Ballistic, Riot, and Capture Shields

Version 1.0 · Current · October 2026 · Codebook variable: `I_Shield`

Definition

Ballistic, riot, and capture shields are hand-held protective barriers used to place a physical structure between police and a threat. These three types should not be treated as interchangeable technologies; each has distinct design priorities that bear directly on edged-weapon encounters.

Ballistic shield

A ballistic shield is designed primarily to resist specified firearm threats. Depending on construction, it may incorporate composite, steel, ceramic, or polyethylene armor along with a viewing port, weapon-support features, lighting, and handles or forearm straps, with protection levels varying by rating. Its defining feature is projectile protection, which is extremely valuable where firearm access is known or uncertain. In a confirmed edged-weapon-only encounter, however, ballistic protection may impose substantial weight and fatigue costs on the shield operator without addressing the actual threat mechanism, and a ballistic shield should therefore not automatically be treated as the ideal choice simply because it offers the highest protection against a different class of threat.

Riot body shield

A riot shield is generally a lighter transparent polycarbonate barrier designed for crowd-control and impact environments. Commercial riot-body shields commonly use a convex curve around the shield holder, allowing broad frontal coverage while preserving relatively mobile operation. Their intended threats commonly include thrown objects, blunt strikes, pushing, grabbing, crowd pressure, and some hand-held weapons. They are not ordinarily ballistic unless specifically rated. For an edged-weapon encounter, the riot shield may be more attractive than a ballistic shield because it is lighter, transparent, relatively mobile, and capable of placing a substantial physical barrier between the weapon and the officer, though it was not specifically designed as an edged-weapon capture system.

Capture / cell-extraction shield

A capture shield, also called a cell-extraction shield, is a distinct shield design used primarily in corrections and institutional settings. Manufacturer literature describes capture shields with a concave formed radius rather than the convex form commonly used by riot-body shields. The design is intended to support controlled entry into confined spaces, sustained two-handed retention, physical capture, pinning or restraining a resistant person against a wall or floor, and use by more than one officer when additional holding force is needed. For example, Paulson's CS-series capture shields use transparent polycarbonate, dual handles, a concave formed radius, and a friction pad intended to assist holding and control. That design makes the capture shield

conceptually important to edged-weapon encounters because it is not merely a passive barrier but is instead designed around closing with, containing, and physically controlling a person at close range.

Terminology is not standardized

The shield literature and commercial market do not use perfectly consistent terminology. Some correctional training materials describe cell-extraction shields in terms that differ from manufacturer geometry labels, and different products use different curves, handle configurations, dimensions, and restraint concepts. The evidence library should therefore code functional shield type where known rather than assuming that every product marketed as a "riot shield," "capture shield," or "cell extraction shield" has identical geometry.

Shared function

All three shield types share one basic mechanism: placing a physical barrier between the officer or team and the threat. Their design priorities differ, however, in ways that matter considerably in edged-weapon encounters. A ballistic shield is optimized to protect against projectiles; a riot shield offers broad mobile protection against crowd, impact, and contact threats; and a capture shield is designed to maintain barrier protection while helping a trained team physically control or pin a resistant subject.

How It Is Designed to Work

A shield changes the geometry of the encounter by inserting a structure the weapon or subject must get around before reaching the officer. Without a shield, the officer's body may be directly exposed to a firearm projectile, edged weapon, impact weapon, thrown object, physical strike, or close-contact assault. Shield geometry matters, however: a flat or conventionally curved shield does not create an impenetrable wall around the officer, and a knife, machete, sword, or other edged weapon may slide or glance off the face, travel toward an exposed side, reach around an edge, be redirected by the curvature of the shield, or become part of a close-range struggle over the shield itself. The specific proposition that a knife commonly "rolls off" a riot or ballistic shield edge into the shield officer is mechanically plausible but not well established in peer-reviewed police research and should therefore be treated as a design and case-history concern, not a quantified failure rate.

Barrier versus capture

A conventional ballistic or riot shield primarily answers the question of how to keep the threat away from the officer's body. A capture shield adds a second question: whether the barrier itself can help the team control the person's movement. That difference is central to the knife context. A shield that only blocks may still leave the officer facing a mobile aggressor at very close distance, whereas a capture shield is specifically designed to help officers close distance deliberately, maintain two-handed control of the barrier, drive or guide the subject toward a wall or floor, restrict movement, and allow additional officers to secure the subject. U.S. corrections

training recognizes a dedicated shield position within organized cell-extraction teams, reinforcing that shield use in this context is a coordinated capture function rather than simple equipment carriage.

