

The Ill-Treatment & Torture (ITT) Data Collection Project

Intercoder Reliability Analysis

Courtenay R. Conrad
Department of Political Science, University of California, Merced
courtenayconrad@ucmerced.edu

Jillienne Haglund
Department of Political Science, Florida State University
jhaglund@fsu.edu

Will H. Moore
Department of Political Science, Florida State University
will.moore@fsu.edu

30 December 2013

Version 2.4

This project has received support from the National Science Foundation (NSF); the Department of Political Science at Florida State University, the School of Social Sciences, Humanities and Arts at the University of California at Merced, and the Department of Political Science at the University of North Carolina at Charlotte.

1 Introduction

To what extent are the ITT data reliable? The most typical approach to evaluating the reliability of human rights data produced by content analysis seems to be multiple coding of a case (i.e., having two or more coders code the same document), and then having a meeting when values are not the same. We did not pursue that approach in the ITT project. Instead, we focused our attention on the reliability of the instrument: the operational definitions of the variables. We also tested coders to ensure that they were employing the instrument at a high level. In this document we describe both processes, as well as the results obtained. It consists of a discussion of the main results, and is complimented by a long set of Appendices that provide the results of the various reliability tests that we conducted during the project.

The ITT Data Collection Project conducted a series of intercoder reliability checks in an effort to evaluate the reliability of the ITT coding rules. These reliability checks allow us to assess the extent to which the coding rules used in the data “represent variations in real phenomena rather than extraneous circumstances of measurement, hidden idiosyncrasies of individual analysts, and surreptitious biases of a procedure” (Krippendorff, 2004, 129). Below we describe the process used to conduct the intercoder reliability checks and the measures of reliability we report, namely the proportion of overall agreement and Krippendorff’s α . We also present the results of our intercoder reliability analysis for the variables in the CY and SA ITT data.

2 Measures of Reliability

In order to examine the reliability of a given variable coded in the ITT data, the degree of agreement between the various coders provides a useful indicator of the consistency of the values coded. If agreement between the coders is high, we can feel more confident that the coding rules reflect the actual value of the variable we care about, while if agreement among coders is low, we are less confident that the rules used to measure any given variable capture the true values of ITT variables.

To assess the reliability of the variables that are coded in both the CY and SA data (i.e. Level of Torture, Order of Magnitude, Agency of Control, Victim Type, Formal Complaint, and Restricted Access, etc.), we report two measures, the overall proportion of agreement measure; Fleiss, 1971, 1981) and either Krippendorff’s (2004) α for variables with mutually exclusive values, or Light’s (1971) κ for variables whose values are non-mutually exclusive. The proportion of overall agreement (P_{OA} ; eq. 1) represents the proportion of cases for which the raters agree based on nominal ratings. The proportion of agreement is specific to any category (j) and is equal to the total number of agreements on category j across all

coders divided by the total number of opportunities for agreement on category j . The overall proportion of agreement is the total number of actual agreements, regardless of category (the sum of the total number of agreements on rating level j across all categories) divided by the total number of possible agreements.¹

$$P_{OA} = \frac{\sum_{j=1}^C \sum_{k=1}^K n_{jk} n_{jk-1}}{\sum_{k=1}^K n_{jk} n_{jk-1}} \quad (1)$$

The proportion of overall agreement (P_{OA}) only evaluates the proportion of agreement across a single category (j), relative to the total number of possible agreements. Using the (P_{OA}) as an indicator of agreement for nonmutually exclusive variables either (1) penalizes the coding of multiple categories by a single coder or (2) inflates the number of raters (n) to equal the number of values coded. As such, the P_{OA} measure has been criticized for failing to account for differences associated with agreement on positive ratings and agreement on negative ratings. For example, identifying the absence of a variable (e.g., restricted access) may be less informative than identifying the presence of a particular variable. The P_{OA} may be driven almost entirely by agreement on the absence of a value on a variable. In other words, we are not given information on whether coders agree in their recognition of the presence of particular variables. As a result, we report two additional measures. First, we also present Krippendorff’s (2004) α (eq. 2), which takes into account the expected proportion of correct classification by all coders if the values were assigned randomly (P_e). Second, we present the proportion of overall agreement only for those allegations in which coders identified the presence of a particular variable. That is, we present the proportion of overall agreement based on recognition of particular values on ITT variables included in AI allegations, rather than based on missing values or the absence of given variables.²

$$\alpha_K = \frac{P_{OA} - P_e}{1 - P_e} \quad (2)$$

While Krippendorff’s α is appropriate when coders can only assign one value to a case for a variable, it is not appropriate when coders can assign more than one value. Several of the ITT variables had non-mutually exclusive values, and for those variables we report Light’s (Light, 1971) κ (eq. 3)³ In eq. 3 κ_{kl} is a generalization of Cohen’s (1960) κ , which is similar to Krippendorff’s α , and is calculated as $\frac{P_{OA} - P_{e,k}}{1 - P_{e,k}}$, where e, k represents the random chance of disagreement. More precisely, in eq. 3 κ_{kl} is Cohen’s κ for coders k and l . Light’s κ is equal to the average of all possible combinations of bivariate Cohen’s κ s between raters

¹See Uebersax (2009) for more information on the Proportion of Overall Agreement.

²These results are reported in appendix to this document.

³Light’s κ can be expressed more generally as $\kappa_L = 1 - \frac{d_o}{d_e}$, where d_o represents the observed proportion of disagreement among coders and d_e represents the proportion of expected disagreement due to chance.

and captures the agreement among raters across various categories. In other words, values coded by ITT coders on non-mutually exclusive variables are evaluated individually relative to each other ITT coder.

$$\kappa_L = 1 - \frac{n \sum_{k < l}^c ((1 - \kappa_{kl})/n)}{\binom{v}{2}} \quad (3)$$

We calculated the proportion of overall agreement “by hand” with a spreadsheet, and used the `irr` package in R to calculate Krippendorff’s α and Light’s κ (<http://cran.r-project.org/web/packages/irr/>).

3 InterCoder Reliability Data and Analysis

To assess reliability we emailed the trained coders documents composed of content taken directly from Amnesty International reports. To build a representative sample of content for our ICR tests we needed to ensure that they contained at least one allegation that would lead to assignment of a non-zero value to each of the many variables in the coding scheme. We also wanted to have regional and temporal variation. Thus, rather than give them whole documents, we selected portions of reports (some of which contained allegations, others of which did not) from different countries and years.

The coders were told that they were performing “certification checks” to ensure that they maintained an adequate level of proficiency to continue coding the ITT data.⁴ Coders were instructed to perform content analysis on these documents in the same way as they would for a country they were coding, including entering information into a spreadsheet and documenting their coding notes. To collect the data for the inter-coder reliability (ICR) analysis we emailed the coders these documents twice during the Fall of 2009 and twice during the Spring of 2010. We analyzed the data in the standard way. That is, while certification checks involved comparison each individual’s coding to a “correct” coding, the ICR analysis compared the coding of all of the coders with one another (and did not include the “correct” coding). Due to attrition, the Fall 2009 ICR analyses included 16 coders, while the Spring 2010 analyses included 15 coders and 14 coders respectively.

⁴In addition to using these data for the ICR tests, we put them to dual use, which is why we referred to them as “certification checks.” More specifically, the coders were told that they needed to code these documents to ensure that their coding still met the standard they had met when they completed their training. At the end of training they had to pass what we called a “certification test,” on which they needed to assign the correct values to at least 80% of the variables. To create the “answer key” for the certification test and checks, Conrad coded the documents, and then Moore reviewed the values she assigned. We used the same standard of 80% plus correct (same as the answer key). No coders failed these certification checks.

The text of the the ICR evaluations contain a total of seven valid country year (CY) allegations and 11 specific allegation (SA) allegations. Many coders identified and coded all of the valid CY and SA allegations, though not all did so. Further, some of the coders incorrectly coded text that did not contain an allegation (sometimes miscoding a valid allegation in a way that made it invalid).⁵

1. Certification Check 19 October 2009

From Panama 1997 (i.e., AI Annual Report for Panama 1998):

Ill-treatment by prison guards was reported and prison conditions were harsh.

Several hundred Colombian refugees fleeing persecution by Colombian paramilitary groups entered Panama in the Darién jungle region between March and April. Despite promises to the UN High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) that they would not take immediate action, Panamanian authorities began the forcible return of more than 300 refugees in mid-April. In May the Panamanian Government accepted UNHCR intervention in the crisis. After conducting visits to refugee communities, UNHCR stated that the refugees' claims for asylum were fully justified.

In March Jorge Luis Alvarado Guerra died of a heart attack after being beaten by prison guards at the prison of Tinajitas, in San Miguelito, Panama Province. Three guards were detained and accused of causing his death. At the end of the year, legal proceedings against them were continuing.

In July prisoners at Renacer Prison in Colón, 55 of whom were on hunger-strike, were reportedly tied up and beaten.

In June Amnesty International produced a report, Panama/Colombia: Refugees - the right to escape from death. The report focused on human rights violations against Colombians on both sides of the border fleeing escalating violence in the northwest of Colombia.

