while those with
303 no stop-and-frisk history are indicated by Black circles.

Racial/ethnic disparities in stop-and-frisk, by neighborhood-level stop activity

Given the likely role of neighborhood policing in participants' exposure to police encounters, we examined racial/ethnic differences in their reported rates of stop-and-frisk (i.e., reported baseline stops per participant) among study participant by tertiles of neighborhood-level rates (Fig 4). Within the lowest stop New York City neighborhoods (i.e., the lowest tertile), White (0.45) and Hispanic/Latinx (0.42) YSMM had substantially lower stop-and-frisk rates than Black YSMM (1.2). In neighborhoods with the second-highest tertile of neighborhood-level stop-and-frisk rates, White YSMM had the lowest rate of stop-and-frisk encounters (0.51) compared to their Hispanic/Latinx (0.78) and Black (1.33). However, in neighborhoods comprising the highest tertile of neighborhood-level stop-and-frisk rates, rates of stop-and-frisk encounters among White YSMM (0.92) were only slightly lower than that among Black YSMM (1.11). Moreover, rates of stop-and-frisk encounters among Hispanic/Latinx (2.38) YSMM were more than two times higher than among their White and Black YSMM. In neighborhoods with low and moderate stop-and-frisk rates, Black participants had over 2.5 times the stop-and-frisk rates (lowest tertile neighborhood stop-and-frisk: RR 2.60, 95% CI: 1.64, 4.34; middle tertile neighborhood stop-and-frisk: RR: 2.60, 95% CI: 1.85, 3.71) while in the highest stop-and-frisk tertile Black and White P18 participants had comparable rates (RR: 1.15, 95% CI: 0.75, 1.82).

Fig 4. Race differences in past year stop-and-frisk rate among P18 participants at cohort baseline in 2014 by neighborhood-level stop-and-frisk rate (counts/1000)*

**P18 participants were categorized according to their neighborhood-level stop-and-frisk rate, which were calculated as followed. Participant's ZIP code was translated to latitude and longitude, which was then used to identify the New York City Police Department (NYPD) precinct in which the respondent lived (total of 77 possible precincts). NYPD precinct-level stop-and-frisk rates were calculated as the 2014 NYPD recorded number of stop-and-frisk events divided by the precinct population of male residents aged 20-29 years old; restricted given the younger age range of the P18 sample (age range: 21-26, at baseline). The population estimates for New York City were calculated from 2014 estimates from the 2010-2014 5-year American Community Survey; population estimates for each census tract of New York City were calculated after restricting the sample to males aged 20-29 years. Each of the 77 precincts were categorized into group groups*

331 based on the precinct-level stop-and-frisk tertile. Within each tertile indicating neighborhood-level stop-and-
 332 frisk, stop-and-frisk rates were calculated at the race-specific number of stop-and-frisk events reported by P18
 333 participants/race-specific P18 study population.

334 Individual-level factors associated with stop-and-frisk

335 Finally, in analyses assessing associations between stop-and-frisk and socio-demographic,
 336 psychosocial and substance use factors (**Table 1**), the odds of multiple stop-and-frisk encounters among Black
 337 and Hispanic/Latinx YSMM were almost 2 times higher than for White YSMM (OR = 2.35, 95% CI 1.39, 4.08
 338 and OR = 1.82, 95% CI 1.02, 3.32, respectively). Next, while 2% of participants reported they did not identify
 339 with a binary gender, the odds of any stop-and-frisk encounter as well as multiple encounters were 2 to almost
 340 5 times higher in this group (OR = 3.51, 95% CI 1.15, 11.7 and OR = 5.78, 95% CI 1.88, 18.28, respectively).
 341 Among YSMM who reported being more likely to socialize or hang out in the Bronx, the odds of both any and
 342 multiple stop-and-frisk encounters were higher (OR = 2.90, 95% CI 1.57, 5.43 and OR = 2.76, 95% CI 1.42,
 343 5.25, respectively) than among YSMM reporting socializing in other New York City boroughs.

