An important contribution and some suggestions

The paper analyzes empirically the positive relationship between tourism and crimes. The two main conclusions that the tourism-crime relationship is persistent over time and that both tourists and residents have equal chance to be victim of these crimes are important contributions.

Three short suggestions:

As clearly stated by the authors the results on the propensity of being victimized strongly depends on the assumption that tourists have the same propensity to report crimes across the Italian provinces. Finding a way of testing this assumption could strengthen the results. Fujii and Mark (1980) argue that “tourists are safer targets for criminals because they rarely report crime to the police...”. In this line of argument I would expect that the likelihood of reporting to the police will be strongly correlated with the perception of the efficiency in the law and order system of that province. An interaction with the deterrence variable could help the cause. Another example on the importance of testing this assumption is that Italian newspapers often signal the inability of tourists to report crimes in big cities, as Rome, because of few offices available compared to the size of the city.

Although the results are consistent to different measure of tourism, arrivals seems to be the most used one. It is well explained that arrivals have increased significantly while the average length of stay have decreased. To better conclude that “overcrowded cities give more opportunities to criminals...” it seems that the most important variable is the number of nights in official accommodations. Given that the results are analogous I suggest focusing on that variable.

The results in table 5 between using Crime and Crime-pe are so close to each other that it could be useful to show what are the differences among the two variables.