

ANALES | ASOCIACION ARGENTINA DE ECONOMIA POLITICA

# **LIII Reunión Anual**

Noviembre de 2018

ISSN 1852-0022 ISBN 978-987-28590-6-0

The Costs of Crime in Argentina

Shehadi Agustin

## The Costs of Crime in Argentina An Estimation of the Social Costs of Crime and Violence as a Percentage of GDP by Jurisdiction

Agustin A. Shehadi C.\*

University of CEMA

2018

"Estimar los costos del crimen es un ejercicio contrafáctico, donde se especula sobre los comportamientos y niveles de satisfacción de los miembros de una sociedad en una situación donde el delito es inexistente" - Ronconi Lucas (2009)

#### Abstract

The main goal for this paper is to deal with the challenging task of estimating the direct and indirect costs of crime and violence for Argentina as a decomposition by jurisdiction (23 provinces). With *Costs of Crime* we are referring not only to material losses or damages but also to "everything that means a welfare loss for society derived for crime". This exercise has the difficulty of assigning a monetary value to aspects such as human life or the productivity loss suffered by a person in jail. In this study we categorize the welfare costs of crime in three main categories: Private Costs, Governmental Costs and Social Costs. There is a great discussion related to the methodology that this task implies, the so-called *Hedonic Prices* (Bishop and Timmis -2011, Gaviria et al - 2008), *Contingent Valuation* (Zarakin, Cates and Bala -2005, Cohen et al -2004, Ronconi -2009), and *The Accounting of Losses and Expenses* (Cohen -2005, Brand and Price -2000, Rollings -2008). The method adopted in this paper is the latter; we opted this way of analysis because this method also includes the identification of intangible costs, such as the weakening of the community's social capital and the social opportunity cost of somebody dedicated to crime instead of lawful activities, and the advantage of a clear distinction of the sources of the welfare loss of crime in the society.

#### 1 Introduction

The estimation of crime costs from the socio-economic point of view is given by the need to cover a wide spectrum of aspects that refer to criminal activity, and effectively result in a reduction in the well-being of the group of individuals in a society. From the economic point of view, it refers to the hypothetical comparison of an ideal world "without crime" versus the daily reality to, in this way, find a quantitative measure of the reduction of social welfare for a country, and also give a comparable measure between countries and / or regions.

On the one hand, crimes as a whole can be classified in numerous ways; the most common refer to crimes against individuals, including homicides, assaults, rapes, kidnappings, etc., followed by crimes against private property, including robbery and theft. And last but not least, economic crimes, which include fraud, usury, conspiracy, fraudulent loan contracting, tax evasion, crimes against industrial property, crimes against intellectual property, etc. On the other hand, the literature also distinguishes between "Tangible" and "Intangible" costs related to criminal activity. The former refer to those costs that, once reduced or eliminated, generate availability of resources for other purposes. For example, investments, expenses or materials; all these are costs incurred by

<sup>\*</sup>Electronic address: ashehadi18@ucema.edu

Special thanks to Mariana Conte Grand (UCEMA) for her advice and recommendations in order to improve the work, and Osvaldo Meloni (UNT) for the provision of indispensable databases for the estimations.

individuals, organizations or communities. In turn, "Intangible" costs refer to the anguish, pain, suffering and loss of quality of life incurred by the victims of crime and violence. These types of costs result in personal trauma and change in the regular behavior of individuals.

Regarding methods of estimating the costs of crime, the bibliography classifies it into two main branches: the "top down methods" and the "bottom up methods". The top down approach seeks to estimate the total cost of crime and violence from a single source, while the bottom-up approach focuses on identifying all individual costs and adding them up subsequently. In turn, both branches are classified according to the methodology they include. On the one hand, the "top down methods" include the Contingent Valuation and the Hedonic Prices; The first based on the stated preferences, aims to identify the willingness to pay for a person or community to improve or prevent the deterioration of their welfare, or to compensate for the damage or an unrealized improvement. And the Hedonic Prices are based on the "Revealed Preferences", and focus on the fact that the value of a good must be the sum of the values given to its characteristics; therefore, the cost of crime and violence can be measured with this method estimating the differences in the prices of the properties. On the other hand, the bottom up method is mainly composed of the "Accounting of losses and expenses" method, and identifies the following costs: The investments made by individuals and organizations to avoid being victims of crime and violence, the monetary value of the stolen property, the income not received by the victims as a consequence of a criminal act, the costs of victimization referred to medical coverage, and the expenses incurred by the State to deter the crime, identify the offender and prosecute and punish him, in accordance with what is established by law. This method also usually includes the identification of intangible costs, such as tax evasion, losses derived from extortive practices, the weakening of a community's social capital, the social opportunity cost of someone who engages in crime rather than legal activities, the opportunity cost of drug abuse, and the damage caused by drug trafficking.

Regarding the review of the literature, some examples can be cited regarding the different methodologies. On the side of the Hedonic Prices, for example, Bishop and Timmis (2011), and Gaviria et al. (2008). Referring to the Contingent Valuation, we find works such as Zarkin, Cates and Bala (2000), Ludwig and Cook (2001), Cohen et al. (2004), Atkinson et al. (2005), Nagin et al. (2006) and Ronconi (2009) among others. Finally, on the side of the accounting method of losses and expenses, we find articles such as those of Brand and Price (2000), Bowles and Pradiptyo (2005), Rollings (2008), Mayhew (2003), Cohen (2005), etc.

The present paper uses as a base the book "The Costs of Crime and Violence - New Findings for Latin America and the Caribbean" of the Inter-American Development Bank (IBD), adopting the same methodology to obtain an updated estimate of the crime costs for Argentina and thus have a solid base of comparison to assess the situation of the provinces regarding the costs of crime and violence as a percentage of their product. In turn, the work of Ronconi (2009) is taken into account, whose work also studies the Argentine case but with another methodology, in order to compare the results, assumptions and methods were used for that purpose.

Basically the focus of this paper makes use of the accounting method of losses and expenses, leaving aside the value of the stolen goods, which generates the biggest difference between this study and the work of Ronconi (2009), to which I attribute the great difference of results obtained. The reason for not considering the value of the stolen merchandise in order to estimate the costs of the crime lies mainly in the fact that these goods represent simply the transfer of ownership from the legal to the illegal hands, which does not generate economic loss for society as a whole. Moreover, related to the broad discussion along the literature, can be considered that the change of behavior on the part of a victim of a crime, as well as the difference of valuations between a legal bearer of a good and a criminal are aspects that make a reduction of social welfare, but those items escape from the focus and possibilities of this paper. Future research is left for this purpose.

This work is organized as follows: Section 2 introduces the methodology to be considered in the estimation of the costs of crime for Argentina as a decomposition by jurisdiction. Section 3 presents the results of such estimation. Section 4 incorporates acknowledgements and facts left for further research. And finally, Section 5 ehibits the main conclusions.

#### 2 Methodology

The methodology that has to be used for the present work takes as a reference the accounting method of losses and expenses for estimating crime costs for Argentina as a decomposition by jurisdiction. This can be characterized in three aspects: the costs incurred by the government, those incurred by the private sector and, finally, the so-called "social costs of crime". The first refers mainly to public spending in the judicial system, the provision of police services and the administration of prisons; the main source from which the relevant data can be used refers to official budgets and expenditure statements issued by governments. On the other hand, the costs incurred by the private sector include the expense of businesses and households in the prevention of crime, namely, security expenses. Finally, the social costs of crime include the costs of victimization in terms of loss of quality of life due to homicides and other violent crimes and the income (not generated) of the prison population. Schematically:

#### Costs for the Government:<sup>1</sup> :

Administration of Justice. Police Services. Penitentiary Administration.

\*Official Sources: Government Budget.

It is worth highlighting certain subtleties in this aspect: the administration of justice, for example, includes many activities that do not necessarily refer to crime: costs associated with commercial, family, labor and other non-criminal disputes. As well as expenses related to the control and regulation of vehicular traffic could be included in this definition, an aspect that is not necessarily associated with any criminal activity per se. In practice, the literature usually considers all public spending on security and crime costs incurred by the government.

#### Private Expenditure in Security :

Households. Firms.