344 **Table 1. Odds ratios (ORs) and 95% confidence intervals (CIs) for associations between participant**
 345 **socio-demographic, psychosocial, and behavioral factors and past year stop-and-frisk at cohort**
 346 **baseline in 2014**

	Total N (%) (n=665)	N (%) Past Year Stop-and-frisk (n=214)	Unadjusted ORs: Association with Past Year Stop-and-frisk	N (%) Repeat (≥2) Past Year Stop- and-frisk (n=119)	Unadjusted ORs: Association with Repeat (≥2) Past Year Stop-and-frisk
Gender					
Male	621 (93.4%)	194 (31.2%)	Ref	104 (16.7%)	Ref
Female	4 (0.6%)	1 (25.0%)	0.73 [0.04,5.74]	0 (0%)	--
Transgender female	5 (0.8%)	2 (40.0%)	1.46 [0.19,8.88]	1 (20%)	1.24 [0.06, 8.47]
Genderqueer	22 (3.3%)	9 (40.9%)	1.64 [0.66,3.95]	7 (31.8%)	2.48 [0.92, 6.11]
I do not identify with a gender	13 (2.0%)	8 (61.5%)	3.51 [1.15, 11.7]	7 (53.8%)	5.78 [1.88, 18.28]
Age					
21-22	41 (6.2%)	13 (31.7%)	Ref	8 (19.5%)	Ref
22-23	320 (48.1%)	110 (34.4%)	1.09 [0.55, 2.26]	59 (18.4%)	0.90 [0.41, 2.20]
23-24	290 (43.6%)	87 (30.0%)	0.90 [0.45, 1.88]	49 (16.9%)	0.82 [0.37, 2.01]
24-26	13 (2.0%)	4 (30.8%)	0.83 [0.20, 3.03]	3 (23.1%)	1.09 [0.21, 4.57]
Race					
White	187 (28.1%)	58 (31.0%)	Ref	22 (11.8%)	Ref
Hispanic/Latinx	163 (24.5%)	56 (34.4%)	1.16 [0.74, 1.81]	32 (19.6%)	1.82 [1.02, 3.32]
Black	241 (36.2%)	85 (35.3%)	1.19 [0.79, 1.80]	58 (24.1%)	2.35 [1.39, 4.08]
Other	68 (10.2%)	14 (20.6%)	0.57 [0.28, 1.08]	7 (10.3%)	0.85 [0.32, 2.00]
Borough of residence					
Manhattan	212 (31.9%)	64 (30.2%)	Ref	37 (17.5%)	Ref
Brooklyn	203 (30.5%)	66 (32.5%)	1.11 [0.74,1.69]	32 (15.8%)	0.89 [0.53, 1.49]

