

Introduction

Individuals living with mental illness are overrepresented within the criminal justice system. At the local level, they can be repeatedly booked and detained, resulting in a vicious cycle of regular incarceration. Duke Health, as the major health care provider in the county, has valuable data about patient encounters at over 350 locations, including the Lincoln Community Health Center, which specializes in providing health care services to the medically underserved. Using data from the Durham County Detention Facility (DCDF) and Duke Health System, this Data + project examines patterns of health-service utilization in the incarcerated population, including those with and without mental illness diagnoses. By working alongside county agencies such as the Criminal Justice Resource Center (CJRC), our team's data analysis could potentially impact policy plans and contribute to new ways of thinking about mental health within the Durham County justice system.

RHODES

INITIATIVE

AT DUKE UNIVERSITY

Building on research done in prior years, our team acquired new data from 2019-2021 provided by the DCDF and Duke Health centers, which gives us the opportunity to examine trends in more recent years and during the COVID-19 pandemic. This summer, our team's primary objective was to clean and organize the various datasets on demographics, bookings, encounters, and diagnoses, in an effort to prepare them for more detailed analysis during the academic year. Additionally, our team created two new variables to identify individuals with a serious mental illness and those with more general mental health disorder based on their records of diagnoses. With these new variables and properly formatted data, we have begun to analyze trends across these institutions.

## Methods

Before beginning this project, each team member was required to complete thorough HIPAA training and receive IRB approval. To maintain the privacy of our data, we worked within Protected Analytics and Computing Environment (PACE), a protected online workspace. Using a matched dataset provided by the Durham County Detention Facility (DCDF) and the Duke Health Analytics Center of Excellence (ACE), we conducted descriptive statistical analysis of the population of interest for this project. To prepare our datasets for analysis, our team had to discuss and address the challenges of dealing with duplicate entries, conflicting race records, conflicting sex records, and conflicting incarceration date records. After cleaning the data, we used R Software — specifically the plyr, dplyr, tidyverse, and xtable packages — to visualize our data and conduct exploratory and descriptive statistical anal-

This year, our team incorporated new mental health related variables, or tags, with which to subset our data. The "Big 3" tag includes individuals who were ever diagnosed with at least one of the following mental illnesses: schizophrenia, bipolar disorder, and major depressive disorder. The Mental Health (MH) tag includes individuals who were ever diagnosed with a mental disorder, including substance use disorders, anxiety, and others. These tags were created to replace the "Mental Alert" tag assigned by the DCDF that previous teams used for their analyses. We created different sets of tables to show general demographic characteristics and information on individuals during the COVID-19 pandemic (Tables 1, 2). Various metrics of bookings and incarceration status were compared for the "Big 3" and "Mental Health (MH)" groups (Tables 3, 4). Health care utilization was examined based on age (Table 5) and service area (Table 6). The occurrence of both substance use disorders (Figure 7, 9) and suicidal ideations (Table 8) were examined within the population with mental health diagnoses.

## Health Utilization

**Table 5:** Frequency of Encounters Across Duke Health Service Areas
 Among Individuals Under 40, and Individuals 40 and Above

Released from DCDF and sa	w provider 2014-2021	under 40
	Not diagnosed with a "Big 3" disorder	Diagnosed with a "Big 3" disorder
	Median d	over 7 yrs
Median		
ED encounters	5	2
Lincoln encounters	3	2
Non-ED and non-Lincoln encounters	20	5
Released from DCDE and saw	provider 2014-2021 40	and above
Refeased from DCDF and saw	provider 2014-2021 40	
	Not diagnosed with	Diagnosed with a
	a "Big 3" disorder	"Big 3" disorder
	Median d	over 7 yrs
Median		
ED encounters	6	2
Lincoln encounters	7	3
Non-ED and non-lincoln encounters	33	7

The chart above details the median number of encounters in the following Duke Health service areas: Lincoln Community Health Center, the Emergency Department, and Duke Health providers excluding the areas previously listed. In population under 40 and 40 and above, those diagnosed with a "Big 3" disorder visited health care providers more frequently than those not diagnosed with a "Big 3" disorder. However, it appears that overall health care utilization is higher in populations over 40. (Table 5)

