

2015

Medical Malpractice Claims in Mississippi: A Preliminary Analysis

Randall K. Johnson

Follow this and additional works at: <https://dc.law.mc.edu/lawreview>



Part of the [Law Commons](#)

Custom Citation

34 Miss. C. L. Rev. 191 (2015)

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by MC Law Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Mississippi College Law Review by an authorized editor of MC Law Digital Commons. For more information, please contact walter@mc.edu.

MEDICAL MALPRACTICE CLAIMS IN MISSISSIPPI: A PRELIMINARY ANALYSIS

Randall K. Johnson*

ABSTRACT

This Article explains where medical malpractice claims are filed in Mississippi. It initially does so by collecting state circuit court data, which have been recently released by the Administrative Office of Courts. Next, this Article computes summary statistics. Last, it examines these statistics in order to determine which county had the most medical malpractice claims.

I. INTRODUCTION

Over the last fifteen years, the State of Mississippi has made it more difficult to file medical malpractice claims.¹ It did so, specifically, through legislative² and judicial action.³ Examples include the imposition of statutory caps on noneconomic damages,⁴ additional filing requirements,⁵ an expanded insurance risk pool,⁶ and several other changes to Mississippi law.⁷

* Assistant Professor of Law, Mississippi College, School of Law, 151 East Griffith, Jackson, Mississippi 39201. J.D., The University of Chicago Law School; M.U.P., The New York University; M.Sc., The London School of Economics, B.A., The University of Michigan. Special thanks to the MC Law Publications Grant Program, Dean Wendy B. Scott, Professor John Haskell, Professor Christoph Henkel, Professor Jeff Jackson, Professor Angela Mae Kupenda and Mr. Taimoor Aziz. Additional thanks are due to the editors of the *Mississippi College Law Review*.

1. See, e.g., Mark A. Behrens, *Medical Liability Reform: A Case Study of Mississippi*, 118 *OBSTETRICS & GYNECOLOGY* 335 (2011).

2. *Id.* at 335 (“In late 2002, a special session of the Mississippi legislature responded [to unfavorable press coverage] by passing . . . House Bill (HB) 2, . . . which generally became effective for causes of action filed on or after January 1, 2003 In the same special session, the legislature enacted HB 19, which also became effective for causes of action filed on or after January 1, 2003 In June 2004, another special session of the legislature enacted a comprehensive civil justice reform bill, HB 13, for causes of action filed on or after September 1, 2004.”).

3. *Id.* at 337 (“The Mississippi Supreme Court also appears to have contributed to improvements in the state’s civil litigation climate.”).

4. *Id.* at 335-336 (“The core of HB 2 was a \$500,000 limit on noneconomic damages, such as pain and suffering, applicable to most medical negligence cases . . . HB 13 creates a hard limit of \$500,000 on noneconomic damages in medical liability cases, removing exceptions found in the 2002 law as well as scheduled increases to the cap.”).

5. *Id.* (“In June 2004, [the Mississippi Legislature] enacted a comprehensive [tort reform] bill, HB 13, for causes of action filed on or after September 1, 2004 The legislation [among other things] provides that a medical negligence suit against a licensed health care provider shall be brought in the county in which the alleged act or omission occurred, and venue must be proper as to each plaintiff.”).

6. See Leonard J. Nelson III, Michael A. Morrissey and Meredith L. Kilgore, *Medical Malpractice Reform in Three Southern States*, 4 *J. HEALTH & BIOMED. L.* 69, 118 (2008) (“In 2003, in reaction to continuing problems with insurance availability and affordability, the Mississippi legislature passed the Medical Malpractice Insurance Availability Act. This legislation, which was signed by Governor Musgrove on April 25, 2003, created a state run malpractice insurance risk pool to provide a ‘temporary market of last resort’ for health care providers.”).