Improvised fit to the knife problem

In policing, a ballistic or riot shield used against a knife may therefore be somewhat analogous to an improvised or repurposed intervention. The equipment is real police protective equipment, but it was not necessarily designed around the specific mechanics of knife thrusts, slash trajectories, close-range circumvention, controlled weapon-bearing capture, or prolonged one-on-one shield retention. That does not make shield use inappropriate, but it reframes the relevant question: not whether a shield was present, but whether the type of shield, training, team configuration, and intended tactic were actually suited to controlling an edged-weapon threat.

Ballistic Protection

Ballistic shields are intended to stop or disrupt specified projectile threats. The protection offered depends on material, thickness, ballistic rating, projectile type and velocity, angle of impact, repeated impacts, shield condition, and whether the projectile strikes the protected area. The shield protects only the area it actually covers and only against threats within its tested capability, meaning it can reduce risk without eliminating it.

Behind-shield injury

Stopping a projectile does not necessarily mean the shield user experiences zero loading. Steinmann and colleagues (Steinmann et al., 2022) found that ballistic impact can deform the back face of a shield and transfer substantial localized force to the arm supporting it, and de Lange and colleagues (De Lange et al., 2023) further characterized this behind-shield blunt trauma mechanism, finding that shield deformation can create loading at the upper extremity; subsequent work developed injury-risk functions for wrist and elbow loading from behind-shield impacts (De Lange et al., 2024). These studies are biomechanical rather than police operational studies, but they establish an important limitation: ballistic non-penetration is not identical to zero injury risk.

Blast protection

Desmoulin and Nolette (Desmoulin & Nolette, 2018) evaluated tactical ballistic shields exposed to blast loading and found meaningful differences in injury-mitigation performance between shield configurations. This is not police encounter-effectiveness evidence, but it demonstrates that shield weight, construction, and design can materially affect protection.

Non-Ballistic Shield Protection

Riot body shields

Riot shields generally provide large transparent coverage, lower weight than ballistic shields, improved visibility, impact resistance, and easier sustained carriage. Their principal limitation is that they are designed primarily for riot-control and broad frontal protection, not specifically for capturing a knife-armed subject. Their convex geometry may help wrap coverage around the user, but that same general shape does not mechanically prevent a hand-held weapon from reaching around or past the shield edge. In a knife encounter, effectiveness therefore depends heavily on shield dimensions, officer positioning, subject movement, weapon length, ability to retain the shield, team spacing, and whether the shield is being used merely to block or as part of a coordinated capture tactic.

Capture / cell-extraction shields

Capture shields use a different design logic. Commercial capture shields commonly use transparent polycarbonate, a concave formed radius, two strong handles, two-handed operation, optional two-officer gripping, and friction padding on the subject-facing surface. The design is intended to help the shield envelop or control the subject's space rather than simply deflect contact away from the operator. Corrections practice provides the closest real-world analogue: cell extraction requires officers to enter a confined environment where a resistant inmate may possess an edged weapon, impact weapon, bodily-fluid weapon, improvised weapon, or other close-contact threat. Professional corrections guidance recommends a hard barrier for the first officer entering the cell and describes shield-assisted extraction as a way to block edged and impact attacks while the team gains physical control. The peer-reviewed outcome literature is weak, but the design logic and established correctional use are directly relevant to the Lab's edged-weapon question.

Important evidence gap

No strong peer-reviewed studies comparing riot shield versus capture shield, ballistic shield versus capture shield, convex versus concave geometry, or shield type versus no shield in actual edged-weapon encounters were identified. Accordingly, any claim that a capture shield is empirically superior for knife encounters would exceed the evidence. The stronger conclusion is that capture shields are more purpose-matched to close-range physical capture than conventional riot or ballistic shields, and that corrections practice provides a plausible model for police edged-weapon intervention that deserves direct study.

Evidence of Effectiveness

Overall assessment

Evidence is strong for the physical principle of barrier protection, moderate for ballistic and biomechanical performance, and low for police field evidence showing that shield deployment reduces force, injury, firearm use, or fatalities. The evidence base is unusually thin. There is substantial research on ballistic materials, shield

deformation, blast loading, police tactical training, load carriage, and tactical-team performance. There is much less research measuring shield deployments per year, subject injury per shield deployment, officer injury per shield deployment, arrest success, firearm avoidance, time to control, containment success, or outcomes specifically in edged-weapon encounters.

Physical effectiveness

At the most basic level, a shield provides a barrier, and that protective function is not controversial. Ballistic-engineering research demonstrates that shield design materially affects protection and transmitted loading (Steinmann et al., 2022; De Lange et al., 2023; De Lange et al., 2024; Desmoulin & Nolette, 2018). The harder question is whether that physical protection translates into better police encounter outcomes, and the literature does not currently provide a reliable answer.

Operational effectiveness

No strong peer-reviewed denominator-based literature establishes, for example, that ballistic shields reduce officer injuries by a given percentage or that shield deployment reduces police firearm use by a measurable amount, and that absence should be treated as an evidence gap rather than filled with tactical convention.