### Diagnoses

Figure 1: Comparing Drug Overdose Types Across Groups Comparing Drug Overdose Types Across "Big 3" and non-"Big 3" Groups Overdosed and not diagnosed with a "Big 25.5 3" disorder (n=275) Overdosed and diagnosed with a "Big 3" 32.6 disorder (n=359) 40.0 80.0 60.0 100.0 Percentage of Group Stimulant Overdose Opioid Overdose

Continuing our analysis on drug overdoses, the graph above compares drug overdose types, either opioid in dark blue or stimulant in light blue, across the following groups: those who overdosed and were diagnosed with a "Big 3" disorder, and those who overdosed but were not diagnosed with a "Big 3" disorder. Opioid drug overdoses are more common than stimulant overdoses in both subgroups. However, they are most common in groups not diagnosed with a "Big 3" disorder, as 92.7% of all people who overdosed, overdosed on an opioid drug at least once. However, among those who were diagnosed with a "Big 3" disorder, stimulant overdoses are slightly more common, as 32.6% overdosed on a stimulant drug at least once. (Figure 2)

### \_\_\_\_\_ Demogr Race/ar Amer Asian/ Black White Other, Latinx Yes

## Bookings

Number o
Median d (per book
Longest o (per indiv

Table 0. Companing r
Healthcare utilization
Ever seen at Lincoln
No/missing
Yes
Ever seen in Duke ED
No/missing
Yes

Ever seen at Duke Health (no
ED, non-Lincoln)
No/missing

Duke Health encounters within our data set could have occurred at a number of health care service areas. Our team was especially curious about how health utilization varied across groups in the Lincoln Community Health Center, at the emergency department, and in Duke Health providers excluding the areas previously listed. To compare how health utilization might have changed over the years, we subsetted our encounter data into the following categories: 2014-2018 data, merged 2014-2021 data, and April 1st, 2020-2021 data. The chart shown above compare the merged 2014-2021 data to April 1st, 2020-2021 data so that we can understand how health utilization changed specifically during the pandemic. Across subsets, those diagnosed with a "Big 3" disorder utilized Duke health services more frequently than those who were not. Casting a wider net to include those diagnosed with a MH disorder, the trends are the same. During the pandemic, individuals in all subgroups were less likely to utilize health services, especially the emergency department. (Table 6)



# No/un

## Age in 2









Ever seen at Duke Health (no
ED, non-Lincoln)
No/missing
Yes

## Mental Health and the Justice System in Durham County

Undergraduate Researchers: Brianna Cellini, John Liakos, Maya Pandey, William Feng

Team Leaders: Nicole Schramm-Sapyta, Maria Tackett

## Results

### Demographics

 Table 1: Demographics Data Table 2014-2021

	2014-2021 Data														
	2014-2021 Data														
	Released from DCDF and saw provider 2014-2021 (n=17,606)		Released from DCDF and saw provider 2014-2021 (n=17,606) Diagnosed with a "Big 3" Disorder (n=4,139)			sed with a Disorder ,467)	Diagnose MHD (n	ed with a =9,460)	Not diagnosed with a MHD (n=8,146)						
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%					
aphic characteristics															
icestry															
nd/AK Native	24	(0.1)	<10	(<0.2)	17	(0.1)	13	(0.1)	11	(0.1)					
PI	100	(0.6)	20	(0.5)	80	(0.6)	43	(0.5)	57	(0.7)					
	12,371	(70.3)	2,664	(64.4)	9,707	(72.1)	6,480	(68.5)	5,891	(72.3)					
	3,694	(21.0)	1,250	(30.2)	2,444	(17.9)	2,383	(25.2)	1,311	(16.1)					
/Multiple/DK	1,417	(8.0)	198	(4.8)	1,219	(9.1)	541	(5.7)	876	(10.8)					
		, <i>,</i>								. ,					
known	16,496	(93.7)	3,936	(95.1)	12,515	(92.9)	9,039	(95.5)	7,457	(91.5)					
	1.110	(6.3)	203	(4.9)	952	(7.1)	, 421	(4.5)	689	(8.5)					
	1 3	()		( - )		· /		\ - /		()					
	12.168	(69.1)	2.229	(53.9)	9.939	(73.8)	6.041	(63.9)	6.127	(75.2)					
2	5.435	(30.9)	1.909	(46.1)	3.526	(26.2)	3.418	(36.1)	2.017	(24.8)					
wn	<10	(<0.1)	<10	(<0.2)	<10	(<0.1)	<10	(<0.1)	<10	(<0.1)					
021 (Mean, SD)	(39.1.	12.5)	(42.4	13.2)	(38.2	12.1)	(41.0	13.0)	(37.0.	11.5)					