2. Certification Check 23 November 2009

From Kenya 1996 (i.e., AI Annual Report for Kenya 1997):

Torture and ill-treatment of both men and women continued to be reported throughout Kenya. In November, Solomon Muruli, a student leader, was reportedly arbitrarily detained by police and tortured. He was held for six days before being left unconscious in a church compound in Kiambu district, Central Province.

At least five people died in custody during the year, apparently as a result of torture. In May, Henry Mutua M'Aritho died, three days after his arrest by Administrative Policemen in Nyambene District. He was reportedly whipped, slapped, kicked and beaten on at least three separate occasions, and on one occasion his legs were burned.

⁵Anyone who wishes to replicate the reliability scores will find in the relevant spreadsheets that we have numbered the CY and SA allegations. We do not identify them here, but do so in the Appendices).

In July, Amodoi Achakar Anamilem died while in police custody in Lokichar, Turkana District. According to eye-witnesses, he was beaten in public, then at a disused building and also at the Lokichar Administration Police camp. He was beaten with his own stick and with gun butts, and received kicks and blows to all parts of his body. He had reportedly been arrested after being incorrectly identified as a robber when the police put pressure on the relatives of the real culprit. Following pressure from local human rights groups, the Attorney General ordered an investigation into the incident in August. However, at the end of the year the police officers allegedly responsible for Amodoi Achakar Anamilem's death were still on duty and no public inquiry had taken place.

Sixty-three people were sentenced to death during the year, including three men who were sentenced to death on appeal, two at the High Court and one at the Court of Appeal. A total of 739 people were on death row at the end of the year. No executions were reported.

3. Certification Check 18 January 2010

From United States 2005 (i.e., AMR 001/004/2005 - "General Info on the U.S."):

Upon illegal entry into the southern United States, four Mexican citizens were beaten by border control guards.

John Alvarez was arrested for petty theft in September 2005. During questioning at a police station, he was tied with his hands above his head for several hours and hit in the face when he refused to cooperate with police.

From United States 2005 (i.e., AI Annual Report for United States 2006):

Although AI previously reported that four Mexican citizens were beaten by border control guards upon entry into the United States, the organization has since learned that the allegation was false.

AI is concerned that Muslims in U.S. prisons are at risk to torture and other forms of ill-treatment.

Investigations into the actions of police accused of hitting John Alvarez were complete by the end of the year, and the case has gone to trial.

Although allegations of U.S. torture in Afghanistan are numerous, AI has been unable to gain regular access to the U.S. detention centers within the country.

4. Certification Check 25 February 2010

From Sierra Leone 1999 (i.e., AI Annual Report for Sierra Leone 2000):

Torture and ill-treatment are widespread in prison in Sierra Leone.

Michael Smith, a Nigerian man working in Sierra Leone, was severely beaten by police when questioned him about his reasons for being in the country. Smith's complaint

led to an investigation of the incident and a trial that resulted in four police officers being removed from duty.

From AFR 001/004/2005 - “Human Rights in Africa”:

Amnesty International is concerned about Guinea’s extradition of political dissidents to Sierra Leone, where they are at risk of torture.

4 InterCoder Reliability Scores

4.1 Reliability for Country Year (CY) Data

Table 1 presents both the proportion of overall agreement and either Krippendorff’s α or Light’s κ for the ITT CY variables. These values represent reliability for the ITT CY variables conditional on coders correctly identifying allegations during the ICR checks. Each of the variables except victim type produces an acceptable score, and victim type is close to the conventional 0.8 level.

Table 1: **POA and α_K or κ_L for ITT Country-Year Variables**

	Proportion of Overall Agreement	$\alpha_K^\dagger / \kappa_L^\dagger$
Level of Torture	1.00	1.00 [†]
Agency of Control	0.900	0.920 [‡]
Victim Type	0.825	0.781 [‡]
Restricted Access	0.908	0.816 [†]

4.2 Reliability for Specific Allegation (SA) Data

Table 2 reports the reliability scores for each of the variables released in the Specific Allegations (SA) dataset. All of the variables except victim type achieve an acceptable score.

Table 2: POA and α_K or Light's κ_L for ITT Specific Allegation Variables

	Proportion of Overall Agreement	$\alpha_K^\dagger / \kappa_L^\ddagger$
Order of Magnitude	0.951	0.953 [†]
Victim Type	0.727	0.618 [‡]
Expectation Torture Has/Will Occur	1.00	1.00 [†]
Torture Type	0.919	0.932 [‡]
Torture Death	0.901	0.846 [†]
Agency of Control	0.893	0.882 [‡]
Formal Compliant Filed	0.972	0.965 [†]
Investigation of Torturers	0.950	0.942 [†]
Outcome of Investigation	0.799	0.817 [‡]
Location of Adjudication/Mediation	0.855	0.797 [†]
Outcome of Adjudication/Mediation	0.838	0.803 [†]
Transborder Torture	1.00	1.00 [†]
Destination	1.00	1.00 [†]

5 Further Discussion

The ITT data were created using a more complex coding procedure than is common, and this complicates the scoring of reliability. These methods have been created for schemes in which a coder assigns a value for a variable, and while that describes well the data that the ITT coders recorded, the ITT data the users download are not those “raw data” as coded by coders. Some of the versions of the country year (CY) data are aggregated quite extensively. The specific allegations (SA) data went through a considerable de-duplication process. Users will want to consult the User Guides for details.

We report in a series of Appendices a large amount of reliability scores on individual variables that coders coded, but are not necessarily released in their raw form (except as replication files). Few users of the data will be interested in the Appendices, but we include them in the interest of full disclosure.

References

- Cohen, J. (1960). A coefficient of agreement for nominal scales. *Educational and Psychological Measurement* 20, 37–46.
- Fleiss, J. L. (1971). Measuring nominal scale agreement among many raters. *Psychological Bulletin* 76(5), 378–382.
- Fleiss, J. L. (1981). The measurement of interrater agreement. In J. Fleiss, B. Levin, and M. Paik (Eds.), *Statistical methods for rates and proportions*, pp. 212–236. New York: Wiley.
- Krippendorff, K. (2004). *Content analysis: An introduction to its methodology*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- Light, R. J. (1971). Measures of response agreement for qualitative data: Some generalizations and alternatives. *Psychological Bulletin* 76(5), 365–377.
- Uebersax, J. (2009). *Raw Agreement Indices*. <http://www.john-uebersax.com/stat/raw.htm>.

6 Appendices

6.1 InterCoder Reliability for All Allegations Identified

The values reported in Table 3 represent reliability based on all allegations identified, even allegations that were incorrectly identified by coders during the ICR checks. Table 4 shows Krippendorff’s α for all allegations identified by coders in both the CY and SA data.

Table 5 presents both the proportion of overall agreement and Krippendorff’s α for only the CY data. Again, all allegations are included in this table, including those that were incorrectly identified by coders in the ICR checks.

6.2 Intercoder Reliability Conditional on Recognition of Variable Presence in AI Reports

Table 7 presents the proportion of overall agreement for only those reliability checks in which coders identified the presence of a particular variable. That is, Table 7 shows the reliability of certain variables conditional on the recognition of the presence of these variables in the content of AI reports, not based on the absence of particular variables in the AI reports.⁶

6.3 Raw Reliability Data

The following frequency tables (11-33) show raw agreement of r raters for each of our variables. Each table provides the distribution of raters for a given variable by Allegation and Value. For each Allegation (i.e., a row), i , and Value, k , r_{ik} represents the number of raters who classified Allegation i as Value k . Each table reports the raw reliability data, the proportion of overall agreement for individual ICR checks, and the overall proportion of agreement for each variable.

Table 8: Distribution of Raters by Allegation and Response Value (Recognition of Allegation)

ICR Check Date	Allegation	Value?		Total
		0	1	
19 October 2009 (N=16)	SA1 (Guerra)	0	16	16

Continued on Next Page

⁶Some of these ICR calculations are based on recognition of the presence of a variable for only a single allegation, and may not accurately reflect the reliability of these variables.