Training and Team Integration

Shield use is not merely equipment possession

The presence of a shield does not automatically create an effective shield response, because using a shield can alter mobility, visibility, balance, weapon access, communication, team spacing, officer fatigue, and role allocation. Clark and colleagues (Clark et al., 2000) found substantial variation in SWAT training needs and emphasized the importance of structured training for specialized tactical functions. More recent experimental work by Espevik and colleagues (Espevik et al., 2026) found that scenario-based decision-making training improved situational awareness in regular and SWAT-type officers and improved team behavior in some ambiguous scenarios. Neither study evaluates shields directly, but both support the broader proposition that specialized equipment works within a trained team system rather than independently of it.

Physical demands

Keeler and colleagues (Keeler et al., 2022) examined SWAT officers performing tactical tasks with and without gear and found that shield walking produced the highest mean muscle activation across several torso muscles among the tasks examined. This does not establish that shields are unsafe, but it does show that carrying and moving with a shield imposes distinct physical demands that may affect endurance, fatigue, mobility, and sustained performance. A heavier shield may provide more protection against firearms while simultaneously increasing the physical burden on the operator; in a confirmed edged-weapon-only encounter, that extra ballistic protection may offer little additional benefit relative to a lighter transparent polycarbonate shield while reducing endurance and mobility.

Role Discipline and the Shield Officer

Why the shield officer may transition to lethal force

The original draft treated shield abandonment mainly as a question of role discipline, but the knife-specific analysis suggests a more nuanced interpretation. If a conventional riot or ballistic shield does little more than delay a determined knife attack, the shield officer may reasonably perceive that the subject can move around the edge, that the weapon can reach exposed anatomy, that the shield can be grabbed or displaced, that continued approach places the officer inside the danger zone, and that the shield does not itself provide a reliable capture mechanism. In that context, dropping or lowering the shield to access a firearm may not represent a simple training failure but may instead reflect a rational conclusion that the barrier no longer provides enough protection to safely continue the contact. The Lab's case histories may therefore be capturing a design mismatch as much as a role-discipline problem.

Case-history observation

Review of police shooting cases suggests that shield officers sometimes lower, discard, reposition, or move away from the shield in order to transition to a firearm. No peer-reviewed research was identified establishing how often this occurs, whether it is more common with ballistic versus riot shields, whether shield geometry influences the transition, or whether a capture-shield configuration would reduce lethal-force transitions. These remain research questions.

Dedicated shield role still matters

A coordinated team can still separate the shield and capture role from communication, arrest and control, less-lethal capability, and lethal overwatch. The shield officer can reasonably be expected to trust the barrier, however, only if the shield is suitable for the threat, officers are trained in its use, the team can actually capture or control the subject, and another officer reliably covers the lethal-force contingency. This reframes the issue from asking why the shield officer abandoned the shield to asking whether the team provided a shield system that made continuing the shield role tactically credible.

Capture shield as a different model

The correctional capture-shield model is relevant because it assumes from the outset that the shield operator remains dedicated to two-handed control, that other team members perform the restraint, that the shield itself assists in pinning and movement control, and that the tactic is performed by a trained extraction team. That is much closer to the capture-and-contain function the Lab is interested in than simply giving a patrol officer a ballistic shield and expecting the shield alone to solve a knife threat. Whether that model transfers safely from a confined correctional cell to open police environments remains untested.

When Its Use May Be Appropriate

Ballistic shield

Shield use may be particularly useful where officers need to maintain a physical barrier during communication, approach a contained person, protect an arrest and control team, rescue someone, hold a doorway or confined space, or physically capture a resistant subject. A ballistic shield is most directly indicated where firearm access is known or uncertain, rescue under potential gunfire is required, ballistic protection is genuinely necessary, or officers must move through an exposed firearm-threat environment. Where the known threat is only an edged weapon, the ballistic shield may be unnecessarily heavy relative to the protection required, and the extra weight may accelerate fatigue, reduce mobility, make sustained two-handed control difficult, and increase the likelihood that the officer abandons or repositions the shield.

Riot body shield

A riot shield may be preferable to a ballistic shield where the threat is edged, blunt, thrown, or physical rather than ballistic. Its lighter weight and transparency can improve endurance, visibility, mobility, and sustained barrier use. The riot shield remains primarily a blocking shield, however, and is not a purpose-built capture device.

Capture shield

A capture shield may be the most conceptually appropriate shield where the objective is to physically close with and control a contained edged-weapon subject without relying on the shield alone to deflect repeated attacks. Its use is most plausible where the subject is geographically contained, multiple trained officers are present, officers can control the direction of approach, firearm threat is not reasonably suspected, the environment supports controlled contact, lethal overwatch remains available, and officers have trained in shield-assisted capture. The strongest existing model for this approach comes from corrections and cell extraction rather than patrol policing.