**Table 3:** Bookings and Length of Incarceration by "Big 3" Diagnosis

					FEMALE										
	2014-2021 (n = 5435) 2019-2021 (n = 783) April 1st, 2020-2021 (n = 229)														
	Diagnosed with a "BIG 3" disorder (35.1%)		Not diagnosed with a "BIG 3" disorder (64.9%)		Diagnosed with a "BIG 3" disorder (31,8%)		Not diagno "BIG 3" (68)	osed with a disorder .2%)	Diagnosed with a "BIG 3" disorder (29.3%)		Not diagno "BIG 3" (70.	osed with a disorder 7%)			
	Mean	(SD)	Mean	(SD)	Mean	(SD)	Mean	(SD)	Mean	(SD)	Mean	(SD)			
f bookings	2.1	(2.2)	1.8	(2.0)	1.5	(1.1)	1.2	(0.7)	1.2	(0.6)	1.2	(0.6)			
ays of incarceration ng per individual)	4.5	(24.1)	4.8	(39.1)	3.5	(23.6)	1.9	(10.1)	6.6	(44.3)	2.0	(10.6)			
oserved incarceration dual)	12 7	(45.2)	95	(52.1)	6.0	(26.2)	2.6	(12.6)	7.8	(45.1)	3.1	(15.8)			

		2014-2021	(n = 12168)			2019-2021	L (n = 1932)		April 1st, 2020-2021 (n = 611)						
	Diagnosed with a "BIG 3" disorder (18.3%)		Not diagnosed with a "BIG 3" disorder (81.7%)		Diagnosed with a "BIG 3" disorder (16.9%)		Not diagnosed with a "BIG 3" disorder (83.1%)		Diagnosed with a "BIG 3" disorder (18.2%)		Not diagnosed wit "BIG 3" disorder(81.8%				
	Mean	(SD)	Mean	(SD)	Mean	(SD)	Mean	(SD)	Mean	(SD)	Mean	(SD)			
f bookings	2.8	(2.9)	2.5	(2.6)	1.6	(1.4)	1.5	(1.1)	1.5	(1.1)	1.3	(0.9)			
ays of incarceration ing per individual)	14.8	(49.9)	12.0	(53.7)	20.1	(74.4)	11.3	(53.6)	23.3	(63.9)	8.5	(31.9)			
bserved incarceration dual)	36.4	(79.6)	31.1	(89.7)	28.7	(82.5)	15.7	(61.5)	35.6	(83.8)	12.5	(40.3)			

Table 6: Comparing Health Care Utilization by Service Area from 2014-2021 and During the Pandemic

	2014-2021 Data											April 1st, 2020-2021 Data									
I	Released fro saw provide (n=17)	m DCDF and r 2014-2021 ,606)	Diagnosed w Disorder	/ith a "Big 3" (n=4,139)	Not diagno "Big 3" ( (n=13	osed with a Disorder 8,467)	Diagnosed Disorder	Diagnosed with a MH N Disorder (n=9,460)		Not diagnosed with a MH Disorder (n=8,146)		om DCDF and ler April 1st, 21 (n=489)	Diagnosed disorde	with a "Big 3" er (n=143)	Not diagr "Big 3" dis	osed with a order (n=346)	Diagnose o disorde	l with a MH r (n=295)	Not diagnos disorde	ed with a MH r (n=194)	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	
	12,492 5,114 3,686 13,920	(71.0) (29.0) (20.9) (79.1)	2,300 1,839 396 3,743	(55.6) (44.4) (9.6) (90.4)	10,192 3,275 3,290 10,177	(75.7) (24.3) (24.4) (75.6)	5,836 3,624 1,162 8,298	(61.7) (38.3) (12.3) (87.7)	6,656 1,490 2,524 5,622	(81.7) (18.3) (31.0) (69.0)	371 118 246 243	(75.9) (24.1) (50.3) (49.7)	105 38 57 86	(73.4) (26.6) (39.9) (60.1)	266 80 189 157	(76.9) (23.1) (54.6) (45.4)	214 81 138 157	(72.5) (27.5) (46.8) (53.2)	157 37 108 86	(80.9) (19.1) (55.7) (44.3)	
1-	1,161 16,445	(6.6) (93.4)	69 4,070	(1.7) (98.3)	1,092 12,375	(8.1) (91.9)	239 9,221	(2.5) (97.5)	922 7,224	(11.3) (88.7)	49 440	(10.0) (90.0)	12 131	(8.4) (91.6)	37 309	(10.7) (89.3)	23 272	(7.8) (92.2)	26 168	(13.4) (86.6)	