7. See Behrens, *supra* note 1 at 337 (“For example, in 2005, the [Mississippi Supreme Court] reversed prior case law and held that ‘a plaintiff must produce expert witness testimony to establish the

This state action, which is also referred to as “tort reform,” has been challenged on several grounds.⁸ For example, one argument is that it may be unconstitutional.⁹ A second theory asserts that tort reform could unjustifiably impair plaintiffs’ rights.¹⁰ A third argument is that it may have unexpected consequences.¹¹ But Mississippi courts have upheld tort reform because it is thought to provide economic benefits.¹²

Legal scholars, on the other hand, are not sure that tort reform actually lives up to its promise.¹³ Some researchers find that it is not useful for “stabilizing the insurance market and moderating the increases in premium levels.”¹⁴ Other scholars have shown that tort reform does not limit moral hazard.¹⁵ A third category of investigator finds that it is “ineffective in controlling liability insurance costs, expanding access to care, and reducing defensive medicine.”¹⁶ None of this scholarship, however, recognizes an unambiguous benefit of tort reform—it provides useful information about the distribution of claims.¹⁷

material risks and available alternatives of a medical procedure. Absent such expert testimony, a jury may not consider whether a physician conducted a medical procedure without informed consent.”).

8. Nelson, *supra* note 6 at 78 (“[U.S.] state courts are divided on the constitutionality of tort reform measures as analyzed under various provisions of their state constitutions.”).

9. See *Sears, Roebuck & Co. v. Learmonth*, 95 So. 3d 633 (Miss. 2012).

10. See, e.g., David F. Maron, *Statutory Damages Caps: Analysis of the Scope of Right To Jury Trial and the Constitutionality of Mississippi Statutory Caps on Noneconomic Damages*, 32 *MISS. C. L. REV.* 109 (2013).

11. *Id.* at 111-12 (In the last few years the high courts in several . . . states have . . . considered challenges to noneconomic damage caps with different results. While a majority of the caps have been upheld, a few were struck down. With few exceptions, arguments in recent challenges have involved policy judgments and strong arguments exist on both sides. While there is sound evidence that such caps can result in positive social impact, tort reform opponents make forceful arguments to the contrary [T]hat debate will no doubt continue.”).

12. See John T. Nockleby, *How To Manufacture A Crisis: Evaluating Empirical Claims Behind ‘Tort Reform’*, 86 *OR. L. REV.* 533, 533 (2007) (“For several decades, tobacco companies, large corporations, and insurance companies have systematically attacked the civil justice system. Mounting a campaign of anecdotes purportedly representative of a complex system that adjudicates several million civil cases each year, political entities have proclaimed that changing the civil justice system [via ‘reform’] is necessary to preserve American business competitiveness.”).

13. See, e.g., Joanna C. Schwartz, *A Dose of Reality for Medical Malpractice Reform*, 88 *N.Y.U. L. REV.* 1224 (2014).

14. Nelson, *supra* note 6 at 80.

15. *Id.* at 77 (“Traditional malpractice reform measures are not intended to reduce the costs of . . . insurance premiums by reducing the rate of injuries, but rather are intended ‘to alter the probability of winning an award, the size of the award, and the costs of litigation . . . [In other words, these measures are] designed to reduce claim frequency and severity. [As such, each actually leads to moral hazard, instead of preventing its occurrence].”).

16. *Id.* at 80.

17. Accurate information about the geographic distribution of these claims is important because few doctors, hospitals or regulators collect any data about medical malpractice, which too often impedes timely health care reform. See Richard Harris, *Who Keeps Track If Your Surgery Goes Well Or Fails?*, *NAT’L PUBLIC RADIO* (May 3, 2015), <http://www.npr.org/blogs/health/2015/05/03/403611589/who-keeps-track-if-your-surgery-goes-well-or-fails> (last visited May 3, 2015) (“In order to improve the quality of health care and reduce its costs, researchers need to know what works and what doesn’t. One powerful way to do that is through a system of ‘registries,’ in which doctors and hospitals compile and share their results. But even in this era of big data, remarkably few medical registries exist.”).