When Its Use May Be Inappropriate or Insufficient

Firearm threat beyond rating

A riot shield should not be used as though it provides ballistic protection, and a ballistic shield should not be assumed to defeat ammunition beyond its tested performance.

Open or uncontrolled environment

A shield protects primarily in the direction it covers. It does not prevent a subject from moving around the officer, changing direction, attacking someone else, fleeing, or accessing another weapon.

Single-officer dependence

A shield may reduce one category of exposure while limiting the operator's ability to perform other functions. Where officers lack backup, role coordination, capture capability, communication, or contingency planning, the shield alone may not produce meaningful control.

Excessive confidence

The shield can create a dangerous cognitive error if officers interpret greater protection as complete protection. A shield does not eliminate exposed limbs, reach-around attacks, grabbing, loss of balance, trips, attacks from another angle, fatigue, projectile threats above its rating, or the subject's ability to threaten someone outside the shield's protection.

Relevance to Edged-Weapon Encounters

The central problem

In edged-weapon encounters, shield type and geometry become more important than generic shield availability. A knife does not need to penetrate a shield; it only needs to reach exposed anatomy. A conventional shield can therefore fail operationally even when the shield material itself performs perfectly. The subject may redirect the weapon around an edge, attack above or below the shield, move laterally, grab or push the shield, force the operator off balance, or create enough uncertainty that the shield officer transitions to lethal force. This is why a conventional shield should not be treated as a knife-proof solution.

Ballistic shield: capable but potentially overbuilt

A ballistic shield offers substantial protection against projectile threats. If the encounter involves only an edged weapon, that protection may come at a cost: greater weight, greater fatigue, reduced mobility, less sustainable shield retention, and no corresponding ballistic-threat benefit. Keeler et al. (Keeler et al., 2022) found that shield walking imposed particularly high muscular demands among SWAT tasks, which supports the more limited conclusion that weight is operationally consequential and that unnecessary ballistic protection may impose a real performance cost.

Riot body shield: lighter but not purpose-built for capture

A transparent riot shield may be more practical than a ballistic shield because it is lighter, larger, more transparent, and intended for sustained contact environments. Riot shields are primarily crowd-control barriers, however, and are not specifically designed to prevent a knife from moving around the edge or to secure the subject against the shield.

Capture shield: a potentially better design match

Capture and cell-extraction shields offer a different approach. Rather than merely blocking the person, their concave form and dual-handle design are intended to help the team maintain two-handed control, close

distance deliberately, pin or hold the person against a wall or floor, restrict movement, and transition from barrier protection to physical restraint. This is particularly relevant to the Lab because the desired outcome in many contained edged-weapon encounters is not simply to avoid being stabbed but to safely capture the person without shooting them. Corrections practice provides the strongest operational analogue because cell-extraction teams routinely prepare to enter confined spaces against resistant persons who may possess improvised edged or impact weapons.

Correctional evidence and practice

U.S. correctional training materials identify a dedicated shield position within organized cell-extraction teams and emphasize controlled removal using the least necessary force. Professional corrections guidance describes the shield as a hard barrier used by the lead officer to block edged and impact attacks during entry while the team gains physical control. Manufacturer literature for purpose-built capture shields describes concave curvature, dual handles, two-person reinforcement, transparent polycarbonate, and friction padding specifically for cell extraction and restraint. This constitutes useful evidence of design purpose and operational practice, but it is not equivalent to a controlled outcome study.

Knife path around the edge

The Lab's concern that a knife may glance or roll off a conventional shield and continue toward the officer is mechanically credible, but no peer-reviewed experimental research quantifying weapon trajectories around shield edges, convex versus concave shield performance, officer injury rates by shield geometry, or capture-shield performance against actual knife attacks was identified. Accordingly, the precise "roll-off" mechanism should be presented as a plausible geometric failure mode supported by case-history observation, but not yet a quantified research finding.

Capture versus protection

The most important conceptual change is that, for edged weapons, the best shield may not be the shield with the highest protective rating but the shield that best supports sustained barrier control and coordinated capture. That hypothesis deserves direct empirical testing.

Conditions favouring capture-shield use

A capture-shield approach is most plausible where the subject is contained, there are no accessible third parties, firearm threat has been reasonably excluded, multiple trained officers are available, the environment limits flanking, continued waiting is undesirable or unsafe, physical capture is necessary, and lethal cover remains immediately available if the tactic fails.

Failure consequences

Capture-shield tactics remain close-contact tactics, and failure could result in shield loss, weapon reaching around the barrier, officer falls, team collapse, subject escape, injury during pinning, or rapid transition to

lethal force. The technique should therefore not be treated as a universal substitute for containment, negotiation, or firearm force.