\* Main Source: Expenditures' Surveys

It is important to note here that the price and quantities of stolen goods are not being taken into account in the analysis, mainly for two reasons. First, because it is interpreted under the concept that this work focuses on, that the theft or robbery of goods can be taken as the transfer of goods from legal to non-legal hands, thus not influencing social welfare for the economy as a whole. Second, because in fact, if the cost of the stolen merchandise comes into consideration, it is necessary to incur in the estimation of the loss of welfare that refers to being stripped of a valued commodity; since under this focus one is aware that the valorization that it gives the legal bearer of the good can come to differ substantially from that of the illegal bearer of the same good. The present work, for simplicity, refrains from answering these questions assuming that the theft or theft of merchandise has no effect on social welfare as a whole. On the other hand, those companies of criminal activity are not taken into account due to the great difficulty that is faced at the time of the search of data, in turn one enters into the field of the aforementioned: the effect of aggregated welfare if we consider both the legal market and the black market, beyond assuming, perhaps unduly, that the welfare losses generated by a black market are negligible (as a basic example, the labor productivity losses generated by the illegal drug market, or trafficking in persons), the net effects on social welfare are compensated simply by using the definition of private costs of crime previously described.

**Social Costs of Crime** : They can be defined as a variety of costs that affect the economy "in general" as a consequence of the crime.

\* Victimization costs: It refers to the income lost (not generated) by the people who were victims of criminal acts.

\* Income lost by convicts who are not performing productive activities for the economy.

Both definitions of social costs of crime refer to the comparison that must be made between a "hypothetical world" lacking in crime, versus reality itself. Basically, it is based on the productivity losses in the labor market, which are assumed, as is usually done, equal to market wages, and for its correct estimation, disaggregated data must be used to allow a precise approximation of the salary not generated for the individuals. In the case of victimization costs, the literature is usually based on human capital methodology and health burden studies, as well as studies that allow the identification of potentially lost life years (DALY - Dolan et. al 2005) due to premature death or disability. In other words, for this interpretation of crime costs one must consider both lost wages in terms of productivity, as well as the present value of the future flow of labor income in the case of homicides or other victimizations that involve a high degree of disability. It is also emphasized that in the case of homicide victims, given the life cycle of the income, this calculation may overestimate the income lost by the elderly victims; and can underestimate the income lost by younger victims.

In the treatment of the methodology in this paper, much emphasis was placed on the estimates of those variables that make our interest, due to the availability of data for the study period. They are detailed below. From the point of view of official data for the assembly of the Government Costs of crime, the problem lies not in the availability of data per se, but rather in its updated availability. Due to the this non-availability of data, linear extrapolation was used using the longest series of published official data (-OLS) in order to estimate GRP levels for all jurisdictions in Argentina for 2017. In turn, since the official data were at constant 1993 prices, expressing them in 2017 prices required the use of the GDP (World Bank data) deflator, which, due to the same availability problem, it was extrapolated for 2017 using the variation rate of the Consumer Price Index (CPI). To get the public spending on security, it was enough to make use of the province's budget for 2017 (data that was actually published). The coverage of public spending on security is detailed in the appendix. On the other hand, Private Costs in Security were obtained using the Expenditure Survey published by the National Institute of Statistics and Censuses (official Argentine source INDEC - EPH), whose last publication was from the year 2012, reason for which the data had to be expressed in constant prices (2017) using the CPI. In this aspect, the survey only provides data about the expenditure on security services by households, leaving aside the expenditure of firms in this study due to the availability of data. Future investigations are left pending to cover this aspect. On the side of the Social Costs of Crime, from the point of view of the costs of victimization due to homicides, the SNEEP report (2015), published by the Ministry of Justice of the Argentine Republic, was used to get the series of homicides in order to extrapolate the level of murders of 2017 for the provinces. Unfortunately, this report does not provide data on the composition of such homicides with respect to variables such as age, sex, occupation, etc. Reason why, the estimation of the social costs for homicides was made using the average age of homicides (31.65)vears of age - Arg 2013 according to report of the Supreme Court of the Nation), the average labor income of the province, the expectation of life (World Bank - Arg. 2016) and the reference interest rate; in order to make the calculation of the present value of the future flow of labor income, multiplied by the number of homicides that occurred in a year, constitutes our definition of Social Cost of Crime associated with homicides. On the part of the costs associated with the income not generated by the convicts, the SNIC (Ministry of Justice of the Nation 2016) report was used, which details the number of inmates, educational level, gender and working status at the time of sentencing. The problem in this aspect is that, even though the information is published, it does not refer to disaggregated data, so for the estimation of the costs associated with the convicts it was decided to multiply the average wage of the province (discriminated against by educational level) by the number of people in prison corresponding to each educational level, then adjusted for the proportion of prisoners who belonged to the labor market before being incarcerated. The estimation of said costs is left pending for future investigations using a disaggregated (and updated) database for the provinces and / or country.

#### 3 Results

The main results of this work can be decomposed according to the classification exposed in the previous section, in order to facilitate the interpretation of both the elaboration and the details of the data. Starting with the Costs for the Government, following the Costs for the Private, and last but not least, the Social Costs of Crime. The procedure used here is the same for all the jurisdictions, which results in a directly comparable number to determine the condition of the provinces against the average of the country. Also, this allows us to compare the results obtained with those of the other works cited (IDB & Ronconi). Although they do not cover the same period of study, as will be seen later, this provides a great deal of information about the methodological differences between articles.

It should be noted previously that the results obtained are subject to the assumptions specified above, which are necessary to work due to the limited availability of reliable data. It is hoped that this work will serve as a "guide" for future research when official published data is available, in order to generate more accurate results.

#### 3.1 Costs for the Government

The efforts made by a government to eradicate or control crime are reflected in the budget line allocated for that purpose. The same can contain a wide detail of the expense, from public security services, prison maintenance, customs controls, federal transfers to provinces, etc. The detail considered in this paper can be found in the Appendix.

In this aspect, the province of Salta is the one that stands out as the one with the highest proportion of its product derived for public security purposes (equivalent to 7.3% of its GRP). In

turn, the province with the lowest relative public funds derives from this task is Misiones $(1.4\%$ of
its GRP). Referring to the country, the average of the 23 provinces shows a number of 5% of the
product. The detail of the descriptive statistics can be visualized in the following table:

	Governme	nt Spendi	ng (%of GRP)	)
	Percentiles	Smallest		
1%	1.4%	1.4%		
5%	2.9%	2.9%		
10%	3.5%	3.5%	Obs	23
25%	4.0%	3.8%	Sum of Wgt.	23
50%	4.8%		Mean	5%
		Largest	Std. Dev.	1%
75%	6.3%	6.9%		
90%	7.1%	7.1%	Variance	0.02%
95%	7.2%	7.2%	Skewness	-0.2
99%	7.3%	7.3%	Kurtosis	2.9

The following figure, in turn, exposes in detail the corresponding government cost for each province:



Costs for the Private Sector

3.2

What refers to the private costs of crime, the data obtained by the so-called Expenditure Survey (ENGHo // INDEC relief 2012 - latest available data), reflects that the province with the highest private expenses in terms of security is Rio Negro, with a total of 7% of its GRP (well above the distribution average). In turn, the province whose private sector spends less in terms of responding to crime is La Pampa, with a corresponding 0.5% of its GRP. Thus, considering the distribution average, Argentina achieves 2.31% of its product in terms of Private Cost of Crime. The provinces of Catamarca, Entre Ríos, La Rioja and Tierra del Fuego do not have available data. The following table develops the relevant descriptive statistics:

	Private S	pending (	%of GRP)	
		a 11 .		
	Percentiles	Smallest		
1.0%	0.5%	0.5%		
5.0%	0.5%	0.5%		
10.0%	0.6%	0.6%	Obs	23
25.0%	1.0%	0.8%	Sum of Wgt.	23
50.0%	1.3%		Mean	2.3%
		Largest	Std. Dev.	1.9%
75.0%	3.5%	4.1%		
90.0%	5.0%	5.0%	Variance	0%
95.0%	6.8%	6.8%	Skewness	1.2
99.0%	7.0%	7.0%	Kurtosis	3.4

The following figure details the decomposition of the private crime costs by province:



#### 3.3 Social Costs

For the correct calculation and detail of the same, we proceeded to categorize the social costs in *Social Costs referred to Homicide*, and *Costs related to Labor Income Lost by Convicts*. In order to calculate the costs related to the homicides, we made use of the SNIC report (Ministry of Security - Argentina 2016), which provides information about the number of victims of crime in the country. In turn it provides a detail of the injuries or damages of the victims by province and at the country level. With this data, it was extrapolated using the available series to obtain the data for 2017. The average age of the victims was then considered together with the average life expectancy of Argentina, the reference interest rate and the average income of the province / country, in order to calculate the cost referred to homicides as the present value of the future flow of labor income. Given this procedure, it was found the following distribution of homicides along wide Argentina:



It should be remembered that these numbers are an estimate due to the fact that the last report is from 2016. Given the average salary of the provinces, an average age of homicide victims of approximately 32 years, a life expectancy of 77 years (World Bank - Arg. 2016 last update), and a benchmark interest rate of 2.8% year-on-year (SP500); Social costs related to homicide victims are led by Formosa with an equivalent to 0.3% of its GRP. In the same way, Catamarca stands out as the smallest of the distribution, with a total of 0.03% of its GRP. The average of the provinces corresponds to the order of 0.12% of the product. The descriptive statistics and the distribution by province are the following:



	Soci	ial Costs -	· Murders	
	Percentiles	Smallest		
1%	0.03%	0.03%		
5%	0.03%	0.03%		
10%	0.04%	0.04%	Obs	23
25%	0.06%	0.04%	Sum of Wgt.	23
50%	0.11%		Mean	0.12%
		Largest	Std. Dev.	0.07%
75%	0.18%	0.18%		
90%	0.19%	0.19%	Variance	0.0001%
95%	0.21%	0.21%	Skewness	0.68
99%	0.30%	0.30%	Kurtosis	2.93

On the side of income lost (not generated) by the convicts, they refer to labor from which the labor market is stripped, thus also the marginal productivity that it would generate, measured by the market wage of those people. To obtain this information, the SNEEP (Ministry of Security -Arg.) report was last published in 2016, so some assumptions had to be made to extrapolate the data for the desired analysis period. Said report presents the detail of the total number of convicts by province, but not the composition of the educational level nor the labor situation prior to the conviction of prisoners by province, so a strong assumption was made in this respect and refers to suppose that this composition in the province responds to the same proportion of the total as in the case of Argentina as a country. The lifting of this assumption requires the availability of a more disaggregated database and, where possible, updated; aspect that is left pending for future research. Having clarified this, the province with the highest number of total convicts is the province of Buenos Aires, with a total of 34,982 prisoners. In turn, the province with the lowest number of convicts is La Pampa. In light of the assumption previously announced, the distribution regarding the educational level of these convicts is as follows: Incomplete primary education equals 28%; complete primary, 38%; incomplete secondary school, 18%; full secondary, 8%; upper / incomplete university, 1%; full university degree, 1%; finally, without instruction it is equivalent to 6%. The average annual salaries associated with each educational level varies among provinces, being the region of Patagonia (Neuquén, Rio Negro, Chubut, Santa Cruz and Tierra del Fuego) the best-paid in terms of average salaries. A clarification should be made in this aspect: the labor income was obtained entirely from the last publication of the Permanent Household Survey (EPH INDEC), which is subject to the problem of underreporting by the respondents, so these numbers are subject to some bias. Finally, the proportion of convicts that prior to their sentence belonged to the labor market is assumed to be 41.1% of the total convicts in concordance of the proportions published in the SNEEP report (again, this number is associated respect of the country itself - ie, there is no availability of disaggregated data by province). Finally, all this results in the following distribution of Social Costs of Crime (including both costs associated with convicts and victims):



Social Costs %of GRP



After all, the total crime costs (defined as the sum of government, private and social costs) are led by the province of Formosa, with a total of 15.1% of its GRP (mainly explained by the high level of expenditure coming from the private sector). In turn, the province of Catamarca is the one with the lowest costs, being these only equivalent to 3.9% of its GRP. Moreover, the average level among provinces (corresponded here as the level for Argentina) refers to a 6.8% of the product. As before, the detail of the distribution is exposed here in the following figure and table:



	Total Cost	s of Crim	e (%of GRP)	
	Percentiles	Smallest		
1%	3.9%	3.9%		
5%	4.0%	4.0%		
10%	4.0%	4.0%	Obs	23
25%	4.3%	4.1%	Sum of Wgt.	23
50%	5.5%		Mean	6.8%
		Largest	Std. Dev.	3.1%
75%	8.7%	9.8%		
90%	10.8%	10.8%	Variance	9.5%
95%	12.6%	12.6%	Skewness	1.1
99%	15.1%	15.1%	Kurtosis	3.5

Total Costs of Crime by Jurisdiction %of GRP



### 4 Acknowledgements and Further Reaserch

It is well known in the light of the latest advances in the "economic valuation of life" that the use of the present value of future income flows (PVoFI) presents a great bias when assessing the social cost of a homicide. Works like Viscusi and Masterman (2017), Robinson (2017) and Hammitt (2017) among others discuss about how to measure the statistical value of life including hedonic factors that can properly reflect the welfare cost as well as the disutility associated with injuries against human life. Moreover, the implementation of PVoFI is treated as the lower bound of the real statistical value of life, compared to those more refined valuation methods. Without incurring any detail, it is estimated that the real measure is 8 to 20 times higher than the estimates reflected by the PVoFI because the latter does not take into account the social disutility that a criminal act generates in the magnitude of a homicide. Reason why, it is tried in this section, to give rise to this fact incorporating an analysis of sensitivity on our results taking into account this bias. For this purpose, in used a monte carlo method whith 10,000 iterations, considering triangular distributions on the Social Costs of Crime associated with homicides, where the lower and upper bounds of distributions captured the effect of the bias previously mentioned. The results obtained are the following:

Total Cost	of Crim	e by Ju	risdictio	on - Sei	nsitivity A	nalysis
Province	Max	Min	Avg	Var	Std Dev.	Std Dev./Avg
Buenos Aires	7.8%	4.8%	6.1%	0.0%	0.6%	10.2%
Catamarca	4.3%	3.9%	4.1%	0.0%	0.1%	2.5%
Chaco	13.3%	9.8%	11.4%	0.0%	0.7%	6.4%
Chubut	7.8%	4.4%	6.0%	0.0%	0.7%	12.1%
Cordoba	5.1%	4.0%	4.5%	0.0%	0.2%	5.1%
Corrientes	8.7%	8.0%	8.3%	0.0%	0.2%	1.9%
Entre Ríos	7.4%	6.0%	6.6%	0.0%	0.3%	4.3%
Formosa	20.8%	15.1%	17.7%	0.0%	1.2%	6.6%
Jujuy	13.1%	10.8%	11.8%	0.0%	0.5%	4.1%
La Pampa	5.2%	4.3%	4.7%	0.0%	0.2%	3.9%
La Rioja	6.2%	5.5%	5.8%	0.0%	0.2%	2.7%
Mendoza	8.1%	5.9%	6.9%	0.0%	0.5%	6.8%
Misiones	5.8%	4.1%	4.9%	0.0%	0.3%	7.0%
Neuquén	8.4%	5.5%	6.8%	0.0%	0.6%	8.9%
Río Negro	16.5%	12.6%	14.4%	0.0%	0.8%	5.7%
Salta	10.9%	8.1%	9.4%	0.0%	0.6%	6.1%
San Juan	9.8%	8.7%	9.2%	0.0%	0.2%	2.5%
San Luis	5.6%	4.1%	4.8%	0.0%	0.3%	6.5%
Santa Cruz	6.6%	5.4%	6.0%	0.0%	0.3%	4.5%
Santa Fe	7.7%	4.1%	5.7%	0.0%	0.8%	13.3%
Santiago del Estero	11.8%	9.7%	10.6%	0.0%	0.4%	4.0%
Tierra del Fuego	5.5%	5.0%	5.3%	0.0%	0.1%	2.0%
Tucumán	11.0%	7.5%	9.1%	0.0%	0.7%	7.8%

Thus, it can easily be seen that the national average increased by one percentage point (from 6.8% to 7.8% of GDP) and that this change, although it is significant, does not substantially alter our original results. On the other hand, it is left for future research the incorporation of the economic valuation of the different criminal acts that conclude in injuries or disability of the victims, being these sources of possible bias of underestimation of the results presented in this paper.

#### 5 Conclusions

The core of this study was on the effects of crime and violence for a society, more precisely, the impact that these variables have on the correct development of a country's economic activity and well-being was studied. We define violence as the intentional use of physical force or power, against oneself or against a third party or a group of people or community, resulting in injury, death, psychological or behavioral harm, including deprivation of consumption of goods or services. For its part, we define crime as any consolidated act under which the law is violated. The costs of crime can be classified in many ways, but, if you want, it can be classified as follows: Direct and Indirect Costs. The first ones referred to the results of the crime, the forecast of the crime or even in response to a criminal activity, respectively defined as injuries, damages and losses; public and private spending on security; and finally, the criminal justice system. On the other hand, Indirect Costs refer both to changes in behavior due to fear of crime, as well as to the costs to the families of the victims or the effects on marginal productivity of the labor market. Given the different methodologies commonly used in the literature to estimate the costs of crime for a society, this paper opted for the accounting method of losses and expenses that, in short, is a direct application of the logic of comparison between scenarios "with crime vs without crime", taking into account the add-up of the sources of welfare loss derived from the presence of crime. We have classified them into three categories: Government Costs of Crime, Private Costs of Crime, and finally, Social Costs of Crime. The latter are defined as the intangible costs that crime involves for a society.