Bronx	93 (14.0%)	34 (36.6%)	1.35 [0.8, 2.25]	21 (22.6%)	1.39 [0.75, 2.52]
Queens	61 (9.2%)	15 (24.6%)	0.75 [0.38, 1.41]	7 (11.5%)	0.61 [0.24, 1.37]
Staten Island	8 (1.2%)	1 (12.5%)	0.33 [0.02, 1.9]	1 (12.5%)	0.67 [0.04, 3.94]
Outside NEW YORK CITY	25 (3.8%)	5 (20%)	0.57 [0.18, 1.49]	2 (8%)	0.41 [0.06, 1.47]
Outside NYS	59 (8.9%)	27 (45.8%)	1.94 [1.07, 3.5]	18 (30.5%)	2.06 [1.05 , 3.96]
Borough you like to hang out the most in					
Manhattan	424 (63.8%)	131 (30.9%)	Ref	74 (17.5%)	Ref
Brooklyn	139 (20.9%)	42 (30.2%)	0.98 [0.64, 1.47]	21 (15.1%)	0.85 [0.49, 1.41]
Bronx	47 (7.1%)	26 (55.3%)	2.90 [1.57, 5.43]	17 (36.2%)	2.76 [1.42, 5.25]
Queens	28 (4.2%)	5 (17.9%)	0.48 [0.16, 1.21]	2 (7.1%)	0.36 [0.06, 1.25]
Staten Island	2 (0.3%)	0 (0.0%)	0.00	0 (0%)	0
Sexual Identity					
Heterosexual	6 (0.9%)	2 (33.3%)	Ref	2 (33.3%)	Ref
Gay/Lesbian	544 (81.8%)	165 (30.3%)	0.88 [0.17, 6.36]	86 (15.8%)	0.38 [0.07, 2.75]
Bisexual	103 (15.5%)	44 (42.7%)	1.49 [0.28, 11.11]	28 (27.2%)	0.75 [0.14, 5.60]
Education					
High school graduate or below	318 (47.8%)	113 (35.5%)	Ref	73 (23%)	Ref
College graduate	346 (52.0%)	101 (29.2%)	0.75 [0.54, 1.04]	46 (13.3%)	0.52 [0.34, 0.77]
Employment					
Unemployed/not regular job	163 (24.5%)	50 (30.7%)	Ref	27 (16.6%)	Ref
Employed	497 (74.7%)	162 (32.6%)	1.09 [0.75,1.61]	91 (18.3%)	1.13 [0.71, 1.83]
Income					
Less than \$10k	296 (44.5%)	105 (35.5%)	Ref	58 (19.6%)	Ref
More than \$10k	337 (50.7%)	103 (30.6%)	0.79 [0.57,1.10]	58 (17.2%)	0.85 [0.56, 1.27]
Unstable housing					
No	580 (87.2%)	178 (30.7%)	Ref	96 (16.6%)	Ref
Yes	60 (9.0%)	22 (36.7%)	1.30 [0.74, 2.24]	15 (25%)	1.67 [0.87, 3.05]
Internalized Homophobia*					
Low (<12)	530 (79.7%)	159 (30%)	Ref	85 (16%)	Ref
High (≥12)	121 (18.2%)	49 (40.5%)	1.58 [1.05,2.37]	29 (24%)	1.64 [1.01, 2.63]
Depression (Beck Depression Inventory)					
Minimal (<14)	490 (73.7%)	149 (30.4%)	Ref	76 (15.5%)	Ref
Mild (14-20)	82 (12.3%)	23 (28%)	0.89 [0.52 , 1.48]	15 (18.3%)	1.22 [0.64, 2.19]
Moderate (21-28)	41 (6.2%)	15 (36.6%)	1.32 [0.66 ,2.53]	10 (24.4%)	1.75 [0.79, 3.61]
Severe (≥29)	22 (3.3%)	15 (68.2%)	4.89 [2.02, 13.03]	9 (40.9%)	3.76 [1.50, 9.03]
Anxiety (Beck's Anxiety Inventory)					
Minimal (<9)	464 (69.8%)	143 (30.8%)	Ref	79 (17%)	Ref
Mild (10-18)	112 (16.8%)	33 (29.5%)	0.93 [0.59, 1.45]	19 (17%)	0.99 [0.56, 1.69]
Moderate (19-29)	49 (7.4%)	19 (38.8%)	1.41 [0.76, 2.57]	9 (18.4%)	1.09 [0.48, 2.24]
Severe (≥30)	23 (3.5%)	13 (56.5%)	2.90 [1.25, 6.94]	8 (34.8%)	2.59 [1.01, 6.17]
Post-traumatic Stress Disorder (PCL-17)**					
No (<44)	543 (81.7%)	165 (30.4%)	Ref	91 (16.8%)	Ref
Yes (≥44)	66 (9.9%)	29 (43.9%)	1.79 [1.06, 3.00]	18 (27.3%)	1.85 [1.01, 3.28]
Childhood abuse (Neglect/physical/sexual)					
No	277 (41.7%)	70 (25.3%)	Ref	36 (13%)	Ref
Yes	374 (56.2%)	140 (37.4%)	1.76 [1.25,2.49]	81 (21.7%)	1.84 [1.21, 2.85]
Binge drinking in past 30 days					
No	155 (23.3%)	44 (28.4%)	Ref	25 (16.1%)	Ref
Yes	430 (64.7%)	148 (34.4%)	1.32 [0.89,1.98]	81 (18.8%)	1.20 [0.74, 2.00]
Marijuana use in past 30 days					
No	287 (43.2%)	69 (24%)	Ref	38 (13.2%)	Ref
Yes	378 (56.8%)	145 (38.4%)	1.97 [1.41,2.79]	81 (21.4%)	1.79 [1.18, 2.75]
Cocaine use in past 30 days					
No	597 (89.8%)	185 (31%)	Ref	100 (16.8%)	Ref
Yes	68 (10.2%)	29 (42.6%)	1.64 [0.98,2.73]	19 (27.9%)	1.92 [1.06, 3.34]