 
 Table 8: Comparing Incidences of Suicidal Ideations and Drug Overdose One Year Prior to
 And During the Pandemic

	Apri	Encount I 1st, 2019	ers from April 1st, 2	Encounters from April 1st, 2020-2021							
	Diagnose "Big 3" ( (n=2	ed with a disorder ,856)	Not diag with a ' disorder (	gnosed 'Big 3" n=5,946)	Diagnos "Big 3" (n=2	ed with a disorder ,577)	Not diagnosed with a "Big 3" disorder (n=5,204)				
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%			
Suicidal Ideations											
No	2634	(92.2)	5915	(99.5)	2384	(92.5)	5188	(99.7)			
Yes	222	(7.8)	31	(0.5)	193	(7.5)	17	(0.3)			
Drug overdose											
No	2775	(97.2)	5893	(99.1)	2494	(96.8)	5145	(98.9)			
Yes	81	(2.8)	53	(0.9)	83	(3.2)	60	(1.2)			

This year, our Data Plus team explored prevalence of suicidal ideations and drug overdoses using a combination of ICD9 and ICD10 codes that correspond to these diagnoses. Because mental wellbeing is related to likelihood of overdosing on drugs, we aimed to explore these diagnoses in relation to each other. The tables shown above compare the encounter data from April 1st, 2019 to April 1st, 2020 (one year prior to the pandemic), and to April 1st, 2020-2021 (during the pandemic) so that we can understand how incidences of suicidal ideations or drug overdoses changed during the pandemic. Rates of diagnosed suicidal ideations decreased during the pandemic, and rates of overdose increased during the pandemic. (Table 8)

Black or African American, non-Latinx, male individuals comprise the majority of the population. Of the incarcerated population from 2014-2021 (n = 17606), almost 25% have been diagnosed with a "Big 3" mental illness (n = 4139). Over 50% have been diagnosed with a general mental health disorder (n = 9460). (Table 1)

Project Manager: Ruth Wygle Faculty Contributor: Michele Easter

Individuals with "Big 3" diagnoses have more bookings and longer lengths of incarceration than those without across the board. A greater percentage (nearly double the percentage) of the incarcerated female population has been diagnosed with a "Big 3" compared to its male counterpart. A general trend can be observed about the booking situation of the female big 3-diagnosed population. Compared to 2014-21, the 2019-21 data frame has shorter median days of incarceration and shorter lengths of longest observed incarceration, implying that during the 2019-21 period both numbers have gone down from the past. However, the numbers go up again during COVID. Though with a little variance, the similar trend can also be found among the male population diagnosed with "Big 3" (Table