This work used as a point of comparison the methodology and results of two other papers that studied the Argentine case: "Los Costos del Crimen y la Violencia – Nuevos Hallazgos para LAC" (Inter-American Development Bank IDB), and "The Costs of Crime in Argentina: Estimate based on Victimization Surveys "(Ronconi Lucas - 2009). Our results are comparable to those obtained by the IDB study, due to the similarity of approach and methodology; those results obtained by Ronconi (2009) are curiously different. The results for Argentina according to the different jobs are equivalent to 6.8%, 2.97% and 14.5% of the GDP respectively<sup>2</sup>. The results and methodologies are expressed schematically below:

	Buenos Aires	3*	Catamar	ca	Chaco		Chubut	
Government Spending								
Security Services	67,491.3	2.2%	\$1,239.3	1.3%	\$3,491.7	3.2%	\$2,569.6	1.6%
Federal Transfers	\$10,655.2	0.3%	\$252.5	0.3%	\$725.9	0.7%	\$680.6	0.4%
Judicial Power	\$21,992.9	0.7%	\$794.7	0.9%	\$2,805.0	2.6%	\$2,499.4	1.5%
Social Costs of Crime								
Convicts	\$1,712.2	0.1%	\$20.6	$0.02^{\circ}_{2}$	% \$50.8	0.05%	\$19.7	0.01%
Murders	\$4,953.3	0.2%	\$23.9	$0.03^{\circ}_{2}$	% \$202.6	0.2%	\$296.9	0.2%
Private Spending	\$40,475.7	1.3%	\$1,243.7	1.3%	\$3,467.9	3.2%	\$1,023.0	0.6%
GRP	3,102,057.1		\$92,847.5		\$109,520.3		\$162,649.7	
Total %		4.7%	<mark>ó</mark>	3.9%	o l	9.8%		4.4%
	Comientes		Cándaha		Entre Díes		Farmage	
	Corrientes		Córdoba		Entre Ríos		Formosa	
Government Spending	Corrientes		Córdoba		Entre Ríos		Formosa	a a 94
Government Spending Security Services	<b>Corrientes</b> \$3,629.7	3.3%	<b>Córdoba</b> \$13,799.0	1.9%	Entre Ríos \$5,429.9	2.5%	<b>Formosa</b> \$1,800.1	3.8%
<b>Government Spending</b> Security Services Federal Transfers	<b>Corrientes</b> \$3,629.7 \$1,267.3	3.3% 1.1%	Córdoba \$13,799.0 \$2,578.1	1.9% 0.4%	Entre Ríos \$5,429.9 \$705.5	2.5% 0.3%	Formosa \$1,800.1 \$975.7	3.8% 2.1%
<b>Government Spending</b> Security Services Federal Transfers Judicial Power	<b>Corrientes</b> \$3,629.7 \$1,267.3 \$2,424.4	3.3% 1.1% 2.2%	Córdoba \$13,799.0 \$2,578.1 \$7,925.9	$\begin{array}{c} 1.9\% \\ 0.4\% \\ 1.1\% \end{array}$	Entre Ríos \$5,429.9 \$705.5 \$3,025.6	2.5% 0.3% 1.4%	Formosa \$1,800.1 \$975.7 \$985.8	3.8% 2.1% 2.1%
Government Spending Security Services Federal Transfers Judicial Power Social Costs of Crime	Solution         Solution	3.3% 1.1% 2.2%	Córdoba \$13,799.0 \$2,578.1 \$7,925.9	$\begin{array}{c} 1.9\% \\ 0.4\% \\ 1.1\% \end{array}$	Entre Ríos \$5,429.9 \$705.5 \$3,025.6	2.5% 0.3% 1.4%	Formosa \$1,800.1 \$975.7 \$985.8	3.8% 2.1% 2.1%
Government Spending Security Services Federal Transfers Judicial Power Social Costs of Crime Convicts	Corrientes \$3,629.7 \$1,267.3 \$2,424.4 \$40.9	3.3% 1.1% 2.2% 0.04%	Córdoba \$13,799.0 \$2,578.1 \$7,925.9 \$324.7	$1.9\% \\ 0.4\% \\ 1.1\% \\ 0.04\%$	Entre Ríos \$5,429.9 \$705.5 \$3,025.6 \$48.8	2.5% 0.3% 1.4% 0.0%	Formosa \$1,800.1 \$975.7 \$985.8 \$16.1	3.8% 2.1% 2.1% 0.0%
Government Spending Security Services Federal Transfers Judicial Power Social Costs of Crime Convicts Murders	Corrientes \$3,629.7 \$1,267.3 \$2,424.4 \$40.9 \$43.8	$\begin{array}{c} 3.3\% \\ 1.1\% \\ 2.2\% \\ 0.04\% \\ 0.04\% \end{array}$	Córdoba \$13,799.0 \$2,578.1 \$7,925.9 \$324.7 \$427.6	$\begin{array}{c} 1.9\% \\ 0.4\% \\ 1.1\% \\ 0.04\% \\ 0.1\% \end{array}$	Entre Ríos \$5,429.9 \$705.5 \$3,025.6 \$48.8 \$160.3	$\begin{array}{c} 2.5\% \\ 0.3\% \\ 1.4\% \\ 0.0\% \\ 0.1\% \end{array}$	Formosa \$1,800.1 \$975.7 \$985.8 \$16.1 \$143.3	3.8% 2.1% 2.1% 0.0% 0.3%
Government Spending         Security Services         Federal Transfers         Judicial Power         Social Costs of Crime         Convicts         Murders         Private Spending	Corrientes \$3,629.7 \$1,267.3 \$2,424.4 \$40.9 \$43.8 \$1,444.2	$\begin{array}{c} 3.3\% \\ 1.1\% \\ 2.2\% \\ 0.04\% \\ 0.04\% \\ 1.3\% \end{array}$	Córdoba \$13,799.0 \$2,578.1 \$7,925.9 \$324.7 \$427.6 \$3,902.6	$\begin{array}{c} 1.9\% \\ 0.4\% \\ 1.1\% \\ 0.04\% \\ 0.1\% \\ 0.5\% \end{array}$	Entre Ríos \$5,429.9 \$705.5 \$3,025.6 \$48.8 \$160.3 \$3,687.4	$\begin{array}{c} 2.5\% \\ 0.3\% \\ 1.4\% \\ 0.0\% \\ 0.1\% \\ 1.7\% \end{array}$	Formosa \$1,800.1 \$975.7 \$985.8 \$16.1 \$143.3 \$3,229.1	$\begin{array}{c} 3.8\% \\ 2.1\% \\ 2.1\% \\ 0.0\% \\ 0.3\% \\ 6.8\% \end{array}$
Government Spending         Security Services         Federal Transfers         Judicial Power         Social Costs of Crime         Convicts         Murders         Private Spending         GRP	Corrientes \$3,629.7 \$1,267.3 \$2,424.4 \$40.9 \$43.8 \$1,444.2 \$110,916.5	$\begin{array}{c} 3.3\% \\ 1.1\% \\ 2.2\% \\ 0.04\% \\ 0.04\% \\ 1.3\% \end{array}$	Córdoba \$13,799.0 \$2,578.1 \$7,925.9 \$324.7 \$427.6 \$3,902.6 \$724,943.2	$\begin{array}{c} 1.9\% \\ 0.4\% \\ 1.1\% \\ 0.04\% \\ 0.1\% \\ 0.5\% \end{array}$	Entre Ríos \$5,429.9 \$705.5 \$3,025.6 \$48.8 \$160.3 \$3,687.4 \$217,770.3	$\begin{array}{c} 2.5\% \\ 0.3\% \\ 1.4\% \\ 0.0\% \\ 0.1\% \\ 1.7\% \end{array}$	Formosa \$1,800.1 \$975.7 \$985.8 \$16.1 \$143.3 \$3,229.1 \$47,470.5	$\begin{array}{c} 3.8\% \\ 2.1\% \\ 2.1\% \\ 0.0\% \\ 0.3\% \\ 6.8\% \end{array}$

 $^{2}$ A distinction must be done in this field, that is that the IBD paper worked with Argentina as a country, and therefore it does not include the desaggregation by jurisdiction. Thereafter, that aspect includes a bias into the results, mainly derived by the high inequality in the distribution of these costs within Argentina. In other words, it is demonstrated in this paper that there is an important standard deviation respect the costs of crime in Argentina, feature which can incorporate a strong bias into the results if disaggregated data by jurisdiction is not taken into account.