Hard drugs in past 30 days***					
No	570 (85.7%)	173 (30.4%)	Ref	94 (16.5%)	Ref
Yes	95 (14.3%)	41 (43.2%)	1.73 [1.11,2.69]	25 (26.3%)	1.80 [1.07, 2.95]

*IHF scale

**DSM criteria

***Hard drugs include cocaine, crack, Meth, opioid, stimulants, Rohypnol, GHB

In terms of psychosocial factors, YSMM reporting higher levels of internalized homophobia had increased odds of reporting both any and multiple stop-and-frisk encounters (OR = 1.58, 95% CI 1.05, 2.37 and OR = 1.64, 95% CI 1.01, 2.63, respectively). With respect to mental health burdens, YSMM who reported any and multiple stop-and-frisk encounters had consistently higher odds of severe levels of depressive symptoms, severe levels of anxiety, and experiences of childhood victimization.

With regard to recent substance use, YSMM who reported using marijuana in the 30 days preceding study visits had higher odds of any and multiple stop-and-frisk encounters (OR = 1.97, 95% CI 1.41, 2.79 and OR = 1.79, 95% CI 1.18, 2.75). Similar relationships between any and multiple stop-and-frisk encounters were observed among individuals who reported hard drug use. Finally, the odds of multiple stop-and-frisk encounters were higher among YSMM who reported recent cocaine use (OR = 1.92, 95% CI 1.06, 3.34). While among White respondents levels of past year stop-and-frisk were markedly higher among those who reported past 30 day marijuana use (41%) than those reporting no use (17%), among Black and Hispanic/Latinx respondents, levels were comparable regardless of past 30 day marijuana use (marijuana use: 38%, no marijuana use: 31%) (race differences in associations between drug use and stop-and-frisk not presented in **Table 1**).

Discussion

This study is among the first to measure the prevalence of recent and repeat stop-and-frisk experience in a population-based sample [8], and the only study to our knowledge to measure stop-and-frisk in YSMM. We observed that being stop-and-frisk by the police is a normative life event among YSMM in New York City with one in three YSMM having experienced the event at baseline, primarily administered in 2014-2015, with comparable levels of the event reported among Black, non-Black Hispanic/Latinx, and White participants. While levels decreased over time, consistent with documented city-wide trends in stop-and-frisk [7], at the final