 Table 2: COVID Demographics Data Table 2014-2021

	Released fro saw provide (n=17	m DCDF and r 2014-2021 ,606)	Diagnosed v disorder	vith a "Big 3" (n=4,139)	Not diagno "Big 3" ( (n=13	osed with a disorder 3,467)	Diagnose MH di (n=9	ed with a sorder ,460)	Not diagnosed with a MH disorder (n=8,146)		
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	
Tested positive for COVID-19											
No	17,367	(98.6)	4,067	(98.3)	13,300	(98.8)	9,304	(98.4)	8,063	(99.0)	
Yes	239	(1.4)	72	(1.7)	167	(1.2)	156	(1.6)	83	(1.0)	
	Released fro	m DCDF, saw	Diagnosed	with a "Big 3"	Not diagno	osed with a	Diagnos	ed with a	Not diagr	nosed with	
	provider 20	14-2021, and	disorder	and tested	"Big 3" di	sorder and	MH disc	order and	a MH disorder and		
	tested posit	ive for COVID	positive fo	or COVID-19	tested posit	ive for COVID-	tested p	ositive for	tested positive for		
	19 (n=239)		(n	=72)	19 (n	= <b>167)</b>	COVID-1	.9 (n=156)	COVID-19 (n=83)		
	n %		n	%	n	%	n %		n	%	
COVID-19 cases resulting in											
hospitalizations											
No	104	(43.5)	38	(52.8)	66	(39.5)	68	(43.6)	36	(43.4)	
Yes	135	(56.5)	34	(47.2)	101	(60.5)	88	(56.4)	47	(56.6)	
Breakdown of positive tests											
by race											
Black/African American	165	(69.0)	48	(66.7)	117	(70.1)	111	(71.2)	54	(65.1)	
Caucasian/White	34	(14.2)	16	(22.2)	18	(10.8)	27	(17.3)	<10	(<12.0)	
Asian	<10	(<4.2)	<10	(<13.9)	0	(0.0)	<10	(<6.4)	0	(0.0)	
2 or more/Unknown/other	<10	(<4.2)	<10	(<13.9)	32	(19.2)	17	(10.9)	22	(26.5)	
Breakdown of positive tests											
by sex											
Female	88	(36.8)	37	(51.4)	69	(41.3)	69	(44.2)	19	(22.9)	
Male	151	(63.2)	35	(48.6)	87	(52.1)	87	(55.8)	64	(77.1)	

### Table 4: Bookings and Length of Incarceration by Mental Health Diagnosis

					FEMALE										
	2014-2021 (n = 5435) 2019-2021 (n = 783) April 1st, 2020-2021 (n = 229)														
	Diagnosed disorder	with a MH (62.9%)	Not diagn MH disoi	osed with a rder (37.1)	Diagnosed disorder	with a MH <sup>.</sup> (58.7%)	Not diagno MH disord	osed with a er (41.3%)	Diagnosed disorder	with a MH <sup>.</sup> (56.3%)	Not diagnose MH disorder	ed with a (43.7%)			
	Mean	(SD)	Mean	(SD)	Mean	(SD)	Mean	(SD)	Mean	(SD)	Mean	(SD)			
Number of bookings	2.1	(2.3)	1.6	(1.5)	1.4	(0.9)	1.2	(0.7)	1.2	(0.5)	1.2	(0.7)			
Median days of incarceration (per booking per individual)	5.1	(36.8)	4.0	(30.4)	2.9	(19.0)	1.8	(9.2)	3.7	(31.9)	2.8	(13.4)			
Longest observed incarceration ( per individual)	12.8	(55.2)	6.9	(38.6)	4.4	(21.1)	2.6	(12.7)	4.4	(32.6)	4.5	(20.0)			
					MALE										
		2014-2021	(n = 12168	)		2019-2021	l (n = 1932)		Ар	ril 1st, 2020	)-2021 (n = 61	1)			
	Diagnosed disorder	with a MH (49.6%)	Not diagn MH disor	osed with a der (50.4%)	Diagnosed disorde	l with a MH r (44.7%)	Not diagno MH disoro	osed with a ler (55.3%)	Diagnosed disorde	l with a MH r (45.5%)	Not diagnos MH disorde	ed with a r (54.5%)			
	Mean	(SD)	Mean	(SD)	Mean	(SD)	Mean	(SD)	Mean	(SD)	Mean	(SD)			
Number of bookings	2.7	(2.9)	2.3	(2.4)	1.6	(1.2)	1.4	(1.1)	1.5	(1.1)	1.3	(0.8)			
Median days of incarceration (per booking per individual)	12.7	(48.3)	12.3	(57.3)	12.9	(54.4)	12.7	(60.3)	14.0	(47.8)	8.9	(32.0)			
Longest observed incarceration ( per individual)	33.9	(83.5)	30.3	(92.1)	19.6	(65.3)	16.5	(65.9)	20.8	(61.0)	13.4	(42.2)			



The graph above compares the prevalence of mental health and substance use diagnoses between males and females. All mental health and substance use diagnoses except for schizophrenia spectrum disorder and alcohol use are more prevalent among females than males. (Figure 3)