This Article, in contrast, recognizes this benefit and uses it to undertake a preliminary analysis.¹⁸ In doing so, it makes three contributions to the tort reform literature.¹⁹ First, this Article identifies every medical malpractice claim that was filed in Mississippi over the last ten years.²⁰ Next, it identifies the specific county where each claim was made.²¹ Last, the Article analyzes this data in order to identify the county with the most claims.²²

This Article proceeds in three parts. Part II describes the Article's methodological approach. Part III contains its analysis of claims over time. Part IV is the conclusion.

II. METHODOLOGY

This Article introduces a new Mississippi state court dataset,²³ which identifies the distribution of medical malpractice claims.²⁴ A single methodological approach, addition, is used to analyze these data.²⁵ Addition requires the Article to “[calculate] the sum of two or more numbers.”²⁶

This approach, however, may not be useful if the Article fails to account for a range of potential issues.²⁷ So these issues are deliberately accounted for. This Article, for example, deals with selection effects by looking at the ten years since comprehensive tort reform.²⁸ In contrast, missing values have been addressed through the use of a single data source.²⁹ Other issues are avoided, perhaps completely, by focusing on claims that are filed in the proper place.³⁰ As a result, this Article will explain where medical malpractice claims are filed in Mississippi.³¹

III. ANALYSIS

This Article collects information about 2,521 state court claims, which were filed in Mississippi between 2004 and 2014.³² It then distributes these

18. See *infra* Table 1.

19. See Ronen Avraham, *An Empirical Study of the Impact of Tort Reforms on Medical Malpractice Settlement Payments*, 36 J. LEGAL STUD. 183, 188-189 (2007) (“There is a dearth of reliable empirical or experimental evaluations of medical malpractice tort reform . . . In fact, over the last 3[sic] decades, only a dozen or so empirical studies have examined the impact of tort reforms on medical malpractice payments or medical liability insurance premiums.”).

20. See *infra* Table 1.

21. *Id.*

22. *Id.*

23. See Administrative Office of Courts, *Medical Malpractice Claims Data, 2004-2014* (2014), which was directly provided to the author by the Office of the Administrative Office of Courts in November 2014.

24. See *infra* Table 1.

25. See E.J. Borowski & J.M. Borwein, *THE HARPER-COLLINS DICTIONARY OF MATHEMATICS* 6 (Collins 2002) (1991).

26. *Id.*

27. See, e.g., John Antonakis, Samuel Bendahan, Philippe Jacquart, & Rafael Lalive, *On Making Causal Claims: A Review and Recommendations*, 21 THE LEADERSHIP QUARTERLY 1086 (2010).

28. *Id.* at 1094.

29. *Id.* at 1090.

30. *Id.* at 1094.

31. See *infra* Table 1.

32. *Id.*

claims among the state's eighty-two counties.³³ Last, this Article interprets this data, finding that Hinds County faced the most claims.³⁴ This preliminary analysis, and other useful information, is provided in the Appendix.³⁵

This preliminary analysis carries positive and normative implications. Among the positive implications is that the total number of claims has declined over time.³⁶ But the normative implications are much less clear. For example, it is unclear whether the observed reduction in claims translates into better outcomes in economic, social, or medical terms.³⁷ Additional work, therefore, is needed in order to answer basic research questions.

Within this context, Mississippi should encourage more research on tort reform. And the state could direct its administrative agencies to analyze all publically available information. Mississippi should also provide new incentives for third parties to undertake this work. An additional option for the state would be to negotiate public-private partnerships.

IV. CONCLUSION

This Article finds that Hinds County had the most medical malpractice claims—at least over the last ten years.³⁸ This preliminary finding remains true whether reference is made to each individual year or to the entire study period (2004 to 2014).³⁹ The preliminary finding is initially based on the fact that Hinds County had at least twenty-seven claims each year.⁴⁰ It is later supported by the fact that Hinds County had 537 claims over the ten-year study period.⁴¹ As a result, this Article explains where medical malpractice claims are filed in Mississippi.