374 follow-up a significant minority of P18 participants continued to report past year stop-and-frisk, including one in
375 nine White and non-Black participants and one in seven Black participants. The vast differences in the levels of
376 self-reported stop-and-frisk experience in the P18 compared with per capita rates based on the NYPD records
377 are consistent with documented underreporting in NYPD records [14], but also suggest that sexual minority
378 men across race/ethnicity may experience much higher rates of police contact than non-sexual minority
379 populations. We observed Black YSMM who lie at the intersection of racial minority and sexual minority status
380 face the greatest vulnerability and that YSMM with the greatest economic and social vulnerability were most
381 likely to report stop-and-frisk experience. This increased exposure was loosely associated with Black
382 participants' residing in neighborhoods with histories of being heavily policed. Stop-and-frisk adds to the
383 burden of structural and systematic discrimination that is known to degrade health, well-being and sense of
384 safety in this already vulnerable group [26, 27]. Together, results indicating the pervasive experience of stop-
385 and-frisk among YSMM, particularly Black YSMM, highlight the need for reduction of this stressful and
386 deleterious life event among YSMM. The results underscore the call for an alternative to policing, and a
387 community response that addresses the economic, social, and health care needs of the population.

388 While YSMM of all races and ethnicities face high rates of police contact, racial inequality persists
389 within this vulnerable group. Black YSMM faced a significantly higher burden of repeat stop-and-frisk than their
390 White counterparts. At baseline, nearly one-quarter of Black YSMM reported being stopped-and-frisked two or
391 more times in the past year compared with one in five non-Black Hispanic/Latinx and approximately 10% of
392 White participants. Further, the cumulative number of stop-and-frisk events in the past year per Black
393 participants, was substantially higher than the stop-and-frisk rate among non-Black participants across follow-
394 up. Race disparities appeared to increase over time as the experience became less normative overall. We also
395 observed that the Black vs non-Black disparities were particularly pronounced in neighborhoods with overall
396 lower levels of stop-and-frisk experience while in the highest stop neighborhoods non-Black Hispanic/Latinxs
397 had a disproportionate rate of being stopped. Disproportionate rates of policing were observed among Black
398 and Hispanic/Latinx participants who did not endorse drug use, which is a primary reason motivating police
399 stops.

400 The inequitable policing of racial/ethnic minorities observed in this study is consistent with the vast
401 scientific literature and current media reports highlighting the inequitable policing including aggressive policing

402 of Black individuals and communities.[13, 28, 29] Although the threat of police violence faced by Black
403 Americans has recently gained prominence in public discourse, a long list of police-related deaths over the
404 past 40 years highlights the long history of police related violence that has persisted into the modern era.
405 Moreover, incidents which lead to death represent only a small fraction of violent police encounters; nonlethal
406 physical force is far more common, if less consistently documented, and has been associated with a variety of
407 adverse health and social outcomes [30].

408 We observed levels of stop-and-frisk based on self-report of the experience were disproportionately
409 high in this sample compared to the official NYPD stop-and-frisk counts. The substantial magnitude of
410 difference in reporting by participants compared to official records is consistent with concerns that official
411 reporting by the NYPD does not fully reflect the burden of police practices on local populations. Moreover, our
412 findings are suggestive of a heavy burden on YSMM, as has been suggested in qualitative studies and
413 advocacy reports [31, 32]. There is agreement that levels of stop-and-frisk as a practice has become less
414 common since the *Floyd v. City of New York* decision in 2013. However, the contrast between general
415 population rates and the reports of P18 participants provide empirical evidence that the experience is likely far
416 more common than official reports suggest.

417 In addition to a lack of information about the nature of the stop-and-frisk experience, which makes
418 comparison to the NYPD official case counts of stop-and-frisk as well as understanding of the severity of the
419 policing exposure challenging, additional limitations of the study include selection and measurement errors.
420 First, attrition over cohort follow-up may have impacted measured levels of stop-and-frisk and race differences
421 in stop-and-frisk levels if those who did not return for a study visit had different stop-and-frisk experience as
422 those who presented for study visits. In addition, due to relatively modest sample size of the cohort, we
423 collapsed multiple racial/ethnic categories and further omitted some (e.g., Asians) who did not identify as one
424 of the three racial/ethnic groups most prominent in discussions of American policing. Although not explicitly
425 limitations, we had no non-sexual minority group against which to compare levels of stop-and-frisk and
426 additionally our analyses of correlates of stop-and-frisk were by design unadjusted to describe the social,
427 mental health, and behavioral health needs of those who come in contact with the police. Our findings highlight
428 the need for future studies in larger samples to include questions of stop-and-frisk experience to enable
429 comparisons of YSMM to non-sexual minority youth. New York City does not report stop-and-frisk rates by

430 sexual minority status, making these comparisons somewhat limited. In addition, future studies should be
431 powered to consider racial/ethnic differences in the burden of this exposure considering a heterogeneity of
432 racial/ethnic groups compared YSMM and non-sexual minority individuals.