Risk trade-off

A capture-shield model may reduce the mismatch seen with conventional shields: a ballistic shield offers high protection at high weight with a weak capture function; a riot shield offers lower weight and a broad barrier but a similarly weak capture function; and a capture shield offers lower ballistic protection with a stronger close-control design. For a known edged-weapon-only threat, that trade-off may be more rational than automatically selecting the heaviest available shield, but comparative police outcome research is presently absent.

Relationship to Other Intervention Options

Versus firearm force

A shield may allow officers to remain protected while another officer maintains lethal-force capability, creating a layered response rather than requiring the same officer to provide both protection and firearm coverage. Whether that configuration reduces shootings is not established by current peer-reviewed evidence.

Versus CEW

A CEW attempts to incapacitate, whereas a shield protects even if the subject cannot be reached effectively by probes, is wearing clothing that interferes with probe contact, or remains behaviorally unaffected. The two may therefore be complementary rather than competing interventions.

Versus chemical spray

Chemical spray relies on sensory and behavioral effects, while a shield provides mechanical protection regardless of whether the subject experiences those effects.

Versus baton or impact weapon

A baton generally requires officers to enter striking distance. A shield may reduce exposure during close approach but also places the shield team within the general reach environment of the edged weapon.

Versus armored vehicle

Both are barrier interventions, but the armored vehicle provides much greater protection while having limited ability to accompany officers into buildings, stairwells, narrow corridors, residences, and other confined spaces. A hand-held shield sacrifices protection and stability for mobility.

Injury and Safety Evidence

Officer injury

Direct police injury data associated specifically with shields are scarce. The clearest evidence concerns ballistic protection, behind-shield loading, fatigue, and occupational physical demand. Keeler et al. (Keeler et al., 2022) found that shield walking imposed comparatively high torso-muscle activation among the SWAT tasks tested. Ballistic studies show that stopped projectiles can still transmit potentially injurious loads through the shield structure (Steinmann et al., 2022; De Lange et al., 2023; De Lange et al., 2024).

Subject injury

The shield itself normally has no injury mechanism when used purely as a barrier, but it can become a force instrument if officers strike, shove, pin, compress, or drive it into a subject, at which point the intervention is no longer merely protective and the injury risk depends on force, contact area, anatomy, body position, environment, and whether the subject falls or is compressed against another surface. There is very little empirical literature quantifying subject injury from police shield strikes, shield-assisted control, or capture-shield pinning; correctional use demonstrates that shield-assisted restraint is an established practice, but does not provide a reliable injury denominator.

U.S. Legal Considerations

Shield presence is generally protective, not force

Merely carrying or positioning a shield ordinarily does not itself constitute physical force against the subject. Its constitutional significance usually arises from the broader police action–detention, entry, arrest, seizure, or accompanying force.

Shield used as physical force

If officers use the shield to strike, push, pin, compress, or knock a person down, that action becomes part of the force analysis under the Fourth Amendment's objective-reasonableness framework. The relevant questions remain the severity of the threat, immediacy, resistance, attempted escape, proportionality, and the totality of circumstances.

No general legal requirement to use a shield

The availability of a shield does not create a universal constitutional rule that officers must use it before resorting to another objectively reasonable force option, though shield availability may become factually relevant where officers had time, the subject was contained, the shield was already deployed, or the reasonableness of the tactical approach is contested. The legal significance will depend heavily on jurisdiction and case facts.

Ethical and Moral Considerations

Protection without injury

The strongest ethical argument for shield use is that it may increase officer safety without requiring injury to the subject. A successful barrier intervention can potentially create time, distance, safer communication, rescue, controlled approach, or physical capture without applying an injurious technology.

Protection should not become forced proximity

A shield can create confidence to approach, which can be beneficial when approach is necessary, but can also create unnecessary risk if officers move closer simply because the shield is available. The ethical question is therefore not whether officers can approach behind a shield but whether approaching is necessary and proportionate compared with continued containment or communication.

Team trust, equipment fit, and role discipline

The case-history observation raises a legitimate ethical and operational question, but it should not be reduced to officer discipline alone. If an officer is expected to remain behind a shield while facing a knife, the agency also has an obligation to ask whether the shield is actually suited to close-contact capture, whether its weight can be sustained, whether the officer has trained in retention, whether enough team members are present, whether the arrest role is clearly assigned, and whether lethal overwatch is reliable. A shield officer abandoning an unsuitable barrier may reflect rational self-protection rather than failure to trust the team. The stronger research question is what shield design and team structure would allow officers to maintain protection long enough to complete a safe capture–a question the existing literature does not answer.