33. *Id.*

34. *Id.* This conclusion is initially based on the fact that Hinds County had at least 27 claims in each individual year. It later is supported by a secondary finding that Hinds County had a total of 537 claims between 2004 and 2014.

35. *See infra* Table 1.

36. *Cf.* Behrens, *supra* note 1 at 338 (“In the five-year period (2005-2009) after the implementation of tort reform, the average number of lawsuits per year against all [Medical Assurance Company of Mississippi]-insured physicians (regardless of specialty) dropped 227% (from 318 to 140).”).

37. *Cf.* Schwartz, *supra* note 13 at 1228-29 (“Despite the strong rhetoric . . . neither side [of the tort reform debate] offers much evidence in support of its claims. To be sure, researchers have examined various effects of medical malpractice suits on the provision of medical care. But no empirical studies support the contention that the threat of medical malpractice suits prevents open discussion with providers and patients. There is also limited evidence to support the contrary view . . . [T]here are case studies but ‘no systematic research on the role of medical malpractice lawsuits in identifying dangerous conditions and dangerous doctors.’”) (citations omitted).

38. *See infra* Table 1.

39. *Id.*

40. *Id.*

41. *Id.*

APPENDIX

Table 1. Medical Malpractice Claims Filed in State Circuit Courts By County

| COUNTY ⁴² | 2004 ⁴³ | 2005 ⁴⁴ | 2006 ⁴⁵ | 2007 ⁴⁶ | 2008 ⁴⁷ | 2009 ⁴⁸ | 2010 ⁴⁹ | 2011 ⁵⁰ | 2012 ⁵¹ | 2013 ⁵² | TOTAL |
|----------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|-------|
| ADAMS | 8 | 4 | 10 | 8 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 50 |
| ALCORN | 5 | 6 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 31 |
| AMITE | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| ATTALA | 4 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 11 |
| BENTON | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| BOLIVAR | 8 | 5 | 9 | 4 | 3 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 2 | 9 | 58 |
| CALHOUN | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| CARROLL | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| CHICKASAW | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| CHOCTAW | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| CLAIBORNE | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 16 |
| CLARKE | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 |
| CLAY | 7 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 27 |
| COAHOMA | 6 | 4 | 6 | 7 | 4 | 5 | 12 | 11 | 3 | 2 | 60 |

42. See Summer Davis & Janet P. Baird, County Government in Mississippi 289 (4th ed. 2011), <http://gcd.msucare.com/sites/gcd.msucare.com/files/county%20government%20in%20ms%202011.pdf> (last visited Apr. 12, 2015).