433 In conclusion, the current study highlights the substantial burden of stop-and-frisk police experience
434 among YSMM in New York City, a group whose experience has remained understudied and
435 underdocumented, and a population that continues to face a heightened burden of health disparities including
436 but not limited to HIV, mental health burden, substance use, and violence [33, 34]. We observed that while
437 rates of stop-and-frisk have declined over time, consistent with official NYPD reporting of the experience, levels
438 remain high and are disproportionately high among Black YSMM. Findings that the most socially vulnerable
439 YSMM are those most likely to experience stop-and-frisk policing highlight the need for community based
440 solutions among those at risk of contact with the police as well as the need for institutions that do not explicitly
441 focus on public safety (e.g., primary care physicians, schools) to raise awareness of police contact as a threat
442 to health and wellbeing. Doing so will reduce a key driver of adverse health in YSMM and particularly those
443 who possess intersectional identities as both sexual minority and racial/ethnic minority individuals.

References

1. Daniels v. City of New York, (2003).
2. Floyd et al., v. City of New York, (2013).
3. Spitzer E. The New York City Police Department's "Stop and Frisk" Practices: A Report to the People of the State of New York. 1999.
4. Schneiderman ET. A Report on Arrests Arising from the New York City Police Department's Stop-And-Frisk Practices. 2013.
5. Kelling GL, Wilson JQ. Broken Windows: The police and neighborhood safety. *The Atlantic*. 1982;29-36.
6. Fagan J. RECENT EVIDENCE AND CONTROVERSIES IN "THE NEW POLICING". *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*. 2017.
7. New York City Civil Liberties Union. Stop-and-Frisk in the de Blasio Era. 2019.
8. Geller A, Fagan J, Tyler T, Link BG. Aggressive policing and the mental health of young urban men. *Am J Public Health*. 2014;104(12):2321-7.
9. DeVlyder JE, Oh HY, Nam B, Sharpe TL, Lehmann M, Link BG. Prevalence, demographic variation and psychological correlates of exposure to police victimisation in four US cities. *Epidemiol Psychiatr Sci*. 2017;26(5):466-77.
10. McLeod MN, Heller D, Manze MG, Echeverria SE. Police Interactions and the Mental Health of Black Americans: a Systematic Review. *J Racial Ethn Health Disparities*. 2020;7(1):10-27.
11. Meares TL. Programming Errors: Understanding the Constitutionality of Stop-and-Frisk as a Program, Not an Incident. *The University of Chicago Law Review*. 2015;82:159-79.
12. Fagan J. Expert testimony. *Floyd et al. v. City of New York, et al.* 2010.
13. Heaney MT. The George Floyd protests generated more media coverage than any protest in 50 years: *The Washington Post*; 2020 [Available from: <https://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/2020/07/06/george-floyd-protests-generated-more-media-coverage-than-any-protest-50-years/>].
14. Zimroth PL. Tenth Report of the Independent Monitor. *Floyd, et al. v. City of New York et al., Ligon et al., v. City of New York et al.* 2020.
15. Lambda Legal. Protected and Served? 2013 [Available from: <https://www.lambdalegal.org/protected-and-served>].
16. Halkitis PN, Cook SH, Ristuccia A, Despotoulis J, Levy MD, Bates FC, et al. Psychometric analysis of the Life Worries Scale for a new generation of sexual minority men: The P18 Cohort Study. *Health Psychol*. 2018;37(1):89-101.
17. Halkitis PN, Jaiswal J, Griffin-Tomas M, Krause KD, D'Avanzo P, Kapadia F. Beliefs About the End of AIDS, Concerns About PrEP Functionality, and Perceptions of HIV Risk as Drivers of PrEP Use in Urban Sexual Minority Men: The P18 Cohort Study. *AIDS Behav*. 2018;22(11):3705-17.
18. Halkitis PN, Kapadia F, Siconolfi DE, Moeller RW, Figueroa RP, Barton SC, et al. Individual, Psychosocial, and Social Correlates of Unprotected Anal Intercourse in a New Generation of Young Men Who Have Sex With Men in New York City. *American Journal of Public Health*. 2013;103(5):889-95.
19. Halkitis PN, Moeller RW, Siconolfi DE, Storholm ED, Solomon TM, Bub KL. Measurement model exploring a syndemic in emerging adult gay and bisexual men. *AIDS Behav*. 2013;17(2):662-73.
20. American Community Survey. 2010—2014 ACS 5-Year Data Profile 2014 [Available from: <https://www.census.gov/acs/www/data/data-tables-and-tools/data-profiles/2014/>].
21. NYC Open Data. Police Precincts 2020 [Available from: <https://data.cityofnewyork.us/Public-Safety/Police-Precincts/78dh-3ptz>].
22. Thiede H, Valleroy LA, MacKellar DA, Celentano DD, Ford WL, Hagan H, et al. Regional patterns and correlates of substance use among young men who have sex with men in 7 US urban areas. *Am J Public Health*. 2003;93(11):1915-21.
23. Beck AT, Ward CH, Mendelson M, Mock J, Erbaugh J. An inventory for measuring depression. *Arch Gen Psychiatry*. 1961;4:561-71.
24. Beck AT, Epstein N, Brown G, Steer RA. An inventory for measuring clinical anxiety: psychometric properties. *J Consult Clin Psychol*. 1988;56(6):893-7.