Continued from Previous Page

	SA2 (Renacer Prison [# Victims -9])	3	13	16
	SA3 (Renacer Prison [# Victims 55])	12	4	16
	SA4 (Colombian Refugees)	13	3	16
	CY1 (Motive 0)	0	16	16
	CY2 (Motive 1)	15	1	16
	Subtotal	43	53	96
	P_0			0.804
<i>23 November 2009 (N=16)</i>	SA1 (M'Aritho)	0	16	16
	SA2 (Anamilem)	0	16	16
	SA3 (Muruli)	0	16	16
	SA4 (At least...)	5	11	16
	SA5 (M'Aritho 2)	15	1	16
	SA6 (Anamilem 2)	15	1	16
	SA7 (Anamilem 3)	15	1	16
	CY1 (No Death 1)	1	15	16
	CY2 (No Death 2)	13	3	16
	CY3 (Death)	10	6	16
	Subtotal	74	86	160
	P_0			0.821
<i>18 January 2010 (N=15)</i>	SA1 (Mexicans)	2	13	15
	SA2 (Alvarez)	0	15	15
	SA3 (Mexicans Negation)	4	11	15
	SA4 (Alvarez Trial)	0	15	15
	SA5 (Muslim Prison)	11	4	15
	CY1 (Muslim Prison)	4	11	15
	CY2 (US in Afghanistan)	0	15	15
	CY3 (Lack of Access) ⁷	11	4	15
	CY4 (Afghanistan)	14	1	15
	Subtotal	46	89	135
	P_0			0.771
<i>25 February 2010 (N=14)</i>	SA1 (Smith)	1	13	14
	SA2 (Guinea Transborder)	12	2	14
	SA3 (Expectation Sierra Leone)	13	1	14
	CY1 (Sierra Leone 1)	0	14	14
	CY2 (Sierra Leone 2)	13	1	14
	CY3 (Guinea Transborder)	3	11	14
	CY4 (Expectation Sierra Leone)	3	11	14
	Subtotal	53	45	98
	P_0			0.797
	Total	216	273	489
	Overall P_0			.800

Continued on Next Page

⁷Coders have the option to include Lack of Access allegations in conjunction with other allegations *or* to code them as entirely separate allegations.

Table 9: Distribution of Raters by Allegation and Response Value [Variable: Duplicate]

ICR Check Date	Allegation	Value?		Total
		0	1	
19 October 2009	SA1 (Guerra)	16	0	16
	SA2 (Renacer Prison [# Victims -9])	13	0	13
	SA3 (Renacer Prison [# Victims 55])	4	0	4
	SA4 (Colombian Refugees)	3	0	3
	CY1 (Motive 0)	16	0	16
	CY2 (Motive 1)	1	0	1
	Subtotal	53	0	53
	P_0			1.0
23 November 2009	SA1 (M'Aritho)	16	0	16
	SA2 (Anamilem)	16	0	16
	SA3 (Muruli)	16	0	16
	SA4 (At least...)	11	0	11
	SA5 (M'Aritho 2)	1	0	1
	SA6 (Anamilem 2)	1	0	1
	SA7 (Anamilem 3)	1	0	1
	CY1 (No Death 1)	16	0	16
	CY2 (No Death 2)	3	0	3
	CY3 (Death)	6	0	6
	Subtotal	87	0	87
P_0			1.0	
18 January 2010 (N=15)	SA1 (Mexicans)	13	0	13
	SA2 (Alvarez)	15	0	15
	SA3 (Mexicans Negation)	2	9	11
	SA4 (Alvarez Trial)	0	15	15
	SA5 (Muslim Prison)	4	0	4
	CY1 (Muslim Prison)	11	0	11
	CY2 (US in Afghanistan)	15	0	15
	CY3 (Lack of Access)	4	0	4
	CY4 (Afghanistan)	1	0	1
	Subtotal	65	24	89
	P_0			0.965
25 February 2010 (N=14)	SA1 (Smith)	13	0	13
	SA2 (Guinea Transborder)	2	0	2
	SA3 (Expectation Sierra Leone)	1	0	1
	CY1 (Sierra Leone 1)	14	0	14
	CY2 (Sierra Leone 2)	0	1	1
	CY3 (Guinea Transborder)	11	0	11
	CY4 (Expectation Sierra Leone)	11	0	11

Continued from Previous Page

Subtotal	52	1	53
P_0			1.0
Total	256	24	280
Overall P_0			0.989

Table 10: Distribution of Raters by Allegation and Response Value [Variable: Location of Torture]

ICR Check Date	Allegation	Value?		Total
		0	1	
<i>19 October 2009</i>	SA1 (Guerra)	16	0	16
	SA2 (Renacer Prison [# Victims -9])	13	0	13
	SA3 (Renacer Prison [# Victims 55])	4	0	4
	SA4 (Colombian Refugees)	3	0	3
	CY1 (Motive 0)	16	0	16
	CY2 (Motive 1)	1	0	1
	Subtotal	53	0	53
	P_0			1.0
<i>23 November 2009</i>	SA1 (M'Aritho)	16	0	16
	SA2 (Anamilem)	16	0	16
	SA3 (Muruli)	16	0	16
	SA4 (At least...)	11	0	11
	SA5 (M'Aritho 2)	1	0	1
	SA6 (Anamilem 2)	1	0	1
	SA7 (Anamilem 3)	1	0	1
	CY1 (No Death 1)	15	0	15
	CY2 (No Death 2)	3	0	3
	CY3 (Death)	6	0	6
	Subtotal	86	0	86
P_0			1.0	
<i>18 January 2010 (N=15)</i>	SA1 (Mexicans)	13	0	13
	SA2 (Alvarez)	15	0	15
	SA3 (Mexicans Negation)	11	0	11
	SA4 (Alvarez Trial)	15	0	15
	SA5 (Muslim Prison)	4	0	4
	CY1 (Muslim Prison)	11	0	11
	CY2 (US in Afghanistan)	1	14	15
	CY3 (Lack of Access)	4	0	4
	CY4 (Afghanistan)	1	0	1
	Subtotal	75	14	89
	P_0			0.973
<i>25 February 2010 (N=14)</i>	SA1 (Smith)	13	0	13
	SA2 (Guinea Transborder)	2	0	2
	SA3 (Expectation Sierra Leone)	1	0	1

Continued on Next Page

Continued from Previous Page

CY1 (Sierra Leone 1)	14	0	14
CY2 (Sierra Leone 2)	1	0	1
CY3 (Guinea Transborder)	11	0	11
CY4 (Expectation Sierra Leone)	11	0	11
Subtotal	53	0	53
P_0			1.0
Total	267	14	281
Overall P_0			0.992

Table 11: Distribution of Raters by Allegation and Response Value [Variable: Order of Magnitude of Victims (Note: Specific Only)]

ICR Check Date	Allegation	Value Coded?									Total
		0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	-9	
19 October 2009	SA1 (Guerra)	0	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
	SA2 (Renacer Prison)	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	9	13
	SA3 (Renacer Prison)	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
	SA4 (Colombian Refugees)	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	3
	Subtotal	0	16	8	3	0	0	0	0	9	36
	P_0										0.826
23 November 2009	SA1 (M'Aritho)	0	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
	SA2 (Anamilem)	0	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
	SA3 (Muruli)	0	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
	SA4 (At least...)	0	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	11
	SA5 (M'Aritho)	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
	SA6 (Anamilem 2)	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
	SA7 (Anamilem 3)	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
	Subtotal	0	61	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	62
P_0										0.976	
18 January 2010 (N=15)	SA1 (Mexicans)	0	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
	SA2 (Alvarez)	0	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
	SA3 (Mexicans Negation)	0	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
	SA4 (Alvarez Trial)	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
	SA5 (Muslim Prison)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	4
	Subtotal	0	44	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	48
P_0										1.0	
25 February 2010 (N=14)	SA1 (Smith)	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
	SA2 (Guinea Transborder)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2
	SA3 (Expectation Sierra Leone)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
	Subtotal	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	16
	P_0										1.0
Total	13	77	8	3	0	0	0	0	17	118	
Overall P_0										0.989	

Continued on Next Page

Table 12: Distribution of Raters by Allegation and Response Value [Variable: Type of Victim (NOTE: Not mutually exclusive (e.g., SA4, CY2))]

ICR Check Date	Allegation	Value Coded?					Total
		0	1	2	3	4	
19 October 2009	SA1 (Guerra)	2	14	0	0	0	16
	SA2 (Renacer Prison)	0	13	0	0	0	13
	SA3 (Renacer Prison)	0	4	0	0	0	4
	SA4 (Colombian Refugees)	0	1	0	3	0	4
	CY1 (Motive 0)	2	14	0	0	0	16
	CY2 (Motive 1)	0	1	0	1	0	1
	Subtotal	4	47	0	4	0	55
	P_0						0.819
23 November 2009	SA1 (M'Aritho)	13	3	0	0	0	16
	SA2 (Anamilem)	6	10	0	0	0	16
	SA3 (Muruli)	6	0	6	4	0	16
	SA4 (At least...)	10	1	0	0	0	11
	SA5 (M'Aritho)	1	0	0	0	0	1
	SA6 (Anamilem 2)	1	0	0	0	0	1
	SA7 (Anamilem 3)	1	0	0	0	0	1
	CY1 (No Death 1)	15	0	0	0	0	15
	CY2 (No Death 2)	1	0	2	0	0	3
	CY3 (Death)	5	1	0	0	0	6
	Subtotal	59	15	8	4	0	86
P_0						0.628	
18 January 2010 (N=15)	SA1 (Mexicans)	0	10	0	12	0	22
	SA2 (Alvarez)	0	15	0	0	0	15
	SA3 (Mexicans Negation)	0	6	0	9	0	15
	SA4 (Alvarez Trial)	8	7	0	0	0	15
	SA5 (Muslim Prison)	0	4	0	4	0	8
	CY1 (Muslim Prison)	0	7	0	11	0	14
	CY2 (US in Afghanistan)	13	1	0	1	0	15
	CY3 (Lack of Access)	4	0	0	0	0	4
	CY4 (Afghanistan)	1	0	0	0	0	1
	Subtotal	26	50	0	37	0	113
P_0						0.582	
25 February 2010 (N=14)	SA1 (Smith)	2	0	0	11	0	13
	SA2 (Guinea Transborder)	1	0	1	0	0	2
	SA3 (Expectation Sierra Leone)	0	0	1	0	0	1
	CY1 (Sierra Leone 1)	2	12	0	0	0	14
	CY2 (Sierra Leone 2)	0	1	0	0	0	1
	CY3 (Guinea Transborder)	0	11	0	0	0	11
	CY4 (Expectation Sierra Leone)	1	9	0	2	0	11