43. See Administrative Office of Courts, *supra* note 23 at 1.

44. *Id.*

45. *Id.*

46. *Id.*

47. *Id.*

48. *Id.*

49. *Id.*

50. *Id.*

51. *Id.*

52. *Id.*

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|-----|---|
| COPIAH | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 8 |
| COVINGTON | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| DESOTO | 7 | 10 | 7 | 8 | 6 | 6 | 2 | 8 | 12 | 9 | 16 | 85 | |
| FORREST | 16 | 7 | 14 | 10 | 6 | 6 | 1 | 10 | 8 | 4 | 4 | 80 | |
| FRANKLIN | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | |
| GEORGE | 2 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | |
| GREENE | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | |
| GRENADA | 6 | 5 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 6 | 38 | |
| HANCOCK | 6 | 6 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 22 | |
| HARRISON | 25 | 21 | 17 | 18 | 14 | 4 | 4 | 22 | 20 | 26 | 0 | 167 | |
| HINDS | 85 | 63 | 65 | 56 | 46 | 36 | 36 | 53 | 53 | 53 | 27 | 537 | |
| HOLMES | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | |
| HUMPHREYS | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 10 | |
| ISSAQUENA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| ITAWAMBA | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | |
| JACKSON | 15 | 15 | 5 | 8 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 7 | 9 | 8 | 9 | 83 | |
| JASPER | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | |
| JEFFERSON | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | |
| JEFFERSONDAVIS | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | |
| JONES | 12 | 10 | 6 | 10 | 9 | 3 | 3 | 7 | 4 | 8 | 7 | 76 | |
| KEMPER | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | |
| LAFAYETTE | 9 | 5 | 6 | 5 | 7 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 6 | 51 | |
| LAMAR | 4 | 3 | 4 | 8 | 7 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 3 | 6 | 5 | 52 | |
| LAUDERDALE | 18 | 7 | 9 | 8 | 15 | 2 | 2 | 11 | 12 | 10 | 7 | 99 | |
| LAWRENCE | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | |
| LEAKE | 3 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 7 | |
| LEE | 16 | 12 | 9 | 10 | 20 | 7 | 7 | 10 | 3 | 9 | 7 | 103 | |
| LEFLORE | 6 | 10 | 3 | 0 | 13 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 44 | |
| LINCOLN | 1 | 0 | 5 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 16 | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-------|---|----|
| UNION | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 12 |
| WALTHALL | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| WARREN | 14 | 6 | 10 | 7 | 11 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 60 |
| WASHINGTON | 16 | 13 | 9 | 7 | 9 | 7 | 5 | 8 | 8 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 82 |
| WAYNE | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 14 |
| WEBSTER | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 7 |
| WILKINSON | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| WINSTON | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| YALOBUSHA | 3 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 |
| YAZOO | 12 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 26 |
| ALL 82 COUNTIES | 405 | 293 | 264 | 257 | 271 | 134 | 247 | 237 | 240 | 173 | 2,521 | | |

Table 2. Other Relevant Information By County

| COUNTY ⁵³ | TOTAL POPULATION ⁵⁴ | TOTAL LAND AREA ⁵⁵ | TOTAL ASSESSED VALUE ⁵⁶ |
|----------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| ADAMS | 32,297 | 488 | 284,997,965 |
| ALCORN | 37,057 | 401 | 230,815,110 |
| AMITE | 13,131 | 732 | 116,949,561 |
| ATTALA | 19,564 | 737 | 175,490,603 |
| BENTON | 8,729 | 409 | 68,021,978 |
| BOLIVAR | 34,145 | 906 | 281,765,264 |
| CALHOUN | 14,962 | 588 | 79,855,876 |
| CARROLL | 10,597 | 635 | 73,351,838 |
| CHICKASAW | 17,392 | 504 | 92,519,110 |
| CHOCTAW | 8,547 | 420 | 226,089,772 |
| CLAIBORNE | 9,604 | 501 | 67,881,179 |
| CLARKE | 16,732 | 694 | 204,895,290 |
| CLAY | 20,634 | 416 | 142,850,886 |
| COAHOMA | 26,151 | 583 | 181,417,110 |
| COPIAH | 29,449 | 780 | 204,759,199 |
| COVINGTON | 19,568 | 415 | 240,976,925 |
| DESOTO | 161,252 | 497 | 1,553,344,200 |
| FORREST | 74,934 | 470 | 654,299,563 |
| FRANKLIN | 8,118 | 567 | 88,155,456 |
| GEORGE | 22,578 | 484 | 156,731,301 |
| GREENE | 14,400 | 719 | 153,620,366 |
| GRENADA | 21,906 | 449 | 180,303,025 |
| HANCOCK | 43,929 | 553 | 561,163,674 |
| HARRISON | 187,105 | 976 | 2,002,889,027 |
| HINDS | 245,285 | 877 | 1,900,972,164 |
| HOLMES | 19,198 | 765 | 119,468,712 |
| HUMPHREYS | 9,375 | 431 | 74,506,625 |
| ISSAQUENA | 1,406 | 441 | 21,029,039 |
| ITAWAMBA | 23,401 | 541 | 128,992,605 |
| JACKSON | 139,668 | 1,043 | 1,663,061,627 |
| JASPER | 17,062 | 678 | 400,247,287 |
| JEFFERSON | 7,726 | 527 | 47,241,011 |

53. See Davis & Baird, *supra* note 42 at 289–93.

54. United States Census Bureau: Census 2010 (2014); Davis & Baird, *supra* note 42 at 289–93.

55. *Id.* The unit of measurement for total land area is square miles, rounded to the nearest whole number.