Evidence Limitations

Police shield research is extremely sparse, and the available ballistic-engineering studies measure material and injury mechanics rather than encounter outcomes. Ballistic shields, riot body shields, and capture and cell-extraction shields should not be treated as equivalent technologies, and shield size, weight, materials, handles, viewing ports, and protection ratings vary widely across commercial products. There are almost no denominator-based field studies measuring officer or subject injury per shield deployment, and little empirical evidence comparing shield deployment with CEW, firearm, chemical spray, police dog, or continued containment. The presence of a shield in a case record does not establish that it was actually positioned effectively during the critical moment, and team training and staffing likely affect effectiveness, though optimal shield-team configuration has not been established. Physical workload and fatigue may influence sustained shield performance (Keeler et al., 2022), and ballistic non-penetration does not eliminate behind-shield blunt-trauma risk (Steinmann et al., 2022; De Lange et al., 2023; De Lange et al., 2024). No strong peer-reviewed evidence establishes how often shield officers transition away from the shield to firearms or how that affects outcomes. Direct edged-weapon-specific field research is essentially absent, and no strong comparative research on convex

versus concave shield geometry in knife encounters exists. Capture-shield evidence comes primarily from correctional practice, training guidance, and manufacturer design information rather than controlled police outcome studies, and the hypothesis that shield abandonment reflects equipment-design mismatch rather than simple role failure has not been directly tested.

Bottom Line

Barrier effectiveness is strong in principle: a shield creates a movable physical barrier between officer and threat.

Ballistic protection is strong but rating-dependent. A ballistic shield can stop specified projectile threats, though non-penetration does not mean zero transmitted injury.

Riot-shield protection is useful as a lighter contact barrier, but the riot shield is not purpose-built for capturing a knife-armed person.

Operational effectiveness is plausible but poorly quantified. Very little field research demonstrates how much shield deployment reduces injury, force, or firearm use.

Training is likely critical. A shield changes team movement, physical workload, communication, visibility, and role allocation, and equipment possession alone should not be treated as equivalent to effective shield capability.

Edged-weapon relevance is potentially very high, though highly design-dependent. The shield must do more than simply resist penetration; it must prevent circumvention long enough for officers to control or disengage from the subject.

Capture and containment: capture shields are conceptually better matched to this objective than conventional ballistic or riot shields, but comparative police evidence is absent. Corrections practice provides the strongest operational analogue.

Shield abandonment and firearm transition constitute an important case-history observation, though the pattern may reflect a design problem as much as a training problem. The literature does not establish whether shield operators abandon conventional shields because of poor role discipline, fatigue, shield geometry, perceived ineffectiveness against the knife, or some combination of these factors.

Risk-benefit assessment: the shield is most compelling where it allows officers to maintain a protective barrier while preserving time, containment, communication, and coordinated capture options. Its value decreases where the environment allows easy circumvention, the officer is untrained, staffing is inadequate, the shield is too burdensome to maintain, or the shield is abandoned when threat intensity increases.

Operational / Practice Evidence on Capture Shields

The capture-shield literature is notable because the most directly relevant material is practice-based rather than peer reviewed.

Nevada Department of Corrections cell-extraction training

A U.S. Department of Justice / NCJRS record for the Nevada Department of Corrections' *Cell Extractions Student Handout* describes a formal extraction team with a dedicated shield position and an objective of removing a resistant inmate in a controlled manner using the least force necessary. This supports shield use as a dedicated team role, structured capture rather than ad-hoc barrier use, and corrections as a relevant operational analogue for contained edged-weapon encounters, but it does not establish comparative injury or effectiveness rates.

Correctional extraction practice

Professional corrections guidance describes a hard shield barrier as protection for the first officer entering a cell, specifically including protection against edged and impact weapons, and emphasizes using the shield as part of a coordinated extraction team rather than as a stand-alone device.

Purpose-built capture shields

Commercial capture shields such as Paulson's CS-series are specifically designed for cell extraction. Documented design features include a concave formed radius, transparent polycarbonate construction, dual handles, two-person reinforcement capability, and friction padding intended to assist restraint. These sources establish design intent, not clinical or tactical outcome superiority.

Design-language caution

Manufacturer material describes riot body shields as convex around the officer and capture shields as concave away from the officer, while some professional correctional sources use different descriptive language for extraction-shield shape. The important distinction is therefore functional rather than semantic: riot shields prioritize mobile broad-area protection, while capture shields prioritize close control and restraint.

Core Peer-Reviewed Evidence

1. Steinmann, N., de Lange, J. E., Binette, J.-S., & Quenneville, C. E. (2022)
Quantification of Behind Shield Blunt Impacts Using a Modified Upper Extremity Anthropomorphic Test Device.
Journal of Biomechanical Engineering, 144(9).
DOI: 10.1115/1.4054200

Citation key: `<span class="cite">(Steinmann et al., 2022)</span>`

Priority: Essential ballistic-shield safety evidence.