Continued on Next Page

Continued from Previous Page

Subtotal	6	33	2	13	0	54
P_0						0.739
Total	70	95	10	21	0	196
Overall P_0						0.666

Table 13: Distribution of Raters by Allegation and Response Value [Variable: Expectation Torture Has/Will Occur]

ICR Check Date	Allegation	Value Coded?		Total
		0	1	
19 October 2009	SA1 (Guerra)	16	0	16
	SA2 (Renacer Prison [# Victims -9])	13	0	13
	SA3 (Renacer Prison [# Victims 55])	4	0	4
	SA4 (Colombian Refugees)	1	2	3
	CY1 (Motive 0)	16	0	16
	CY2 (Motive 1)	1	0	1
	Subtotal	51	2	53
	P_0			0.994
23 November 2009	SA1 (M'Aritho)	16	0	16
	SA2 (Anamilem)	16	0	16
	SA3 (Muruli)	16	0	16
	SA4 (At least...)	11	0	11
	SA5 (M'Aritho)	1	0	1
	SA6 (Anamilem 2)	1	0	1
	SA7 (Anamilem 3)	1	0	1
	CY1 (No Death 1)	15	0	15
	CY2 (No Death 2)	3	0	3
	CY3 (Death)	6	0	6
	Subtotal	86	0	86
		P_0		
18 January 2010 (N=15)	SA1 (Mexicans)	13	0	13
	SA2 (Alvarez)	15	0	15
	SA3 (Mexicans Negation)	11	0	11
	SA4 (Alvarez Trial)	15	0	15
	SA5 (Muslim Prison)	0	4	4
	CY1 (Muslim Prison)	0	11	11
	CY2 (US in Afghanistan)	15	0	15
	CY3 (Lack of Access)	4	0	4
	CY4 (Afghanistan)	1	0	1
	Subtotal	74	15	89
		P_0		
25 February 2010 (N=14)	SA1 (Smith)	13	0	13
	SA2 (Guinea Transborder)	2	0	2

Continued on Next Page

Continued from Previous Page			
SA3 (Expectation Sierra Leone)	0	1	1
CY1 (Sierra Leone 1)	14	0	14
CY2 (Sierra Leone 2)	1	0	1
CY3 (Guinea Transborder)	9	2	11
CY4 (Expectation Sierra Leone)	0	11	11
Subtotal	39	14	0
P_0			0.936
Total	250	31	281
Overall P_0			0.988

Table 14: Distribution of Raters by Allegation and Response Value [Variable: Ill-Treatment/Abuse Mentioned]

ICR Check Date	Allegation	Value Coded?		Total
		0	1	
19 October 2009	SA1 (Guerra)	15	1	16
	SA2 (Renacer Prison [# Victims -9])	12	1	13
	SA3 (Renacer Prison [# Victims 55])	4	0	4
	SA4 (Colombian Refugees)	2	1	3
	CY1 (Motive 0)	0	16	16
	CY2 (Motive 1)	1	0	1
	Subtotal	34	19	53
	P_0			0.911
23 November 2009	SA1 (M'Aritho)	16	0	16
	SA2 (Anamilem)	16	0	16
	SA3 (Muruli)	15	1	16
	SA4 (At least...)	10	1	11
	SA5 (M'Aritho)	1	0	1
	SA6 (Anamilem 2)	1	0	1
	SA7 (Anamilem 3)	1	0	1
	CY1 (No Death 1)	1	15	16
	CY2 (No Death 2)	1	2	3
	CY3 (Death)	6	0	6
Subtotal	68	19	87	
P_0			0.951	
18 January 2010 (N=15)	SA1 (Mexicans)	13	0	13
	SA2 (Alvarez)	15	0	15
	SA3 (Mexicans Negation)	11	0	11
	SA4 (Alvarez Trial)	15	0	15
	SA5 (Muslim Prison)	0	4	4
	CY1 (Muslim Prison)	6	5	11
	CY2 (US in Afghanistan)	14	1	15
	CY3 (Lack of Access)	0	4	4
CY4 (Afghanistan)	0	0	1	

Continued on Next Page

Continued from Previous Page

	Subtotal	74	14	88
	P_0			0.915
<i>25 February 2010 (N=14)</i>	SA1 (Smith)	12	1	13
	SA2 (Guinea Transborder)	2	0	2
	SA3 (Expectation Sierra Leone)	1	0	1
	CY1 (Sierra Leone 1)	1	13	14
	CY2 (Sierra Leone 2)	0	1	1
	CY3 (Guinea Transborder)	11	0	11
	CY4 (Expectation Sierra Leone)	11	0	11
	Subtotal	38	15	53
	P_0			0.912
	Total	214	67	281
	Overall P_0			0.917

Table 15: Distribution of Raters by Allegation and Response Value [Variable: Unknown Torture]

ICR Check Date	Allegation	Value Coded?		Total
		0	1	
<i>19 October 2009</i>	SA1 (Guerra)	16	0	16
	SA2 (Renacer Prison [# Victims -9])	13	0	13
	SA3 (Renacer Prison [# Victims 55])	4	0	4
	SA4 (Colombian Refugees)	2	1	3
	CY1 (Motive 0)	15	1	16
	CY2 (Motive 1)	1	0	1
	Subtotal	51	2	53
	P_0			0.948
<i>23 November 2009</i>	SA1 (M'Aritho)	16	0	16
	SA2 (Anamilem)	16	0	16
	SA3 (Muruli)	1	15	16
	SA4 (At least...)	0	11	11
	SA5 (M'Aritho)	1	0	1
	SA6 (Anamilem 2)	1	0	1
	SA7 (Anamilem 3)	1	0	1
	CY1 (No Death 1)	0	15	15
	CY2 (No Death 2)	1	2	3
	CY3 (Death)	0	6	6
Subtotal	37	49	86	
	P_0			0.968
<i>18 January 2010 (N=15)</i>	SA1 (Mexicans)	13	0	13
	SA2 (Alvarez)	15	0	15
	SA3 (Mexicans Negation)	11	0	11
	SA4 (Alvarez Trial)	15	0	15
	SA5 (Muslim Prison)	0	4	4

Continued on Next Page

Continued from Previous Page

	CY1 (Muslim Prison)	3	8	11
	CY2 (US in Afghanistan)	0	15	15
	CY3 (Lack of Access)	4	0	4
	CY4 (Afghanistan)	1	0	1
	Subtotal	62	27	89
	P_0			0.953
25 February 2010 (N=14)	SA1 (Smith)	12	1	13
	SA2 (Guinea Transborder)	1	1	2
	SA3 (Expectation Sierra Leone)	0	1	1
	CY1 (Sierra Leone 1)	0	14	14
	CY2 (Sierra Leone 2)	0	1	1
	CY3 (Guinea Transborder)	9	2	11
	CY4 (Expectation Sierra Leone)	5	6	11
	Subtotal	27	26	53
	P_0			0.782
	Total	177	104	281
	Overall P_0			0.928

Table 16: Distribution of Raters by Allegation and Response Value [Variable: Scarring Torture]

ICR Check Date	Allegation	Value Coded?		Total
		0	1	
19 October 2009	SA1 (Guerra)	0	16	16
	SA2 (Renacer Prison [# Victims -9])	0	13	13
	SA3 (Renacer Prison [# Victims 55])	0	4	4
	SA4 (Colombian Refugees)	3	0	3
	CY1 (Motive 0)	16	0	16
	CY2 (Motive 1)	1	0	1
	Subtotal	20	33	53
	P_0			1.0
23 November 2009	SA1 (M'Aritho)	0	16	16
	SA2 (Anamilem)	0	16	16
	SA3 (Muruli)	16	0	16
	SA4 (At least...)	11	0	11
	SA5 (M'Aritho)	0	1	1
	SA6 (Anamilem 2)	0	1	1
	SA7 (Anamilem 3)	0	1	1
	CY1 (No Death 1)	15	0	15
	CY2 (No Death 2)	3	0	3
	CY3 (Death)	6	0	6
	Subtotal	51	35	86
P_0			1.0	
18 January 2010 (N=15)	SA1 (Mexicans)	2	11	13