Using ICD10 code U07.1 for patients diagnosed with COVID-19, our team could analyze a sampling of individuals in our data set who contracted the disease. The chart shown above details the number of individuals who tested positive for COVID-19 across subgroups. Our team analyzed the demographics information of individuals who tested positive for COVID-19. We focused our analysis on race and sex characteristics, while also incorporating information pertaining to COVID -19 cases that resulted in hospitalizations. As shown in the chart above, 56.5% of those who tested positive for COVID-19 were hospitalized, and the likelihood of becoming hospitalized was more prevalent in groups not diagnosed with a "Big 3" or MH disorder groups. The overwhelming majority of those who tested positive are Black or African American, especially among individuals who were diagnosed with a mental health disorder. Females diagnosed with a "Big 3" disorder were more likely to contract COVID-19 than males, but this not the case among those who were not diagnosed with a "Big 3" disorder. (Table 2)

Individuals with mental health diagnoses are booked more often and incarcerated for longer periods of time. The male incarcerated population overall has more bookings and longer incarceration compared to the female population. Across all three time frames, a greater percentage of female inmates has been diagnosed with some kind of mental health disorder compared to that of male inmates. By comparing the 2014-21 data frame and the new 2019-21 data frame, one can discover that both people with and without mental health diagnoses generally have shorter median days of incarceration and shorter lengths of longest observed incarceration in more recent years, though with the median days of incarceration for male individuals as an exception. However, no particular changes in booking patterns during COVID were found (Table 4).

## Discussion

Consistent with prior years' findings, individuals who are released from DCDF and saw providers are composed mainly of Black or African American, non-Latinx, males.

Individuals in the "Big 3" group have longer lengths of incarceration and a higher number of bookings compared to individuals without a "Big 3" diagnosis. The percentage of the incarcerated female population that have been diagnosed with a "Big 3" disorder is nearly double the percentage of incarcerated males with a "Big 3" disorder. However, the male population generally has more average bookings and a longer length of incarceration than the female population.

Analysis of Duke Health utilization shows that both those diagnosed with a "Big 3" disorder and those with a more-general MH diagnosis utilized Duke health services more frequently than without these diagnoses. The group with a "Big 3" diagnosis also had higher percentages of mental healthrelated Emergency Department encounters, non-Emergency Department Encounters, and encounters within the Lincoln Community Health Center than the non "Big 3" population.

A larger percentage of individuals in the MH group have mental health-related diagnoses for drug and alcohol use disorders. All mental health and substance use diagnoses — except for schizophrenia spectrum disorder and alcohol use — are more prevalent among females than males.

By examining patterns in suicidal ideation and overdose diagnoses, it became clear that those who were diagnosed with a "Big 3" disorder were more likely to experience suicidal ideations and drug overdoses. Over all, rates of diagnosed suicidal ideations were lower during the pandemic, and rates of overdose were higher during the pandemic.

From these initial findings, the team plans on continuing research on the impact of mental health and mental illness on rates of recidivism. Looking ahead, we plan to thoroughly examine the effects of COVID-19 pandemic on the trajectories of individuals in and out of both the DCDF and health care providers. With more data analysis, our team hopes to further illuminate the intersection of mental health and incarceration within Durham County.

## Acknowledgements

Our team would like to thank the Durham County Detention Facility (DCDF), Duke Health, and the Lincoln Community Health Center for providing and trusting us with the data necessary to conduct this research. We would also like to thank Duke Health's Analytics Center for Excellence (ACE), specifically Keri Linares and Mike Chrestensen, for their work matching our dataset. An additional thanks to those at Duke's Protected Analytics Computing Environment (PACE) for providing us with a secured workspace to conduct our analysis. A very special thanks to Major Bazemore from Durham County Sheriff's Office, Gudrun Parmer from Criminal Justice Resource Center, and Laylon Williams from Alliance Health, among other stakeholders, for the critical insights into the health and criminal justice systems and continued support for our research. Thank you Dr. Michele Easter for all the groundwork you laid and psychiatric expertise you brought to the team. Thank you Dr. Nicole Schramm- Sapyta, Dr. Maria Tackett, and Ruth Wygle for your leadership and guidance. Thank you to Becky Tang for your guidance and support. Last but not least, thank you to the Rhodes Information Initiative for the thoughtful programming throughout this summer and to all of the participating Data+ teams for the inspiration.