

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	08/21/2017			VCC-01			
Manuscript Title:	Evaluation Due	09/21/2017					
Beasts of Prey or Rational Animals? Private Governance in Brazil's <i>Jogo do Bicho</i>							
Please rate the manuscript on the following: (A=Excellent, B=Requires Revision, C=Inadequate)							
Subject Appropriateness:	C	Timeliness:	B	Organization:	A	Theoretical Framework:	B
Data and/or its Presentation:	B	Analysis of Data:	A	Style:	B	References:	A
Overall Grade (Check One):							
A. Publish, Requires Little or No Editing		B. Possibly Publish, Requires Revision		X		(Substantial)	
						C. Do Not Publish	

Editor Evaluation:

This is a well-written and very complete examination of the *jogo do bicho* illegal gambling game in Brazil. The author analyzes three issues pertaining to the game: 1) how internal governance is achieved among the different members of the criminal organization that control the game; 2) how the game is legitimized among the wider population, including through the funding of Samba schools; and 3) how the criminal groups controlling the *jogo do bicho* have coopted politicians and the police.

The author's methodology is, at first, not clear. It eventually becomes apparent that the article is based on an analysis of bibliographical sources, and not on any primary data or secondary statistical data. The author should make this clear in the introduction.

What I find most problematic with this article is the intention to address too many topics, and the fact that the connections between the topics are not always clear, or perhaps are non-existent in some cases. If the author intends to analyze all three major issues (internal governance, legitimation with the public, and cooptation of civil servants), the connections between them should be made clearer. If one of the major issues has few or no connections with the rest, perhaps the author should avoid analyzing that issue. For example, is there a connection between internal governance in the *jogo do bicho* and cooptation of civil servants? In addition, the long examination of the historical background, including the directed acyclic graph, does not seem to be crucial for the rest of the article. Moreover, by attempting to address too many issues, the author does not focus on a theoretical perspective (or contrasts theoretical perspectives), but instead briefly mentions different perspectives for each separate issue (repugnant markets, game theory, state capture...). I suggest the author to focus more keenly on one or two issues and one or two different theoretical perspectives, rather than attempting to address all topics in an overarching way.

Finally, although I think the article may be published with some revisions (particularly by making it more focused), it is not appropriate for the special issue on Violence and Capital Accumulation. The reason is simply that violence is not a major topic in the article. The special issue on Violence and Capital Accumulation seeks papers dealing with: 1) how violence is linked to capital accumulation; 2) the creation of initiatives and movements for peace and justice to confront accumulation-related violence. The article on the *jogo do bicho* does mention violence reduction, but linked to internal governance in the criminal organization (and not to any initiative or movement for peace and justice). In brief, I recommend that the article be published with some revisions, but that it be published in an open issue of LAP.

Matthew Lorenzen
8/25/2017