	Jujuy		La Pampa	ı	La Rioja		Mendoza	
Government Spending			-					
Security Services	\$2,998.4	3.9%	\$1,501.7	2.1%	\$1,856.2	3.1%	\$6,096.0	1.6%
Federal Transfers	\$748.2	1.0%	\$387.1	0.5%	\$152.8	0.3%	\$829.3	0.2%
Judicial Power	\$1,221.9	1.6%	\$872.5	1.2%	\$15.2	0.0%	\$3,343.3	0.9%
Social Costs of Crime	,							
Convicts	\$12.6	0.02%	\$4.8	0.01%	\$12.5	0.02%	\$165.9	0.04%
Murders	\$96.5	0.1%	\$33.8	0.0%	\$23.4	0.0%	\$460.3	0.1%
Private Spending	\$3,168.0	4.1%	\$346.9	0.5%	\$1,168.3	2.0%	\$11,894.8	3.1%
GRP	\$76,678.6		\$73,086.2		\$59,182.9		\$385,753.8	
Total %		10.8%		4.3%		<b>5.5%</b>		<b>5.9%</b>
	N.T		NT		Día Maria		<b>C</b> - 14 -	
Comment Secondina	Misiones		Neuquen		Rio Negro		Salta	
Government Spending	¢46 1	0.0907	¢1 000 8	9 107	¢2 700 0	2.007	¢1627 0	2 607
Federal Transford	040.1 01.002.0	0.0370	\$4,009.0 \$501.6	2.470	Φ5,700.9 Φεεε 7	2.970	\$4,037.0 \$1.252.5	5.070 1.007
Judicial Daman	\$1,003.9 \$1,002.9	1.4/0	\$001.0 \$0.227.2	0.470	0000.7 Фо сор 4	0.470	\$1,333.3	1.070
Social Costs of Crimo	\$1,995.2	1.370	\$2,337.3	1.470	\$2,385.4	2.070	\$5,040.4	2.370
Convicto	¢51 7	0.04%	¢21.6	0.02%	\$56 D	0.04%	¢96.2	0.1%
Murders	\$J1.7 \$117.6	0.0470 0.1%	\$31.0	0.0270 0.9%	\$30.2 \$266 1	0.0470 0.9%	\$00.5 \$102.5	0.170
Drivets Sponding	\$117.0 \$1.500.1	1 107	\$254.9 \$1.796.4	0.270	\$200.1 \$\$ \$67.6	7.007	\$192.5 \$1.100 E	0.170
	\$1,309.1 \$122,571.7	1.170	\$1,700.4 \$164.146.7	1.170	\$0,007.0 \$107.179.0	1.070	\$1,199.5	0.970
Total %	\$155,571.7	1 1 07	\$104,140.7	5 5 <sup>07</sup>	\$127,176.9	19 60%	\$129,970.0	Q 107
		4.170		0.070		12.070		0.170
	San Juan		San Luis		Santa Cruz		Santa Fe	
Government Spending	San Juan		San Luis		Santa Cruz		Santa Fe	
Government Spending Security Services	<b>San Juan</b> \$2,656.6	2.6%	San Luis \$1,666.3	1.8%	Santa Cruz \$3,380.1	2.8%	Santa Fe \$15,027.5	2.0%
Government Spending Security Services Federal Transfers	<b>San Juan</b> \$2,656.6 \$788.3	$2.6\% \\ 0.8\%$	<b>San Luis</b> \$1,666.3 \$126.0	1.8% 0.1%	Santa Cruz \$3,380.1 \$498.7	2.8% 0.4%	Santa Fe \$15,027.5 \$1,384.2	2.0% 0.2%
Government Spending Security Services Federal Transfers Judicial Power	San Juan \$2,656.6 \$788.3 \$1,196.6	$2.6\% \\ 0.8\% \\ 1.2\%$	San Luis \$1,666.3 \$126.0 \$681.6	$\begin{array}{c} 1.8\% \\ 0.1\% \\ 0.7\% \end{array}$	Santa Cruz \$3,380.1 \$498.7 \$1,520.4	2.8% 0.4% 1.3%	<b>Santa Fe</b> \$15,027.5 \$1,384.2 \$4,920.2	2.0% 0.2% 0.7%
Government Spending Security Services Federal Transfers Judicial Power Social Costs of Crime	<b>San Juan</b> \$2,656.6 \$788.3 \$1,196.6	2.6% 0.8% 1.2%	San Luis \$1,666.3 \$126.0 \$681.6	$1.8\% \\ 0.1\% \\ 0.7\%$	Santa Cruz \$3,380.1 \$498.7 \$1,520.4	2.8% 0.4% 1.3%	Santa Fe           \$15,027.5           \$1,384.2           \$4,920.2	2.0% 0.2% 0.7%
Government Spending Security Services Federal Transfers Judicial Power Social Costs of Crime Convicts	San Juan \$2,656.6 \$788.3 \$1,196.6 \$50.4	2.6% 0.8% 1.2% 0.05%	San Luis \$1,666.3 \$126.0 \$681.6 \$23.0	$     1.8\% \\     0.1\% \\     0.7\% \\     0.02\% $	Santa Cruz \$3,380.1 \$498.7 \$1,520.4 \$15.4	2.8% 0.4% 1.3% 0.01%	Santa Fe           \$15,027.5           \$1,384.2           \$4,920.2           \$141.2	$2.0\% \\ 0.2\% \\ 0.7\% \\ 0.02\%$
Government Spending Security Services Federal Transfers Judicial Power Social Costs of Crime Convicts Murders	San Juan \$2,656.6 \$788.3 \$1,196.6 \$50.4 \$60.8	$\begin{array}{c} 2.6\% \\ 0.8\% \\ 1.2\% \\ 0.05\% \\ 0.1\% \end{array}$	San Luis \$1,666.3 \$126.0 \$681.6 \$23.0 \$75.6	$\begin{array}{c} 1.8\% \\ 0.1\% \\ 0.7\% \\ \hline 0.02\% \\ 0.1\% \end{array}$	Santa Cruz \$3,380.1 \$498.7 \$1,520.4 \$15.4 \$81.0	$\begin{array}{c} 2.8\% \\ 0.4\% \\ 1.3\% \\ 0.01\% \\ 0.1\% \end{array}$	Santa Fe           \$15,027.5           \$1,384.2           \$4,920.2           \$141.2           \$1,435.3	$\begin{array}{c} 2.0\% \\ 0.2\% \\ 0.7\% \\ \end{array}$ $\begin{array}{c} 0.02\% \\ 0.2\% \end{array}$
Government Spending Security Services Federal Transfers Judicial Power Social Costs of Crime Convicts Murders Private Spending	San Juan \$2,656.6 \$788.3 \$1,196.6 \$50.4 \$60.8 \$4,195.4	$\begin{array}{c} 2.6\% \\ 0.8\% \\ 1.2\% \\ 0.05\% \\ 0.1\% \\ 4.1\% \end{array}$	San Luis \$1,666.3 \$126.0 \$681.6 \$23.0 \$75.6 \$1,285.0	$\begin{array}{c} 1.8\% \\ 0.1\% \\ 0.7\% \\ \hline 0.02\% \\ 0.1\% \\ 1.4\% \\ \end{array}$	Santa Cruz \$3,380.1 \$498.7 \$1,520.4 \$15.4 \$81.0 \$919.6	$\begin{array}{c} 2.8\% \\ 0.4\% \\ 1.3\% \\ \hline 0.01\% \\ 0.1\% \\ \hline 0.8\% \end{array}$	Santa Fe \$15,027.5 \$1,384.2 \$4,920.2 \$141.2 \$1,435.3 \$7,230.4	$\begin{array}{c} 2.0\% \\ 0.2\% \\ 0.7\% \\ \hline 0.02\% \\ 0.2\% \\ \hline 1.0\% \end{array}$
Government Spending         Security Services         Federal Transfers         Judicial Power         Social Costs of Crime         Convicts         Murders         Private Spending         GRP	San Juan \$2,656.6 \$788.3 \$1,196.6 \$50.4 \$60.8 \$4,195.4 \$103,384.8	$\begin{array}{c} 2.6\% \\ 0.8\% \\ 1.2\% \\ 0.05\% \\ 0.1\% \\ 4.1\% \end{array}$	San Luis \$1,666.3 \$126.0 \$681.6 \$23.0 \$75.6 \$1,285.0 \$94,801.7	$\begin{array}{c} 1.8\% \\ 0.1\% \\ 0.7\% \\ \hline 0.02\% \\ 0.1\% \\ 1.4\% \\ \end{array}$	Santa Cruz \$3,380.1 \$498.7 \$1,520.4 \$15.4 \$81.0 \$919.6 \$119,446.5	$\begin{array}{c} 2.8\% \\ 0.4\% \\ 1.3\% \\ 0.01\% \\ 0.1\% \\ 0.8\% \end{array}$	Santa Fe           \$15,027.5           \$1,384.2           \$4,920.2           \$141.2           \$1,435.3           \$7,230.4           \$744,813.2	$\begin{array}{c} 2.0\% \\ 0.2\% \\ 0.7\% \\ \hline 0.02\% \\ 0.2\% \\ \hline 1.0\% \end{array}$
Government Spending Security Services Federal Transfers Judicial Power Social Costs of Crime Convicts Murders Private Spending GRP Total %	San Juan \$2,656.6 \$788.3 \$1,196.6 \$50.4 \$60.8 \$4,195.4 \$103,384.8	2.6% 0.8% 1.2% 0.05% 0.1% 4.1% <b>8.7%</b>	San Luis \$1,666.3 \$126.0 \$681.6 \$23.0 \$75.6 \$1,285.0 \$94,801.7	1.8%           0.1%           0.7%           0.02%           0.1%           1.4%           4.1%	Santa Cruz \$3,380.1 \$498.7 \$1,520.4 \$15.4 \$81.0 \$919.6 \$119,446.5	2.8% 0.4% 1.3% 0.01% 0.1% 0.8% 5.4%	Santa Fe \$15,027.5 \$1,384.2 \$4,920.2 \$141.2 \$1,435.3 \$7,230.4 \$744,813.2	2.0% 0.2% 0.7% 0.02% 0.2% 1.0% 4.0%
