The Editors  
*The Economic Journal* December, 2021

Dear Editors,

Please find attached our manuscript, “Conservative News Media and Criminal Justice: Evidence from Exposure to Fox News Channel.”

Our manuscript is the first to show a causal effect of media bias on judicial decisions. We use a dataset of criminal cases from state courts to show that judges impose longer sentences in counties with higher viewership on the conservative Fox News Channel. Using a channel position instrument, we can show that this relationship is causal.

In support analysis, we provide evidence that the effect is driven by elected judges, and provide evidence against other channels. We further validate the channel by showing larger effects when Fox talks about crime more on their broadcasts, and by showing that Fox exposure increases voter beliefs about the social importance of drug crime.

The data and programs used to compute the estimates in the paper are available to you or the referees upon

request, should they be needed.

A note on replication:

Part of our data come from the National Corrections Reporting Program (ICPSR 36373). This dataset is restricted; however, one can apply for it with IRB and get access within a month.

We also had to apply separately for data access to each individual state’s Sentencing Commission. Although we can anonymize judges, they are still potentially identifiable by their sentencing cycles (when they are up for election) and entry and retirement dates, meaning we cannot make the data public. However, all data are obtainable through “FOIA-style” (formal use of FOIA was only rarely requested by the states) requests. We have included details of the data application process for each state in the online appendix.

Gallup and Nielsen data are not publicly available as they are proprietary. However, one can request this data from Gallup and Nielsen and merge it to the rest of our dataset. We are happy to post the code for the merging.

We thank you for your consideration and look forward to your editorial decision.

Please, note that we removed Figure 1 A (predicted ideology based on political phrases used by Republicans and Democrats) because it was from Martin and Yurukoglu (2017) and we just cite it instead because we don’t have access to their data to replicate it. Previously our text on Page 5 was ``First, Panel A, from Martin

and Yurukoglu (2017), shows that Fox News tends to use politicized phrases associated with Republican politicians.” Now we write: ”First, Figure 3 from Martin and Yurukoglu (2017), shows that Fox News tends to use politicized phrases associated with Republican politicians.”

On submission of the accepted version a few issues were pointed out to us by the Data Editor. We updated the submission files according to these comments and thank Florian Oswald for his support in their resolution. Here are the comments and our response to them:

1. Please give a good look to this website https://ejdataeditor.github.io/package.html for how your readme and folder structure should look like. It's not compliant right now. Please also observe the data citation requirements. – We updated the structure of the folders. Now restricted data is included in the folder 4 and folder 3 has correct name.

2. We have datasets which are missing or not supplied in non-proprietary format. – fixed, see 1

3. The replication crashes at a certain point where ivreghdfe is called. – we now updated our do-file to specify that package ivreghdfe and related packages (like reghdfe) should be installed on Stata prior to running the code. We also noted in readmy file that some regressions takes time to run and it is normal if regression is running for 20 minutes.

4. There are several inconsistencies between paper results and what we get which you should fix. – we specified in readme that regdfe and ivregdfe commands omit singletons, and in different columns with different controls and fixed effects the number of singletons is different. Hence the number of observations decreases sometimes. As a result, we only report the maximum number of observations before singletons are omitted.

5. Data citation was wrong in the paper’s references but right in the paper’s Data Section and in the Readme file. The paper’s References cited an updated version (up to 2017) of the data but I had access to the older version (up to 2014) cited in the readme. That mistake has been fixed. Both now cite older version of the data that is up to 2014.

6. There was no mistake in the replication file of Table 4 Column 3 at the same time there is no mistake in the paper either. The confusion happened because the paper has a coefficient 0.0001 and a standard error (0.0001). The regression produces a coefficient 0.00005 and a standard error (0.00005). I rounded them in the paper to have the same number of digits as in other columns. To prevent confusion, I changed the table in the paper to have additional digits after the comma in Column III. Now both the replication and the paper show 0.00005s.

7. We thank the Replicator for pointing out this issue. Anderson-Rubin p-value in Table 2 Column III is wrong in the paper and the one produced by replication is correct. We also thank the Replicator here because the correct p-value makes our results stronger. Anderson-Rubin p-values in Columns V and VI are also wrong in the paper and correct in the replication files. These two do not affect the results of the paper because these Columns show null results. I apologize for this mistake that was likely caused by a typo in the copy-paste process. These three p-values are now fixed in the paper.

Sincerely,

Elliott Ash and Mikhail Poyker