Continued on Next Page

Continued from Previous Page

	SA2 (Alvarez)	1	14	15
	SA3 (Mexicans Negation)	4	7	11
	SA4 (Alvarez Trial)	1	14	15
	SA5 (Muslim Prison)	4	0	4
	CY1 (Muslim Prison)	11	0	11
	CY2 (US in Afghanistan)	15	0	15
	CY3 (Lack of Access)	4	0	4
	CY4 (Afghanistan)	1	0	1
	Subtotal	43	46	89
	P_0			0.849
<i>25 February 2010 (N=14)</i>	SA1 (Smith)	2	11	13
	SA2 (Guinea Transborder)	2	0	2
	SA3 (Expectation Sierra Leone)	1	0	1
	CY1 (Sierra Leone 1)	14	0	14
	CY2 (Sierra Leone 2)	1	0	1
	CY3 (Guinea Transborder)	11	0	11
	CY4 (Expectation Sierra Leone)	11	0	11
	Subtotal	42	11	53
	P_0			0.921
	Total	156	125	281
	Overall P_0			0.941

Table 17: Distribution of Raters by Allegation and Response Value [Variable: Clean/Stealth Torture]

ICR Check Date	Allegation	Value Coded?		Total
		0	1	
<i>19 October 2009</i>	SA1 (Guerra)	16	0	16
	SA2 (Renacer Prison [# Victims -9])	8	5	13
	SA3 (Renacer Prison [# Victims 55])	1	3	4
	SA4 (Colombian Refugees)	3	0	3
	CY1 (Motive 0)	16	0	16
	CY2 (Motive 1)	1	0	1
	Subtotal	45	8	53
	P_0			0.869
<i>23 November 2009</i>	SA1 (M'Aritho)	16	0	16
	S2 (Anamilem)	16	0	16
	S3 (Muruli)	16	0	16
	S4 (At least...)	11	0	11
	S5 (M'Aritho)	1	0	1
	S6 (Anamilem 2)	1	0	1
	S7 (Anamilem 3)	1	0	1
	CY1 (No Death)	15	0	15
	CY2 (No Death)	3	0	3

Continued on Next Page

Continued from Previous Page				
	CY3 (Death)	6	0	6
	Subtotal	86	0	86
	P_0			1.0
<i>18 January 2010 (N=15)</i>	SA1 (Mexicans)	13	0	13
	SA2 (Alvarez)	3	12	15
	SA3 (Mexicans Negation)	11	0	11
	SA4 (Alvarez Trial)	12	3	15
	SA5 (Muslim Prison)	4	0	4
	CY1 (Muslim Prison)	11	0	11
	CY2 (US in Afghanistan)	15	0	15
	CY3 (Lack of Access)	4	0	4
	CY4 (Afghanistan)	1	0	1
	Subtotal	74	15	89
	P_0			0.860
<i>25 February 2010 (N=14)</i>	SA1 (Smith)	13	0	13
	SA2 (Guinea Transborder)	2	0	2
	SA3 (Expectation Sierra Leone)	1	0	1
	CY1 (Sierra Leone 1)	14	0	14
	CY2 (Sierra Leone 2)	1	0	1
	CY3 (Guinea Transborder)	11	0	11
	CY4 (Expectation Sierra Leone)	11	0	11
	Subtotal	53	0	53
	P_0			1.0
	Total	258	23	281
	Overall P_0			0.931

Table 18: Distribution of Raters by Allegation and Response Value [Variable: Torture Death]

ICR Check Date	Allegation	Value Coded?		Total
		0	1	
<i>19 October 2009</i>	SA1 (Guerra)	4	12	16
	SA2 (Renacer Prison [# Victims -9])	13	0	13
	SA3 (Renacer Prison [# Victims 55])	4	0	4
	SA4 (Colombian Refugees)	3	0	3
	CY1 (Motive 0)	16	0	16
	CY2 (Motive 1)	1	0	1
	Subtotal	41	12	53
	P_0			0.853
<i>23 November 2009</i>	SA1 (M'Aritho)	3	13	16
	SA2 (Anamilem)	1	15	16
	SA3 (Muruli)	0	16	16
	SA4 (At least...)	0	11	11
	SA5 (M'Aritho)	0	1	1
	SA6 (Anamilem 2)	0	1	1

Continued on Next Page

Continued from Previous Page

	SA7 (Anamilem 3)	0	1	1
	CY1 (No Death)	15	0	15
	CY2 (No Death)	3	0	3
	CY3 (Death)	0	6	6
	Subtotal	22	64	86
	P_0			0.900
18 January 2010 (N=15)	SA1 (Mexicans)	13	0	13
	SA2 (Alvarez)	15	0	15
	SA3 (Mexicans Negation)	11	0	11
	SA4 (Alvarez Trial)	15	0	15
	SA5 (Muslim Prison)	4	0	4
	CY1 (Muslim Prison)	11	0	11
	CY2 (US in Afghanistan)	15	0	15
	CY3 (Lack of Access)	4	0	4
	CY4 (Afghanistan)	1	0	1
	Subtotal	89	0	89
	P_0			1.0
25 February 2010 (N=14)	SA1 (Smith)	13	0	13
	SA2 (Guinea Transborder)	2	0	2
	SA3 (Expectation Sierra Leone)	1	0	1
	CY1 (Sierra Leone 1)	14	0	14
	CY2 (Sierra Leone 2)	1	0	1
	CY3 (Guinea Transborder)	11	0	11
	CY4 (Expectation Sierra Leone)	11	0	11
	Subtotal	53	0	53
	P_0			1.0
	Total	205	76	281
	Overall P_0			0.939

Table 19: Distribution of Raters by Allegation and Response Value [Variable: Agency of Control]

ICR Check Date	Allegation	Value Coded?									Total
		0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
19 October 2009	SA1 (Guerra)	0	0	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
	SA2 (Renacer Prison)	0	0	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
	SA3 (Renacer Prison)	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
	SA4 (Colombian Refugees)	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3
	CY1 (Motive 0)	0	0	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
	CY2 (Motive 1)	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
	Subtotal	2	0	50	0	0	0	1	0	0	53
	P_0										0.994
23 November 2009	SA1 (M'Aritho)	0	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
	SA2 (Anamilem)	0	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16

Continued on Next Page

Continued from Previous Page

	SA3 (Muruli)	0	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
	SA4 (At least...)	8	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
	SA5 (M'Aritho)	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
	SA6 (Anamilem 2)	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
	SA7 (Anamilem 3)	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
	CY1 (No Death)	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
	CY2 (No Death)	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
	CY3 (Death)	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
	Subtotal	31	55	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	86
	P_0										0.952
18 January 2010 (N=15)	SA1 (Mexicans)	0	5	0	2	0	0	0	6	0	13
	SA2 (Alvarez)	0	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
	SA3 (Mexicans Negation)	0	5	0	1	0	0	0	5	0	11
	SA4 (Alvarez Trial)	0	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
	SA5 (Muslim Prison)	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
	CY1 (Muslim Prison)	0	0	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
	CY2 (US in Afghanistan)	12	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
	CY3 (Lack of Access)	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
	CY4 (Afghanistan)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
	Subtotal	16	40	18	3	0	0	0	11	0	88
	P_0										0.761
25 February 2010 (N=14)	SA1 (Smith)	0	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
	SA2 (Guinea Transborder)	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
	SA3 (Expectation Sierra Leone)	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
	CY1 (Sierra Leone 1)	1	0	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
	CY2 (Sierra Leone 2)	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
	CY3 (Guinea Transborder)	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	11
	CY4 (Expectation Sierra Leone)	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
	Subtotal	25	13	14	0	0	0	0	2	0	54
	P_0										0.918
	Total	74	108	82	3	0	0	1	13	0	281
	Overall P_0										0.807

Table 20: Distribution of Raters by Allegation and Response Value [Variable: Formal Complaint Filed]

ICR Check Date	Allegation	Value Coded?			Total
		-1	0	1	
19 October 2009	SA1 (Guerra)	0	0	16	16
	SA2 (Renacer Prison [# Victims -9])	0	13	0	13
	SA3 (Renacer Prison [# Victims 55])	0	4	0	4
	SA4 (Colombian Refugees)	0	1	2	3
	CY1 (Motive 0)	0	16	0	16
	CY2 (Motive 1)	0	1	0	1