Government Spending Security Services Federal Transfers Judicial Power Social Costs of Crime Convicts Murders Private Spending GRP Total %	San Juan \$2,656.6 \$788.3 \$1,196.6 \$50.4 \$60.8 \$4,195.4 \$103,384.8	2.6% 0.8% 1.2% 0.05% 0.1% 4.1% <b>8.7%</b>	San Luis \$1,666.3 \$126.0 \$681.6 \$23.0 \$75.6 \$1,285.0 \$94,801.7	1.8%           0.1%           0.7%           0.02%           0.1%           1.4%           4.1%	Santa Cruz \$3,380.1 \$498.7 \$1,520.4 \$15.4 \$81.0 \$919.6 \$119,446.5	2.8% 0.4% 1.3% 0.01% 0.1% 0.8% 5.4%	Santa Fe \$15,027.5 \$1,384.2 \$4,920.2 \$141.2 \$1,435.3 \$7,230.4 \$744,813.2	2.0% 0.2% 0.7% 0.02% 0.2% 1.0% <b>4.0%</b>
Government Spending Security Services Federal Transfers Judicial Power Social Costs of Crime Convicts Murders Private Spending GRP Total %	San Juan \$2,656.6 \$788.3 \$1,196.6 \$50.4 \$60.8 \$4,195.4 \$103,384.8 <b>Santiago</b>	2.6% 0.8% 1.2% 0.05% 0.1% 4.1% 8.7% del Est	San Luis \$1,666.3 \$126.0 \$681.6 \$23.0 \$75.6 \$1,285.0 \$94,801.7 ero	1.8%           0.1%           0.7%           0.02%           0.1%           1.4%           4.1%           Tierra	Santa Cruz \$3,380.1 \$498.7 \$1,520.4 \$15.4 \$81.0 \$919.6 \$119,446.5 del Fuego	2.8% 0.4% 1.3% 0.01% 0.1% 0.8% 5.4%	Santa Fe \$15,027.5 \$1,384.2 \$4,920.2 \$141.2 \$1,435.3 \$7,230.4 \$744,813.2 Tucumán	2.0% 0.2% 0.7% 0.02% 0.2% 1.0% <b>4.0%</b>
Government Spending Security Services Federal Transfers Judicial Power Social Costs of Crime Convicts Murders Private Spending GRP Total %	San Juan \$2,656.6 \$788.3 \$1,196.6 \$50.4 \$60.8 \$4,195.4 \$103,384.8 Santiago \$1 024.2	2.6% 0.8% 1.2% 0.05% 0.1% 4.1% 8.7% del Est	San Luis \$1,666.3 \$126.0 \$681.6 \$23.0 \$75.6 \$1,285.0 \$94,801.7 ero	1.8% 0.1% 0.7% 0.02% 0.1% 1.4% 4.1% Tierra	Santa Cruz \$3,380.1 \$498.7 \$1,520.4 \$15.4 \$81.0 \$919.6 \$119,446.5 • del Fuego	2.8% 0.4% 1.3% 0.01% 0.1% 0.8% 5.4%	Santa Fe           \$15,027.5           \$1,384.2           \$4,920.2           \$141.2           \$1,435.3           \$7,230.4           \$744,813.2	2.0% 0.2% 0.7% 0.02% 0.2% 1.0% 4.0%
Government Spending Security Services Federal Transfers Judicial Power Social Costs of Crime Convicts Murders Private Spending GRP Total % Government Spending Security Services	San Juan \$2,656.6 \$788.3 \$1,196.6 \$50.4 \$60.8 \$4,195.4 \$103,384.8 Santiago \$1,934.3 \$202.0	2.6% 0.8% 1.2% 0.05% 0.1% 4.1% 8.7% del Est	San Luis \$1,666.3 \$126.0 \$681.6 \$23.0 \$75.6 \$1,285.0 \$94,801.7 ero 2.6%	1.8% 0.1% 0.7% 0.02% 0.1% 1.4% 4.1% Tierra \$1,447.	Santa Cruz \$3,380.1 \$498.7 \$1,520.4 \$15.4 \$81.0 \$919.6 \$119,446.5 • del Fuego 5	2.8% 0.4% 1.3% 0.01% 0.1% 0.8% 5.4%	Santa Fe \$15,027.5 \$1,384.2 \$4,920.2 \$141.2 \$1,435.3 \$7,230.4 \$744,813.2 Tucumán \$3,826.8 \$714.5	2.0% 0.2% 0.7% 0.02% 0.2% 1.0% 4.0%
Government Spending Security Services Federal Transfers Judicial Power Social Costs of Crime Convicts Murders Private Spending GRP Total % Government Spending Security Services Federal Transfers Ludicial Power	San Juan \$2,656.6 \$788.3 \$1,196.6 \$50.4 \$60.8 \$4,195.4 \$103,384.8 Santiago \$1,934.3 \$822.9 \$660 0	2.6% 0.8% 1.2% 0.05% 0.1% 4.1% 8.7% del Est	San Luis \$1,666.3 \$126.0 \$681.6 \$23.0 \$75.6 \$1,285.0 \$94,801.7 ero 2.6% 1.1% 0.0%	1.8% 0.1% 0.7% 0.02% 0.1% 1.4% 4.1% Tierra \$1,447. \$276.0 \$1.002	Santa Cruz \$3,380.1 \$498.7 \$1,520.4 \$15.4 \$81.0 \$919.6 \$119,446.5 • del Fuego 5	2.8% 0.4% 1.3% 0.01% 0.1% 0.8% 5.4%	Santa Fe \$15,027.5 \$1,384.2 \$4,920.2 \$141.2 \$1,435.3 \$7,230.4 \$744,813.2 Tucumán \$3,826.8 \$714.5 \$15,027.5 \$1,384.2 \$1,284.2 \$1,284.2 \$1,284.2 \$1,284.2 \$1,284.2 \$1,284.2 \$1,284.2 \$1,284.2 \$1,284.2 \$1,284.2 \$1,284.2 \$1,284.2 \$1,284.2 \$1,284.2 \$1,284.2 \$1,284.2 \$1,284.2 \$1,435.3 \$1,284.2 \$1,435.3 \$1,284.2 \$1,435.3 \$1,284.2 \$1,435.3 \$1,284.2 \$1,435.3 \$1,284.2 \$1,435.3 \$1,284.2 \$1,435.3 \$1,284.2 \$1,435.3 \$1,284.2 \$1,435.3 \$1,435.3 \$1,435.3 \$1,445.3 \$1,455.	$\begin{array}{c} 2.0\% \\ 0.2\% \\ 0.7\% \\ \hline \\ 0.02\% \\ 0.2\% \\ \hline \\ 1.0\% \\ \hline \\ 4.0\% \\ \hline \\ 2.4\% \\ 0.5\% \\ 1.0\% \end{array}$
Government Spending Security Services Federal Transfers Judicial Power Social Costs of Crime Convicts Murders Private Spending GRP Total % Government Spending Security Services Federal Transfers Judicial Power	San Juan \$2,656.6 \$788.3 \$1,196.6 \$50.4 \$60.8 \$4,195.4 \$103,384.8 <b>Santiago</b> \$1,934.3 \$822.9 \$669.8	2.6% 0.8% 1.2% 0.05% 0.1% 4.1% 8.7% del Est	San Luis \$1,666.3 \$126.0 \$681.6 \$23.0 \$75.6 \$1,285.0 \$94,801.7 ero 2.6% 1.1% 0.9%	1.8%         0.1%         0.7%         0.02%         0.1%         1.4%         4.1%         Tierra         \$1,447.         \$276.0         \$1,093.	Santa Cruz \$3,380.1 \$498.7 \$1,520.4 \$15.4 \$81.0 \$919.6 \$119,446.5 • del Fuego 5 4	$2.8\% \\ 0.4\% \\ 1.3\% \\ 0.01\% \\ 0.1\% \\ 0.8\% \\ 5.4\% \\ 2.0\% \\ 0.4\% \\ 1.5\% \\$	Santa Fe           \$15,027.5           \$1,384.2           \$4,920.2           \$141.2           \$1,435.3           \$7,230.4           \$744,813.2           Tucumán           \$3,826.8           \$714.5           \$1,523.8	$\begin{array}{c} 2.0\% \\ 0.2\% \\ 0.7\% \\ \hline \\ 0.02\% \\ 0.2\% \\ \hline \\ 1.0\% \\ \hline \\ 4.0\% \\ \hline \\ 2.4\% \\ 0.5\% \\ 1.0\% \end{array}$