25. Blanchard EB, Jones-Alexander J, Buckley TC, Forneris CA. Psychometric properties of the PTSD Checklist (PCL). *Behav Res Ther.* 1996;34(8):669-73.
26. Harrell JP, Hall S, Taliaferro J. Physiological responses to racism and discrimination: an assessment of the evidence. *Am J Public Health.* 2003;93(2):243-8.
27. Sawyer PJ, Major B, Casad BJ, Townsend SS, Mendes WB. Discrimination and the stress response: psychological and physiological consequences of anticipating prejudice in interethnic interactions. *Am J Public Health.* 2012;102(5):1020-6.
28. BBC. Breonna Taylor: What happened on the night of her death? 2020 [Available from: <https://www.bbc.com/news/world-us-canada-54210448>].
29. Milner A, George, BJ, Allison, DB. Black and Hispanic Men Perceived to Be Large Are at Increased Risk for Police Frisk, Search, and Force. *PLoS One.* 2016;11(1):e0147158.
30. Geller A, Goff PA, Lloyd T, Haviland A, Obermark D, Glaser J. Measuring Racial Disparities in Police Use of Force: Methods Matter. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology.* In press.
31. Make the Road New York. *Transgressive Policing: Police Abuse of LGBTQ Communities of Color in Jackson Heights.* 2012.
32. Mallory C, Hasenbush A, Sears B. *Discrimination and Harrassment by Law Enforcement Officers in the LGBT Community.* Los Angeles, CA: The Williams Institute, UCLA School of Law; 2015.
33. Halkitis PN, Wolitski RJ, Millett GA. A holistic approach to addressing HIV infection disparities in gay, bisexual, and other men who have sex with men. *Am Psychol.* 2013;68(4):261-73.
34. Halkitis PN, Maiolatesi AJ, Krause KD. The Health Challenges of Emerging Adult Gay Men: Effecting Change in Health Care. *Pediatr Clin North Am.* 2020;67(2):293-308.