Continued on Next Page

Continued from Previous Page

	Subtotal	0	35	18	53
	P_0				0.994
<i>23 November 2009</i>	SA1 (M'Aritho)	0	16	0	16
	SA2 (Anamilem)	0	1	15	16
	SA3 (Muruli)	0	16	0	16
	SA4 (At least...)	0	11	0	11
	SA5 (M'Aritho)	0	1	0	1
	SA6 (Anamilem 2)	0	0	1	1
	SA7 (Anamilem 3)	0	0	1	1
	CY1 (No Death)	0	15	0	15
	CY2 (No Death)	0	3	0	3
	CY3 (Death)	0	6	0	6
	Subtotal	0	69	17	86
	P_0				0.972
<i>18 January 2010 (N=15)</i>	SA1 (Mexicans)	0	13	0	13
	SA2 (Alvarez)	0	15	0	15
	SA3 (Mexicans Negation)	0	11	0	11
	SA4 (Alvarez Trial)	0	1	14	15
	SA5 (Muslim Prison)	0	4	0	4
	CY1 (Muslim Prison)	0	11	0	11
	CY2 (US in Afghanistan)	0	15	0	15
	CY3 (Lack of Access)	0	4	0	4
	CY4 (Afghanistan)	0	1	0	1
	Subtotal	0	75	14	89
	P_0				0.973
<i>25 February 2010 (N=14)</i>	SA1 (Smith)	0	0	13	13
	SA2 (Guinea Transborder)	0	2	0	2
	SA3 (Expectation Sierra Leone)	0	1	0	1
	CY1 (Sierra Leone 1)	0	14	0	14
	CY2 (Sierra Leone 2)	0	1	0	1
	CY3 (Guinea Transborder)	0	11	0	11
	CY4 (Expectation Sierra Leone)	0	11	0	11
	Subtotal	0	40	13	53
	P_0				1.0
	Total	0	219	62	281
	Overall P_0				0.981

Table 21: Distribution of Raters by Allegation and Response Value [Variable: Investigation of Torturers]

ICR Check Date	Allegation	Value Coded?			Total
		-1	0	1	
<i>19 October 2009</i>	SA1 (Guerra)	0	0	16	16
	SA2 (Renacer Prison [# Victims -9])	0	13	0	13

Continued on Next Page

Continued from Previous Page

	SA3 (Renacer Prison [# Victims 55])	0	4	0	4
	SA4 (Colombian Refugees)	0	2	1	3
	CY1 (Motive 0)	0	16	0	16
	CY2 (Motive 1)	0	1	0	1
	Subtotal	0	36	17	53
	P_0				0.994
23 November 2009	SA1 (M'Aritho)	0	16	0	16
	SA2 (Anamilem)	3	1	12	16
	SA3 (Muruli)	0	16	0	16
	SA4 (At least...)	0	11	0	11
	SA5 (M'Aritho)	0	1	0	1
	SA6 (Anamilem 2)	0	0	1	1
	SA7 (Anamilem 3)	0	0	1	1
	CY1 (No Death)	0	15	0	15
	CY2 (No Death)	0	3	0	3
	CY3 (Death)	0	6	0	6
	Subtotal	3	69	14	86
	P_0				0.993
18 January 2010 (N=15)	SA1 (Mexicans)	0	13	0	13
	SA2 (Alvarez)	0	15	0	15
	SA3 (Mexicans Negation)	0	11	0	11
	SA4 (Alvarez Trial)	0	0	15	15
	SA5 (Muslim Prison)	0	4	0	4
	CY1 (Muslim Prison)	0	11	0	11
	CY2 (US in Afghanistan)	0	15	0	15
	CY3 (Lack of Access)	0	4	0	4
	CY4 (Afghanistan)	0	1	0	1
	Subtotal	0	74	15	89
	P_0				1.0
25 February 2010 (N=14)	SA1 (Smith)	0	0	13	13
	SA2 (Guinea Transborder)	0	2	0	2
	SA3 (Expectation Sierra Leone)	0	1	0	1
	CY1 (Sierra Leone 1)	0	14	0	14
	CY2 (Sierra Leone 2)	0	1	0	1
	CY3 (Guinea Transborder)	0	11	0	11
	CY4 (Expectation Sierra Leone)	0	11	0	11
	Subtotal	0	40	13	53
	P_0				1.0
	Total	3	219	59	281
	Overall P_0				0.968

Table 3: **Proportion of Overall Agreement for ITT Variables**

	Proportion of Overall Agreement
Recognition of an Allegation	0.800
Duplicate	0.989
Location of Torture	0.992
Order of Magnitude (SA Only)	0.989
Victim Type	0.666
Expectation Torture Has/Will Occur	0.988
Ill-Treatment/Abuse Mentioned	0.917
Unknown Torture	0.928
Scarring Torture	0.941
Clean/Stealth Torture	0.931
Torture Death	0.939
Agency of Control	0.807
Formal Compliant Filed	0.981
Investigation of Torturers	0.968
Outcome of Investigation	0.870
Location of Adjudication/Mediation	0.910
Outcome of Adjudication/Mediation	0.892
Transborder Torture	0.975
Destination	0.895
AI Negates Allegation	0.976
Level of Torture	0.796
AI Comments on Access	0.911

Table 4: **Krippendorff's α for ITT Variables**

	Krippendorff's α
Recognition of an Allegation	0.600
Duplicate	0.978
Location of Torture	0.984
Order of Magnitude (SA Only)	0.978
Victim Type	0.332
Expectation Torture Has/Will Occur	0.976
Ill-Treatment/Abuse Mentioned	0.834
Unknown Torture	0.856
Scarring Torture	0.882
Clean/Stealth Torture	0.862
Torture Death	0.878
Agency of Control	0.614
Formal Compliant Filed	0.962
Investigation of Torturers	0.936
Outcome of Investigation	0.740
Location of Adjudication/Mediation	0.820
Outcome of Adjudication/Mediation	0.784
Transborder Torture	0.950
Destination	0.790
AI Negates Allegation	0.952
Level of Torture	0.592
AI Comments on Access 28	0.822

Table 5: **Proportion of Overall Agreement and Krippendorff's α for ITT Country-Year Variables**

	Proportion of Overall Agreement	Krippendorff's α
Recognition of an Allegation	0.776	0.552
Duplicate	1.00	1.00
Location of Torture	0.977	0.954
Victim Type	0.732	0.464
Expectation Torture Has/Will Occur	0.970	0.940
Ill-Treatment/Abuse Mentioned	0.882	0.764
Unknown Torture	0.824	0.648
Scarring Torture	1.00	1.00
Clean/Stealth Torture	1.00	1.00
Torture Death	1.00	1.00
Agency of Control	0.900	.800
Formal Compliant Filed	1.00	1.00
Investigation of Torturers	1.00	1.00
Outcome of Investigation	1.00	1.00
Location of Adjudication/Mediation	1.00	1.00
Outcome of Adjudication/Mediation	1.00	1.00
Transborder Torture	0.931	0.862
Destination	0.910	0.820
AI Negates Allegation	1.00	1.00
Level of Torture	0.801	0.602
AI Comments on Access	0.911	0.822

Table 6: **Proportion of Overall Agreement and Krippendorff's α for ITT Specific Allegation Variables**

	Proportion of Overall Agreement	Krippendorff's α
Recognition of an Allegation	0.820	0.640
Duplicate	0.983	0.966
Location of Torture	1.00	1.00
Order of Magnitude (SA Only)	0.952	0.904
Victim Type	0.614	0.228
Expectation Torture Has/Will Occur	0.998	0.996
Ill-Treatment/Abuse Mentioned	0.937	0.874
Unknown Torture	0.971	0.942
Scarring Torture	0.905	0.810
Clean/Stealth Torture	0.890	0.780
Torture Death	0.903	0.806
Agency of Control	0.892	0.784
Formal Compliant Filed	0.970	0.940
Investigation of Torturers	0.986	0.972
Outcome of Investigation	0.843	0.686
Location of Adjudication/Mediation	0.908	0.816
Outcome of Adjudication/Mediation	0.840	0.680
Transborder Torture	1.00	1.00
Destination	0.999	0.998
AI Negates Allegation	0.962	0.924

Table 7: **Proportion of Overall Agreement for ITT Variables Conditional on the Presence of Variables in Content**

	Proportion of Overall Agreement
Duplicate	1.00
Location of Torture	0.867
Level of Torture	0.914
Order of Magnitude	0.987
Victim Type	0.746
Expectation Torture Has/Will Occur	1.00
Ill-Treatment/Abuse Mentioned	0.850
Unknown Torture	0.882
Scarring Torture	0.884
Clean/Stealth Torture	0.657
Torture Death	0.810
Agency of Control	0.920
Formal Compliant Filed	0.931
Investigation of Torturers	0.879
Outcome of Investigation	0.750
Location of Adjudication/Mediation	0.511
Outcome of Adjudication/Mediation	0.671
Transborder Torture	0.673
Destination	0.364
AI Negates Allegation	0.820
AI Comments on Access	0.486

Table 22: Distribution of Raters by Allegation and Response Value [Variable: Outcome of Investigation (NOTE: Not mutually exclusive)]