Government Spending Security Services Federal Transfers Judicial Power Social Costs of Crime Convicts Murders Private Spending GRP Total % Government Spending Security Services Federal Transfers Judicial Power Social Costs of Crime	San Juan \$2,656.6 \$788.3 \$1,196.6 \$50.4 \$60.8 \$4,195.4 \$103,384.8 Santiago \$1,934.3 \$822.9 \$669.8 \$14.2	2.6% 0.8% 1.2% 0.05% 0.1% 4.1% 8.7% del Est	San Luis \$1,666.3 \$126.0 \$681.6 \$23.0 \$75.6 \$1,285.0 \$94,801.7 ero 2.6% 1.1% 0.9%	1.8% 0.1% 0.7% 0.02% 0.1% 1.4% 4.1% Tierra \$1,447. \$276.0 \$1,093.	Santa Cruz \$3,380.1 \$498.7 \$1,520.4 \$15.4 \$81.0 \$919.6 \$119,446.5 • del Fuego 5 4	$\begin{array}{c} 2.8\% \\ 0.4\% \\ 1.3\% \\ \hline \\ 0.01\% \\ 0.8\% \\ \hline \\ 5.4\% \\ \hline \\ 2.0\% \\ 0.4\% \\ 1.5\% \\ \hline \\ 0.08\% \\ \hline \end{array}$	Santa Fe \$15,027.5 \$1,384.2 \$4,920.2 \$141.2 \$1,435.3 \$7,230.4 \$744,813.2 Tucumán \$3,826.8 \$714.5 \$1,523.8 \$45.5	$\begin{array}{c} 2.0\% \\ 0.2\% \\ 0.7\% \\ \hline \\ 0.02\% \\ 0.2\% \\ \hline \\ 1.0\% \\ \hline \\ 4.0\% \\ \hline \\ 2.4\% \\ 0.5\% \\ 1.0\% \\ \hline \\ 0.02\% \\ \hline \end{array}$
Government Spending Security Services Federal Transfers Judicial Power Social Costs of Crime Convicts Murders Private Spending GRP Total % Government Spending Security Services Federal Transfers Judicial Power Social Costs of Crime Convicts	San Juan \$2,656.6 \$788.3 \$1,196.6 \$50.4 \$60.8 \$4,195.4 \$103,384.8 Santiago \$1,934.3 \$822.9 \$669.8 \$14.3 \$14.3	2.6% 0.8% 1.2% 0.05% 0.1% 4.1% 8.7% del Est	San Luis \$1,666.3 \$126.0 \$681.6 \$23.0 \$75.6 \$1,285.0 \$94,801.7 ero 2.6% 1.1% 0.9% 0.02%	1.8% 0.1% 0.7% 0.02% 0.1% 1.4% 4.1% Tierra \$1,447. \$276.0 \$1,093. \$12.9	Santa Cruz \$3,380.1 \$498.7 \$1,520.4 \$15.4 \$81.0 \$919.6 \$119,446.5 • del Fuego 5 4	$\begin{array}{c} 2.8\% \\ 0.4\% \\ 1.3\% \\ \hline \\ 0.01\% \\ 0.8\% \\ \hline \\ 5.4\% \\ \hline \\ 2.0\% \\ 0.4\% \\ 1.5\% \\ \hline \\ 0.02\% \\ 0.02\% \\ 0.02\% \\ \hline \end{array}$	Santa Fe         \$15,027.5         \$1,384.2         \$4,920.2         \$141.2         \$1,435.3         \$7,230.4         \$744,813.2         Tucumán         \$3,826.8         \$714.5         \$1,523.8	$\begin{array}{c} 2.0\% \\ 0.2\% \\ 0.7\% \\ \hline \\ 0.02\% \\ 0.2\% \\ \hline \\ 1.0\% \\ \hline \\ 4.0\% \\ \hline \\ 2.4\% \\ 0.5\% \\ 1.0\% \\ \hline \\ 0.03\% \\ 0.2\% \end{array}$
Government Spending Security Services Federal Transfers Judicial Power Social Costs of Crime Convicts Murders Private Spending GRP Total % Government Spending Security Services Federal Transfers Judicial Power Social Costs of Crime Convicts Murders Devices Spending	San Juan \$2,656.6 \$788.3 \$1,196.6 \$50.4 \$60.8 \$4,195.4 \$103,384.8 <b>Santiago</b> \$1,934.3 \$822.9 \$669.8 \$14.3 \$81.4 \$275.0	2.6% 0.8% 1.2% 0.05% 0.1% 4.1% 8.7% del Est	San Luis \$1,666.3 \$126.0 \$681.6 \$23.0 \$75.6 \$1,285.0 \$94,801.7 ero 2.6% 1.1% 0.9% 0.02% 0.1%	1.8% 0.1% 0.7% 0.02% 0.1% 1.4% <b>4.1%</b> <b>Tierra</b> \$1,447. \$276.0 \$1,093. \$12.9 \$19.2	Santa Cruz \$3,380.1 \$498.7 \$1,520.4 \$15.4 \$81.0 \$919.6 \$119,446.5 • del Fuego 5 4	$\begin{array}{c} 2.8\% \\ 0.4\% \\ 1.3\% \\ \hline \\ 0.01\% \\ 0.8\% \\ \hline \\ 5.4\% \\ \hline \\ 2.0\% \\ 0.4\% \\ 1.5\% \\ \hline \\ 0.02\% \\ 0.03\% \\ \hline \\ 1.1\% \end{array}$	Santa Fe \$15,027.5 \$1,384.2 \$4,920.2 \$141.2 \$1,435.3 \$7,230.4 \$744,813.2 Tucumán \$3,826.8 \$714.5 \$1,523.8 \$45.5 \$285.3 \$5.114.0	$\begin{array}{c} 2.0\% \\ 0.2\% \\ 0.7\% \\ \hline \\ 0.02\% \\ 0.2\% \\ \hline \\ 1.0\% \\ \hline \\ 4.0\% \\ \hline \\ 2.4\% \\ 0.5\% \\ 1.0\% \\ \hline \\ 0.03\% \\ 0.2\% \\ \hline \\ 2.5\% \\ \hline \end{array}$
Government Spending Security Services Federal Transfers Judicial Power Social Costs of Crime Convicts Murders Private Spending GRP Total % Government Spending Security Services Federal Transfers Judicial Power Social Costs of Crime Convicts Murders Private Spending CDD	San Juan \$2,656.6 \$788.3 \$1,196.6 \$50.4 \$60.8 \$4,195.4 \$103,384.8 <b>Santiago</b> \$1,934.3 \$822.9 \$669.8 \$14.3 \$81.4 \$3,752.0 \$74,971.0	2.6% 0.8% 1.2% 0.05% 0.1% 4.1% 8.7% del Est	San Luis \$1,666.3 \$126.0 \$681.6 \$23.0 \$75.6 \$1,285.0 \$94,801.7 2.6% 1.1% 0.9% 0.02% 0.1% 5.0%	1.8%         0.1%         0.7%         0.02%         0.1%         1.4%         4.1%         4.1%         \$1,447.         \$276.0         \$1,093.         \$12.9         \$19.2         \$77.77.7	Santa Cruz \$3,380.1 \$498.7 \$1,520.4 \$15.4 \$81.0 \$919.6 \$119,446.5 • del Fuego 5 4	$\begin{array}{c} 2.8\% \\ 0.4\% \\ 1.3\% \\ \hline \\ 0.01\% \\ 0.8\% \\ \hline \\ 5.4\% \\ \hline \\ 2.0\% \\ 0.4\% \\ 1.5\% \\ \hline \\ 0.02\% \\ 0.03\% \\ \hline \\ 1.1\% \\ \hline \end{array}$	Santa Fe           \$15,027.5           \$1,384.2           \$4,920.2           \$141.2           \$1,435.3           \$7,230.4           \$744,813.2           Tucumán           \$3,826.8           \$714.5           \$1,523.8           \$45.5           \$285.3           \$5,414.9	$\begin{array}{c} 2.0\% \\ 0.2\% \\ 0.7\% \\ \hline \\ 0.02\% \\ 0.2\% \\ \hline \\ 1.0\% \\ \hline \\ 4.0\% \\ \hline \\ 2.4\% \\ 0.5\% \\ 1.0\% \\ \hline \\ 0.03\% \\ 0.2\% \\ \hline \\ 3.5\% \end{array}$
Government Spending Security Services Federal Transfers Judicial Power Social Costs of Crime Convicts Murders Private Spending GRP Total % Government Spending Security Services Federal Transfers Judicial Power Social Costs of Crime Convicts Murders Private Spending GRP	San Juan \$2,656.6 \$788.3 \$1,196.6 \$50.4 \$60.8 \$4,195.4 \$103,384.8 <b>Santiago</b> \$1,934.3 \$822.9 \$669.8 \$14.3 \$81.4 \$3,752.0 \$74,971.9	2.6% 0.8% 1.2% 0.05% 0.1% 4.1% 8.7% del Est	San Luis \$1,666.3 \$126.0 \$681.6 \$23.0 \$75.6 \$1,285.0 \$94,801.7 2.6% 1.1% 0.9% 0.02% 0.1% 5.0%	1.8%           0.1%           0.7%           0.02%           0.1%           1.4%           4.1%           4.1%           \$1,447.           \$276.0           \$1,093.           \$12.9           \$19.2           \$773.7           \$71,982	Santa Cruz \$3,380.1 \$498.7 \$1,520.4 \$15.4 \$81.0 \$919.6 \$119,446.5 • del Fuego 5 4 2.2	2.8% 0.4% 1.3% 0.01% 0.8% 5.4% 2.0% 0.4% 1.5% 0.02% 0.03% 1.1%	Santa Fe         \$15,027.5         \$1,384.2         \$4,920.2         \$141.2         \$1,435.3         \$7,230.4         \$744,813.2         Tucumán         \$3,826.8         \$714.5         \$1,523.8         \$45.5         \$285.3         \$5,414.9         \$156,652.8	2.0% 0.2% 0.7% 0.02% 1.0% 4.0% 2.4% 0.5% 1.0% 0.03% 0.2% 3.5%