Contribution: Quantifies upper-extremity loading produced when a projectile deforms the back face of a ballistic shield.

Key finding: Two shields with the same nominal ballistic protection produced statistically different loading responses.

Key value: Demonstrates that stopping the projectile does not eliminate injury risk to the shield operator.

Limitation: Laboratory biomechanics, not police field effectiveness.

---

2. de Lange, J. E., Burrows, L. J., Binette, J.-S., et al. (2023)
Behind Shield Blunt Trauma: Characterizing the Back-Face Deformation of Shields with a Focus on Upper Limb Loading.
Annals of Biomedical Engineering, 51, 1331–1342.
DOI: 10.1007/s10439-023-03141-0

Citation key: `<span class="cite">(De Lange et al., 2023)</span>`

Priority: Essential ballistic-shield injury evidence.

Contribution: Characterizes shield back-face deformation and resulting upper-extremity loading.

Key value: Provides biomechanical evidence for behind-shield blunt-trauma risk.

Limitation: Does not measure tactical effectiveness or real-world injury incidence.

---

3. de Lange, J. E., Burrows, L. J., & Quenneville, C. E. (2024)
Injury Risk Functions for the Midsized Male Wrist and Elbow as a Result of Behind Shield Blunt Trauma.
Journal of Biomechanical Engineering, 146(10), 101004.
DOI: 10.1115/1.4065362

Citation key: `<span class="cite">(De Lange et al., 2024)</span>`

Priority: High injury-risk evidence.

Contribution: Develops injury-risk functions for wrist and elbow loading behind ballistic shields.

Key value: Refines understanding of residual injury risk even when ballistic penetration is prevented.

---

4. Desmoulin, G. T., & Nolette, M.-A. (2019)

Novel Tactical Ballistic Shield Technology: A Blast Injury Mitigation Evaluation.

Advances in Military Technology, 14(1).

DOI: 10.3849/aimt.01234

Citation key: `<span class="cite">(Desmoulin & Nolette, 2018)</span>`

Priority: Supporting shield-performance evidence.

Contribution: Compares blast-injury mitigation across shield configurations using an anthropomorphic test device.

Key finding: Shield weight and configuration materially affected modeled injury risk.

Limitation: Blast environment and laboratory design; indirect to ordinary police encounters.

---

5. Keeler, J. M., Pohl, M. B., Bergstrom, H. C., Thomas, J. M., & Abel, M. G. (2022)

The Effect of Tactical Tasks and Gear on Muscle Activation of SWAT Officers.

Journal of Strength and Conditioning Research, 36(1), 238–244.

DOI: 10.1519/JSC.0000000000003396

Citation key: `<span class="cite">(Keeler et al., 2022)</span>`

Priority: Important operator-demand evidence.

Contribution: Examines muscle activation during SWAT occupational tasks, including shield walking.

Key finding: Shield walking produced the highest mean activation for several torso muscles among the tasks tested.

Key value: Supports treating shield carriage as a physically demanding specialist task.

Limitation: Does not measure fatigue-related tactical failure or encounter outcomes.

---

6. Clark, J. G., Jackson, M. S., Schaefer, P. M., & Sharpe, E. G. (2001)

Training SWAT teams: implications for improving tactical units.

Journal of Criminal Justice, 29(5), 407–413.

DOI: 10.1016/S0047-2352(00)00055-6

Citation key: `<span class="cite">(Clark et al., 2000)</span>`

Priority: Supporting specialist-training evidence.

Contribution: Exploratory study of training needs among 65 U.S. law-enforcement organizations with tactical units.

Key value: Supports the broader proposition that specialist equipment and tactics require structured training rather than simple issuance.

Limitation: Not shield-specific and now relatively old.

---

7. Espevik, R., Rose-Saus, E., Johnsen, B. H., Sanden, S., & Olsen, O. K. (2026)
Decision-Making Training for Frontline Police Officers: Effects on Situational Awareness and Team Behavior.
Scandinavian Journal of Psychology, 67, 596–604.
DOI: 10.1111/sjop.70050

Citation key: `<span class="cite">(Espevik et al., 2026)</span>`

Priority: Supporting team-training evidence.

Contribution: Quasi-experimental study of 166 regular and SWAT-type officers in simulated arrest scenarios.

Key finding: Training improved situational awareness across officer groups and improved team behavior in some ambiguous scenarios.

Key value: Supports the importance of shared situational awareness and team coordination around specialist tactics.

Limitation: Not U.S.-based and not shield-specific.

Evidence Rating

Physical barrier function: ★★★★★
Mechanically straightforward and directly relevant to contact threats.

Ballistic protection: ★★★★☆ to ★★★★★
Strong engineering evidence, but entirely dependent on rating, design, and impact conditions.