ICR Check Date	Allegation	Value Coded?							Total
		Missing	-1	0	1	2	3	4	
19 October 2009	SA1 (Guerra)	0	0	3	13	2	0	0	18
	SA2 (Renacer Prison)	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
	SA3 (Renacer Prison)	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
	SA4 (Colombian Refugees)	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	3
	CY1 (Motive 0)	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
	CY2 (Motive 1)	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
	Subtotal	37	0	3	14	2	0	0	56
P_0								0.804	
23 November 2009	SA1 (M'Aritho)	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
	SA2 (Anamilem)	4	8	4	0	0	0	0	16
	SA3 (Muruli)	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
	SA4 (At least...)	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
	SA5 (M'Aritho)	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
	SA6 (Anamilem 2)	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
	SA7 (Anamilem 3)	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
	CY1 (No Death)	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
	CY2 (No Death)	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
	CY3 (Death)	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
	Subtotal	72	10	4	0	0	0	0	86
	P_0								0.851
18 January 2010 (N=15)	SA1 (Mexicans)	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
	SA2 (Alvarez)	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
	SA3 (Mexicans Negation)	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
	SA4 (Alvarez Trial)	0	0	1	14	0	0	0	15
	SA5 (Muslim Prison)	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
	CY1 (Muslim Prison)	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
	CY2 (US in Afghanistan)	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
	CY3 (Lack of Access)	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
	CY4 (Afghanistan)	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
	Subtotal	74	0	1	14	0	0	0	89
P_0								0.973	
25 February 2010 (N=14)	SA1 (Smith)	0	0	0	6	0	10	0	16
	SA2 (Guinea Transborder)	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	2
	SA3 (Expectation Sierra Leone)	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
	CY1 (Sierra Leone 1)	0	0	14	0	0	0	0	14
	CY2 (Sierra Leone 2)	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
	CY3 (Guinea Transborder)	0	0	11	0	0	0	0	11
	CY4 (Expectation Sierra Leone)	0	0	11	0	0	0	0	11
	Subtotal	0	0	40	6	0	10	0	56
P_0								0.814	

Continued on Next Page

Continued from Previous Page

Total	183	10	48	34	2	10	0	287
Overall P_0								0.870

Table 23: Distribution of Raters by Allegation and Response Value [Variable: Location of Adjudication/Mediation]

ICR Check Date	Allegation	Value Coded?			Total
		0/Missing	1	2	
<i>19 October 2009</i>	SA1 (Guerra)	6	0	10	16
	SA2 (Renacer Prison)	13	0	0	13
	SA3 (Renacer Prison)	4	0	0	4
	SA4 (Colombian Refugees)	3	0	0	3
	CY1 (Motive 0)	16	0	0	16
	CY2 (Motive 1)	1	0	0	1
	Subtotal	43	0	10	53
	P_0				0.817
<i>23 November 2009</i>	SA1 (M'Aritho)	16	0	0	16
	SA2 (Anamilem)	16	0	0	16
	SA3 (Muruli)	16	0	0	16
	SA4 (At least...)	11	0	0	11
	SA5 (M'Aritho)	1	0	0	1
	SA6 (Anamilem 2)	1	0	0	11
	SA7 (Anamilem 3)	1	0	0	11
	CY1 (No Death)	15	0	0	15
	CY2 (No Death)	3	0	0	3
	CY3 (Death)	6	0	0	6
	Subtotal	86	0	0	86
P_0				1.0	
<i>18 January 2010 (N=15)</i>	SA1 (Mexicans)	13	0	0	13
	SA2 (Alvarez)	15	0	0	15
	SA3 (Mexicans Negation)	11	0	0	11
	SA4 (Alvarez Trial)	5	10	0	15
	SA5 (Muslim Prison)	4	0	0	4
	CY1 (Muslim Prison)	11	0	0	11
	CY2 (US in Afghanistan)	15	0	0	15
	CY3 (Lack of Access)	4	0	0	4
	CY4 (Afghanistan)	1	0	0	1
	Subtotal	79	10	0	89
	P_0				0.902
<i>25 February 2010 (N=14)</i>	SA1 (Smith)	8	0	5	13
	SA2 (Guinea Transborder)	2	0	0	2
	SA3 (Expectation Sierra Leone)	1	0	0	1
	CY1 (Sierra Leone 1)	14	0	0	14
	CY2 (Sierra Leone 2)	1	0	0	1

Continued on Next Page

Continued from Previous Page

CY3 (Guinea Transborder)	11	0	0	11
CY4 (Expectation Sierra Leone)	11	0	0	11
Subtotal	48	0	5	53
P_0				0.857
Total	256	10	15	281
Overall P_0				0.910

Table 24: Distribution of Raters by Allegation and Response Value [Variable: Outcome of Adjudication/Mediation]

ICR Check Date	Allegation	Missing	Value Coded?					Total	
			0	1	2	3	4		5
19 October 2009	SA1 (Guerra)	3	3	0	0	0	0	10	16
	SA2 (Renacer Prison)	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
	SA3 (Renacer Prison)	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
	SA4 (Colombian Refugees)	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
	CY1 (Motive 0)	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
	CY2 (Motive 1)	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
	Subtotal	40	3	0	0	0	0	10	53
	P_0								0.789
23 November 2009	SA1 (M'Aritho)	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
	SA2 (Anamilem)	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
	SA3 (Muruli)	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
	SA4 (At least...)	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
	SA5 (M'Aritho)	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
	SA6 (Anamilem 2)	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
	SA7 (Anamilem 3)	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
	CY1 (No Death)	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
	CY2 (No Death)	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
	CY3 (Death)	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Subtotal	86	0	0	0	0	0	0	86	
	P_0								1.0
18 January 2010 (N=15)	SA1 (Mexicans)	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
	SA2 (Alvarez)	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
	SA3 (Mexicans Negation)	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
	SA4 (Alvarez Trial)	0	4	0	0	0	0	11	15
	SA5 (Muslim Prison)	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
	CY1 (Muslim Prison)	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
	CY2 (US in Afghanistan)	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
	CY3 (Lack of Access)	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
	CY4 (Afghanistan)	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
	Subtotal	74	4	0	0	0	0	11	89
	P_0								0.915

Continued on Next Page

Continued from Previous Page

<i>25 February 2010 (N=14)</i>	SA1 (Smith)	0	8	1	4	1	0	0	14
	SA2 (Guinea Transborder)	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
	SA3 (Expectation Sierra Leone)	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
	CY1 (Sierra Leone 1)	0	14	0	0	0	0	0	14
	CY2 (Sierra Leone 2)	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
	CY3 (Guinea Transborder)	0	11	0	0	0	0	0	11
	CY4 (Expectation Sierra Leone)	0	11	0	0	0	0	0	11
	Subtotal	0	48	1	4	1	0	0	54
	P_0								0.805
	Total	200	55	1	4	1	0	21	282
	Overall P_0								0.892

Table 25: Distribution of Raters by Allegation and Response Value [Variable: Trans-Border Torture]

ICR Check Date	Allegation	Value Coded?			Total
		0	1	2	
<i>19 October 2009</i>	SA1 (Guerra)	16	0	0	16
	SA2 (Renacer Prison)	13	0	0	13
	SA3 (Renacer Prison)	4	0	0	4
	SA4 (Colombian Refugees)	0	3	0	3
	CY1 (Motive 0)	16	0	0	16
	CY2 (Motive 1)	0	1	0	1
	Subtotal	49	4	0	53
	P_0				1.0
<i>23 November 2009</i>	SA1 (M'Aritho)	16	0	0	16
	SA2 (Anamilem)	16	0	0	16
	SA3 (Muruli)	16	0	0	16
	SA4 (At least...)	11	0	0	11
	SA5 (M'Aritho)	1	0	0	1
	SA6 (Anamilem 2)	1	0	0	1
	SA7 (Anamilem 3)	1	0	0	1
	CY1 (No Death)	15	0	0	15
	CY2 (No Death)	3	0	0	3
	CY3 (Death)	6	0	0	6
Subtotal	86	0	0	86	
P_0				1.0	
<i>18 January 2010 (N=15)</i>	SA1 (Mexicans)	13	0	0	13
	SA2 (Alvarez)	15	0	0	15
	SA3 (Mexicans Negation)	11	0	0	11
	SA4 (Alvarez Trial)	15	0	0	15
	SA5 (Muslim Prison)	4	0	0	4
	CY1 (Muslim Prison)	11	0	0	11
	CY2 (US in Afghanistan)	14	1	0	15
Continued on Next Page					

Continued from Previous Page

	CY3 (Lack of Access)	4	0	0	4
	CY4 (Afghanistan)	1	0	0	1
	Subtotal	88	1	0	
	P_0				0.973
25 February 2010 (N=14)	SA1 (Smith)	13	0	0	13
	SA2 (Guinea Transborder)	0	0	2	2
	SA3 (Expectation Sierra Leone)	1	0	0	1
	CY1 (Sierra Leone 1)	14	0	0	14
	CY2 (Sierra Leone 2)	1	0	0	1
	CY3 (Guinea Transborder)	0	2	9	11
	CY4 (Expectation Sierra Leone)	10	0	1	11
	Subtotal	39	2	12	53
	P_0				0.900
	Total	262	7	12	281
	Overall P_0				0.975

Table 26: Distribution of Raters by Allegation and Response Value [Variable: Destination]