Prices are expressed in millions of pesos (constant 2017=100). Not available data was matched by the corresponding average values of the region weighted by its participation in the regional product for calculus.

	as nerce
tudies	r Argentina.
s and s	Trime fo
nethodologie	he Costs of C
between 1	ation of t
Comparison	for the estim

	Ъ.
	$\Box$
	75
	~
	5
	Ð
	60
	5
	R
	ర
	E.
	Ď,
	S
	8
	13
	-H
	Ħ
	e.
	Ĥ
	4
	H
	Ä
	ē
	Ξ
	Ξ.
	$\circ$
)	Ä
	~
	÷
	ő
	Ū.
	Ð
	q.
	Ξ.
	0
	ц
	.2
	Et.
	ã
	÷Ξ
	S
	Š
•	ğ
	<u> </u>
	S
	4

Study	Year   Methodology	Variables Considered	Results
"Los Costos del Crimen y de la Violencia - Nueva Evidencia y Hallazgos en America Latina y el Caribé" - Interametra Development Bank (IDB)	2014 Accounting of losses and expenses	*Private Expenditure in Security BEEPS (World Bank Survey for LAC)	2.97%
	*Victimization Costs Official Sources, CCVS and LAPOP (victimization surveys). *Governmental Budget in Security. *Social Costs Official Sources - DALYS (Dolan et. Al)		
"Los Costos de la Delincuencia en Argentina: Estimacion en base a Encuestas de	2009 Contingent Valuation	*Victimization Costs LICIP (victimization survey developed by Universidad Torcuato Di	14.50%
Victimización" Lucas Ronconi (UTDT)	5	Tella). Price and quantities of stolen goods were considered.	
"The Costs of Crime and Violence for Argentina as Percentage of GDP" Agustin A. Shehadi C. (UNT INVECO - UCEMA)	Accounting of losses and expenses	*Private Expenditure in Security Expenditures Survey (EPH - Indec Argentina)	6.8%
	2011 *Victimization Costs Official Sources, Argentina's Government (SNIC )		
	*Social Costs Official Sources, Argentina's Government (SNEEP & EPH - Indec)		
	*Governmental Budget in Security.		

Finally, it is expected that this work will be understood as a procedure manual for future research in the field, at which time more accurate, detailed and up-to-date databases will be available. The estimation of crime costs as a percentage of their product is understood as a much more powerful indicator than simply counting the amount of crime in a country; this is an indicator that complements the second and that provides very useful information in the diagnosis of the negative effects that crime has on social welfare. And that, finally, results in a tool of great importance regarding the design of public policies.

#### 6 References

Atkinson, Giles; Healey, Andrew; Mourato, Susana. 2005. "Valuing the Cost of Violent Crime: A Stated Preference Approach." Oxford Economic Papers, 57: 559–85.

Acevedo, Carlos. 2008a. "Los costos económicos de la violencia en Centroamérica." El Salvador: Presidency of the Republic, National Council of Public Security.

Bartley, William. 2000. "Valuation of Specific Crime Rates: Final Report." National Criminal Justice Reference Service. Rockville, MD: NCJRS.

Brand, Sam and Price, Richard. 2000. "The Economic and Social Cost of Crime" in Home Office research study 217. London: UK Home Office.

Bishop, Kelly and Timmins, Christopher. 2011. "Hedonic Prices and Implicit Markets: Estimating Marginal Willingness to Pay for Differentiated Products Without Instrumental Variables." NBER Working Paper 17611. Cambridge, MA: NBER.

Bowles, Roger and Pradiptyo, Rimawan. 2005. "Young Adults in Criminal Justice System: Cost and Benefits Considerations." Centre for Criminal Justice, Economics and Psychology, University of York. Study commissioned by Barrow Cadbury Foundation.

Cerro, Ana María y Meloni, Osvaldo (1999a) Análisis Económico de las Políticas de Prevención y Represión del Delito en la Argentina. Libro publicado por la Fundación ARCOR. Premio Fulvio S. Pagani 1999. ISBN 987-9094-75-1.

Cerro, Ana María y Meloni, Osvaldo (2000) Determinants of the Crime Rate in Argentina during the 90's. Estudios de Economía, Universidad de Chile, Vol. 27 Nº 1. Diciembre.

Cherry, T.L., List, J.A. (2002). Aggregation bias in the economic model of crime. Economics Letters 75: 81-82

Cohen, Mark and Piquero, Alex. 2007. "New Evidence on the Monetary Value of Saving a High Risk Youth." Law and Economics Working Paper 08-07. Vanderbilt University Law School.

Cohen, Mark; Rust, Roland; Steen, Sara; and Tidd, Simon. 2004. "Willingness-to-pay for Crime Control Programs." Criminology, 42: 86–106.

Dolan, P., G. Loomes, T. Peasgood y A. Tsuchiya. 2005. "Estimating the Intangible Victim Costs of Violent Crime". British Journal of Criminology 45(6): 958-76

Hammitt, James K. (2017). Extrapolating the Value per Statistical Life Between Populations: Theoretical Implications. Journal of Benefit-Cost Analysis, 8(2), 215–225.

International Development Bank (IDB). Research Department. Call for Research Proposals. 2012. "The Cost of Crime and Violence in Latin America and the Caribbean" (RG-K1109 and RG-K1198)

International Development Bank (IDB). Research Department. 2017. "Los Costos del Crimen y de la Violencia, Nueva Evidencia y Hallazgos en América Latina y el Caribe".

"Los costos económicos de la violencia en El Salvador." América Latina Hoy, 50: 71–88. Anderson, David. 1999. "The Aggregate Burden of Crime." Journal of Law and Economics, Vol. XLII: 611–42.

Pope DG, JC Pope (2012). Crime and property values: Evidence from the 1990s crime drop. Regional Science and Urban Economics 42 (1-2), 177-188

Robinson, Lisa A. (2017). Estimating the Values of Mortality Risk Reductions in Low- and Middle-Income Countries. Journal of Benefit-Cost Analysis, 8(2): 205-214.

Ronconi, Lucas. 2009. "Los Costos de la Delincuencia Argentina: Estimación en base a Encuestas de Victimización". Laboratorio de Investigaciones sobre el Crimen, Instituciones y Políticas. Universidad Torcuato Di Tella.

Viscusi, W. Kip & Masterman, Clayton (2017). Income Elasticities and Global Values of a Statistical Life. Journal of Benefit-Cost Analysis, 8(2), 226–250.