Behind-shield injury evidence: ★★★★☆
Good laboratory evidence identifies residual loading and injury mechanisms.

Operator physical-demand evidence: ★★★☆☆
Direct SWAT task research exists but is limited.

Police field effectiveness: ★☆☆☆☆ to ★★☆☆☆
Very little denominator-based evidence.

Training / team-integration importance: ★★★☆☆
Strongly plausible and supported indirectly, but shield-specific outcome studies are lacking.

Edged-weapon-specific effectiveness: ★★☆☆☆
Strong physical rationale but extremely limited field research.

Capture / firearm-substitution effect: ★☆☆☆☆
No reliable comparative evidence.

Shield-role discipline / abandonment: ★☆☆☆☆
Important observational hypothesis with little or no direct published evidence.

Overall confidence: Moderate for protective mechanism; low for encounter-level effectiveness.

Research-library conclusion

Shields remain highly relevant to edged-weapon encounters, but the knife-specific analysis changes what should count as an optimal shield intervention. A conventional ballistic shield is designed primarily to defeat firearm threats; against a confirmed knife-only threat, its added ballistic protection may impose unnecessary weight, fatigue, and mobility costs without solving the central problem that a mobile aggressor can attack around the shield edge. A conventional riot shield is lighter and better suited to sustained contact, but it remains primarily a crowd-control barrier rather than a capture device. Capture and cell-extraction shields provide a different model–transparent polycarbonate, concave geometry, two-handed retention, and designs intended to help a trained team pin and physically control a resistant person–and corrections practice therefore offers a meaningful analogue for contained edged-weapon incidents in which the objective is to capture rather than simply block the subject. The evidence, however, is largely operational, training-based, and manufacturer-derived rather than peer reviewed. No strong studies show that capture shields outperform riot or ballistic shields in knife incidents, nor do any studies quantify whether knife blades commonly glance around conventional shield edges into officers. The Lab should therefore treat the proposed advantage of capture shields as a strong design hypothesis grounded in correctional practice, not an established effectiveness finding. The case-history observation that shield officers sometimes abandon conventional shields and transition to firearms may reflect role discipline, fatigue, fear, shield geometry, or a rational perception that the shield no longer offers enough protection. The research question is therefore not simply whether officers should trust the shield, but whether agencies are providing a shield design, training model, staffing structure, and capture tactic that make continued shield use credible when facing an edged weapon.

References

Clark, J. G, Jackson, M. S, Schaefer, P. M, & Sharpe, E. (2000). Training swat teams: implications for improving tactical units. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, *28*(5), 407–413. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0047-2352(00)00055-6

De Lange, J. E., Burrows, L. J., Binette, J. S., & Quenneville, C. E. (2023). Behind Shield Blunt Trauma: Characterizing the Back-Face Deformation of Shields with a Focus on Upper Limb Loading. *Annals of Biomedical Engineering*, *51*(6), 1331–1342. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10439-023-03141-0

De Lange, J. E., Burrows, L., & Quenneville, C. E. (2024). Injury Risk Functions for the Midsized Male Wrist and Elbow as a Result of Behind Shield Blunt Trauma. *Journal of Biomechanical Engineering*, *146*(10), 101004. https://doi.org/10.1115/1.4065362

Desmoulin, G. T., & Nolette, M. A. (2018). Novel Tactical Ballistic Shield Technology: a Blast Injury Mitigation Evaluation. *Advances in Military Technology*, *13*(2), 249–264. https://doi.org/10.3849/aimt.01234

Espevik, R., Rose-Saus, E., Johnsen, B. H., Sanden, S., & Olsen, O. K. (2026). Decision-Making Training for Frontline Police Officers: Effects on Situational Awareness and Team Behavior. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology*, *67*(2), 596–604. https://doi.org/10.1111/sjop.70050

Keeler, J. M., Pohl, M. B., Bergstrom, H. C., Thomas, J. M., & Abel, M. G. (2022). The Effect of Tactical Tasks and Gear on Muscle Activation of swat Officers. *Journal of Strength & Conditioning Research*, *36*(1), 238–244. https://doi.org/10.1519/JSC.0000000000003396

Steinmann, N., De Lange, J. E., Binette, J. S., & Quenneville, C. E. (2022). Quantification of Behind Shield Blunt Impacts Using a Modified Upper Extremity Anthropomorphic Test Device. *Journal of Biomechanical Engineering*, *144*(9), 091010. https://doi.org/10.1115/1.4054200

HOW TO CITE

Edged-Weapon Response Lab. (2026). *Ballistic, Riot, and Capture Shields*. In *EWRL Evidence Library* (Version 1.0). https://droptheknife.org/evidence-base/I_Shield (https://droptheknife.org/evidence-base/I_Shield)