ICR Check Date	Allegation	Value Coded?			Total	Total
		Missing	1	2		
19 October 2009	SA1 (Guerra)	16	0	0	16	
	SA2 (Renacer Prison)	13	0	0	13	
	SA3 (Renacer Prison)	4	0	0	4	
	SA4 (Colombian Refugees)	0	3	0	3	
	CY1 (Motive 0)	16	0	0	16	
	CY2 (Motive 1)	0	1	0	1	
	Subtotal	49	4	0	53	
	P_0				1.0	
23 November 2009	SA1 (M'Aritho)	16	0	0	16	
	SA2 (Anamilem)	16	0	0	16	
	SA3 (Muruli)	16	0	0	16	
	SA4 (At least...)	11	0	0	11	
	SA5 (M'Aritho)	1	0	0	1	
	SA6 (Anamilem 2)	1	0	0	1	
	SA7 (Anamilem 3)	1	0	0	1	
	CY1 (No Death)	15	0	0	15	
	CY2 (No Death)	3	0	0	3	
	CY3 (Death)	6	0	0	6	
	Subtotal	86	0	0	86	
	P_0				1.0	
18 January 2010 (N=15)	SA1 (Mexicans)	13	0	0	13	
	SA2 (Alvarez)	15	0	0	15	
	SA3 (Mexicans Negation)	11	0	0	11	

Continued on Next Page

Continued from Previous Page

	SA4 (Alvarez Trial)	15	0	0	15
	SA5 (Muslim Prison)	4	0	0	4
	CY1 (Muslim Prison)	11	0	0	11
	CY2 (US in Afghanistan)	14	0	1	15
	CY3 (Lack of Access)	4	0	0	4
	CY4 (Afghanistan)	1	0	0	1
	Subtotal	88	0	1	89
	P_0				0.973
25 February 2010 (N=14)	SA1 (Smith)	13	0	0	13
	SA2 (Guinea Transborder)	1	0	1	2
	SA3 (Expectation Sierra Leone)	1	0	0	1
	CY1 (Sierra Leone 1)	14	0	0	14
	CY2 (Sierra Leone 2)	1	0	0	1
	CY3 (Guinea Transborder)	1	3	7	11
	CY4 (Expectation Sierra Leone)	10	0	1	11
	Subtotal	41	3	9	53
	P_0				0.850
	Total	264	7	10	281
	Overall P_0				0.0895

Table 27: Distribution of Raters by Allegation and Response Value [Variable: AI Negates Allegation]

ICR Check Date	Allegation	Value Coded?		Total
		0	1	
19 October 2009	SA1 (Guerra)	16	0	16
	SA2 (Renacer Prison)	13	0	13
	SA3 (Renacer Prison)	4	0	4
	SA4 (Colombian Refugees)	3	0	3
	CY1 (Motive 0)	16	0	16
	CY2 (Motive 1)	1	0	1
	Subtotal	53	0	53
	P_0			1.0
23 November 2009	SA1 (M'Aritho)	16	0	16
	SA2 (Anamilem)	16	0	16
	SA3 (Muruli)	16	0	16
	SA4 (At least...)	11	0	11
	SA5 (M'Aritho)	1	0	1
	SA6 (Anamilem 2)	1	0	1
	SA7 (Anamilem 3)	1	0	1
	CY1 (No Death)	15	0	15
	CY2 (No Death)	3	0	3
	CY3 (Death)	6	0	6
	Subtotal	86	0	86

Continued on Next Page

Continued from Previous Page

	P_0			1.0
18 January 2010 (N=15)	SA1 (Mexicans)	10	3	13
	SA2 (Alvarez)	15	0	15
	SA3 (Mexicans Negation)	1	10	11
	SA4 (Alvarez Trial)	15	0	15
	SA5 (Muslim Prison)	4	0	4
	CY1 (Muslim Prison)	11	0	11
	CY2 (US in Afghanistan)	15	0	15
	CY3 (Lack of Access)	4	0	4
	CY4 (Afghanistan)	1	0	1
		Subtotal	76	13
	P_0			0.922
25 February 2010 (N=14)	SA1 (Smith)	13	0	13
	SA2 (Guinea Transborder)	2	0	2
	SA3 (Expectation Sierra Leone)	1	0	1
	CY1 (Sierra Leone 1)	14	0	14
	CY2 (Sierra Leone 2)	1	0	1
	CY3 (Guinea Transborder)	11	0	11
	CY4 (Expectation Sierra Leone)	11	0	11
		Subtotal	53	0
	P_0			1.0
	Total	268	13	281
	Overall P_0			0.976

Table 28: Distribution of Raters by Allegation and Response Value [Variable: Level of Torture (Country-Year-Agency)]

ICR Check Date	Allegation	Value Coded?										Total	
		Missing	1	2	3	4	5	-6	-7	-8	-9		
19 October 2009	CY1 (Motive 0)	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	16
	CY2 (Motive 1)	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
	Subtotal	14	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	17
	P_0												0.767
23 November 2009	CY1 (No Death)	2	0	0	0	0	0	13	0	0	0	0	15
	CY2 (No Death)	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	3
	CY3 (Death)	5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
	Subtotal	7	1	0	0	0	0	16	0	0	0	0	24
	P_0												0.748
18 January 2010 (N=15)	CY1 (Muslim Prison)	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	11
	CY2 (US in Afghanistan)	0	0	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
	CY3 (Lack of Access)	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
	CY4 (Afghanistan)	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
	Subtotal	14	0	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	31

Continued on Next Page

Continued from Previous Page												
	P_0											0.892
25 February 2010 (N=14)	CY1 (Sierra Leone 1)	0	0	0	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
	CY2 (Sierra Leone 2)	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
	CY3 (Guinea Transborder)	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	11
	CY4 (Expectation Sierra Leone)	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	11
	Subtotal	16	0	0	0	15	0	0	0	0	6	37
	P_0											0.761
	Total	51	1	16	0	15	0	16	0	0	10	109
	Overall P_0											0.796

Table 29: Distribution of Raters by Allegation and Response Value [Variable: AI Comments on Access (Country-Year)]

ICR Check Date	Allegation	Value Coded?		Total
		0	1	
19 October 2009	CY1 (Motive 0)	16	0	16
	CY2 (Motive 1)	1	0	1
	Subtotal	17	0	17
	P_0			1.0
23 November 2009	CY1 (No Death)	15	0	15
	CY2 (No Death)	3	0	3
	CY3 (Death)	6	0	6
	Subtotal	24	0	24
	P_0			1.0
18 January 2010 (N=15)	CY1 (Muslim Prison)	11	0	11
	CY2 (US in Afghanistan)	6	9	15
	CY3 (Lack of Access)	0	4	4
	CY4 (Afghanistan)	1	0	1
	Subtotal	18	13	31
	P_0			0.675
25 February 2010 (N=14)	CY1 (Sierra Leone 1)	14	0	14
	CY2 (Sierra Leone 2)	1	0	1
	CY3 (Guinea Transborder)	11	0	11
	CY4 (Expectation Sierra Leone)	11	0	11
	Subtotal	37	0	37
	P_0			1.0
	Total	96	13	109
	Overall P_0			0.911

Table 30: Distribution of Raters by Allegation and Response Value [Variable: Specific Number of Victims (Specific Only)]

ICR Check Date	Allegation	Value Coded?							Total
		-9	1	55	300	3	4	5	
19 October 2009	SA1 (Guerra)	0	16	0	0	0	0	0	16
	SA2 (Renacer Prison)	0	13	0	0	0	0	0	13
	SA3 (Renacer Prison)	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	4
	SA4 (Colombian Refugees)	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	3
	Subtotal	1	29	4	2	0	0	0	36
	P_0								0.990
23 November 2009	SA1 (M'Aritho)	0	16	0	0	0	0	0	16
	SA2 (Anamilem)	0	16	0	0	0	0	0	16
	SA3 (Muruli)	0	16	0	0	0	0	0	16
	SA4 (At least...)	6	0	0	0	4	0	1	11
	SA5 (M'Aritho)	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
	SA6 (Anamilem 2)	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
	SA7 (Anamilem 3)	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
	Subtotal	6	51	0	0	4	0	1	62
	P_0								0.989
18 January 2010 (N=15)	SA1 (Mexicans)	0	0	0	0	0	13	0	13
	SA2 (Alvarez)	0	15	0	0	0	0	0	15
	SA3 (Mexicans Negation)	0	0	0	0	0	11	0	11
	SA4 (Alvarez Trial)	0	15	0	0	0	0	0	15
	SA5 (Muslim Prison)	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	4
	Subtotal	0	30	0	0	0	24	4	58
	P_0								1.0
25 February 2010 (N=14)	SA1 (Smith)	0	13	0	0	0	0	0	13
	SA2 (Guinea Transborder)	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
	SA3 (Expectation Sierra Leone)	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
	Subtotal	3	13	0	0	0	0	0	16
	P_0								
	Total	10	123	4	2	4	24	5	172
	Overall P_0								0.967

6.4 Replication

For each certification check, correctly identified allegations are:

Oct. 19th, 2009: SA1, SA2, CY1

Nov. 23rd, 2009: SA1, SA2, SA3, SA4, CY1

Jan. 18th, 2010: SA1, SA2, SA3, SA4, CY1, CY2

Feb. 25th, 2010: SA1, CY1, CY3, CY4