

The author will appreciate your assessment of the article. Please also offer comments to guide LAP editors in deciding whether to publish. If you recommend revisions, please be as specific as possible. A copy of this review will be sent to the author.

Date Sent	02/01/2018		VCC-01
Manuscript Title:	Evaluation Due	03/01/2018	
Beasts of Prey or Rational Animals? Private Governance in Brazil's <i>Jogo do Bicho</i>		G. Leddy	
Please rate the manuscript on the following: (A=Excellent, B=Requires Revision, C=Inadequate)			
Subject Appropriateness:	<u>C</u>	Timeliness:	<u>A</u>
Data and/or its Presentation:	<u>B</u>	Analysis of Data:	<u>C</u>
		Style:	<u>A</u>
		Organization:	<u>A</u>
		References:	<u>B</u>
		Theoretical Framework:	<u>C</u>
		Reference Style:	<u>A</u>
Overall Grade (Check One):			
A. Publish, Requires Little or No Editing <u> </u>		B. Possibly Publish, Requires Revision <u> </u> (Substantial) <u>X</u>	
		C. Do Not Publish <u>X</u>	

Editor Evaluation:

This paper departs from the prospectus for this thematic issue in a significant way. It is not about violence and capital accumulation. It is about crime and advances a tool for studying an illegal lottery in Brazil using a variant of rational choice theory. There is a lot in this paper and it takes on the role of the state and the organization of crime over the long term. Thus we have many theoretical approaches around the culture and practice and economics of the *jogo do bicho*, including state capture theory.

I think this paper is a good paper as a stand-alone paper. But I do not think it is appropriate for the VCC issue. Note:

...Although those concepts have a long tradition in public choice, scholars have not applied those ideas thus far to understand the dynamics of the *jogo do bicho*. By doing so, I integrate seemingly contradictory historical facts into a single narrative that connects micro-level decisions to macro-level outcomes.

There are references to history and money supply which I found very interesting as a line of analysis. In one case the vagueness of the theory is clear "civil servants can be co-opted by criminal groups and produce sub-optimal social outcomes." Sub-optimal is vague. But then there are short sections in this long MS that really invite a closer look and expanded analysis. See for example this insightful paragraph:

"Next is the impact of expanded monetary supply. The abolition of slavery and the growing industrialisation of Brazil increased the amount of capital available in the country (Franco 1987; Schulz 2008). The 1888 Banking Act gave extra liquidity to local financial markets, and the *jogo do bicho* entrepreneurs utilised that increase in the monetary base to extend the scope of their business. Some years later, the animal game would be available not only across the city of Rio de Janeiro but throughout Brazil."

The problem I have with the theoretical approaches used in this text is that they are neutralistic, evading discussions of social conflict in favor of an amalgam of theories based on rational choice and functional aspects of government. For example:

"The situation is a prisoner's dilemma in which candidates would be better off by running cheaper campaigns and not being dependent of *jogo do bicho* bankers, but asymmetric information prevents them from reaching an optimal solution."

The rational choice conundrum is furthered by information theory and "optimal solutions" whatever those might be.

I think this could have been a more LAP style paper if it had expanded on the role of gambling rackets in the economy, the specific types of political candidates supported by the *jogo*, the overall impact of this much cash circulating and how it is harnessed by the formal economy, and the manipulation of poor district votes. I find much of the discussion on how the game is perceived and the theories of choice to be less interesting. What welfare provisions are provided by the *jogo*? Why is the only discussion of violence saved for the conclusion? The most interesting questions (as far as the VCC issue is concerned) are found in the conclusion.

Footnotes show go at the end.

Spelling should be US and not UK.

Links do not work and should not be in the footnotes.

G. Leddy
Signature

3/18/18
Date