56. *Id.* The unit of measurement for total assessed value is United States dollars, rounded to the nearest whole number.

| | | | |
|------------------------|---------|-----|---------------|
| JEFFERSON DAVIS | 12,487 | 409 | 182,130,263 |
| JONES | 67,761 | 700 | 662,411,658 |
| KEMPER | 10,456 | 767 | 53,484,357 |
| LAFAYETTE | 47,351 | 679 | 476,357,659 |
| LAMAR | 55,658 | 500 | 573,428,397 |
| LAUDERDALE | 80,261 | 715 | 605,087,555 |
| LAWRENCE | 12,929 | 436 | 135,941,393 |
| LEAKE | 23,805 | 586 | 117,286,358 |
| LEE | 82,910 | 453 | 811,772,940 |
| LEFLORE | 32,317 | 606 | 236,214,721 |
| LINCOLN | 34,869 | 588 | 386,567,382 |
| LOWNDES | 59,779 | 517 | 912,322,594 |
| MADISON | 95,203 | 742 | 1,368,840,345 |
| MARION | 27,088 | 549 | 171,689,611 |
| MARSHALL | 37,144 | 710 | 224,949,716 |
| MONROE | 36,989 | 772 | 314,750,917 |
| MONTGOMERY | 10,925 | 408 | 57,671,701 |
| NESHOPA | 29,676 | 572 | 160,564,843 |
| NEWTON | 21,720 | 580 | 111,473,897 |
| NOXUBEE | 11,545 | 700 | 63,541,129 |
| OKTIBBEHA | 47,671 | 462 | 342,890,632 |
| PANOLA | 34,707 | 705 | 272,002,719 |
| PEARL RIVER | 55,834 | 819 | 383,039,567 |
| PERRY | 12,250 | 650 | 118,083,636 |
| PIKE | 40,404 | 411 | 351,349,995 |
| PONTOTOC | 29,957 | 501 | 168,936,464 |
| PRENTISS | 25,276 | 418 | 132,601,702 |
| QUITMAN | 8,223 | 406 | 46,912,096 |
| RANKIN | 141,617 | 806 | 1,456,266,294 |
| SCOTT | 28,264 | 610 | 179,943,010 |
| SHARKEY | 4,916 | 435 | 38,854,974 |
| SIMPSON | 27,503 | 591 | 218,387,983 |
| SMITH | 16,491 | 637 | 177,366,011 |
| STONE | 17,786 | 448 | 110,532,365 |
| SUNFLOWER | 29,450 | 707 | 170,705,673 |
| TALLAHATCHIE | 15,378 | 652 | 89,344,808 |
| TATE | 28,886 | 411 | 168,255,671 |
| TIPPAH | 22,232 | 460 | 113,398,059 |
| TISHOMINGO | 19,593 | 445 | 147,380,386 |
| TUNICA | 10,778 | 481 | 247,809,202 |

| | | | |
|----------------------------|-----------|--------|----------------|
| UNION | 27,134 | 417 | 203,457,509 |
| WALTHALL | 15,443 | 404 | 101,043,739 |
| WARREN | 48,773 | 619 | 627,475,767 |
| WASHINGTON | 51,137 | 761 | 387,106,438 |
| WAYNE | 20,747 | 814 | 364,277,367 |
| WEBSTER | 10,253 | 423 | 63,086,129 |
| WILKINSON | 9,878 | 688 | 74,799,719 |
| WINSTON | 19,198 | 610 | 118,229,628 |
| YALOBUSHA | 12,678 | 495 | 72,556,170 |
| YAZOO | 28,065 | 934 | 328,360,402 |
| ALL 82 COUNTIES | 2,967,297 | 48,432 | 17,334,231,242 |

