This paper is not ready for publication, and I do not know if it is most suited for becoming a small book or an article. For a book it will have to be developed and reworked. For an article it needs focus and concentration. In both cases it needs a lot of work. I think that it should be carefully rewritten, with a lot of attention to language. Already the first sentence is confusing:

"Organized crime has been longstanding extensively on transnational grounds but has even more accelerated through globalization and has become its biggest winner, thus negatively affected business."

This is not a sentence, and certainly not in English, though the words are – maybe it is a google translation? If I understand it right, it is not true. Free trade is a strong factor reducing corruption. There are many sentences like that. It gives the reader the impression that either the author is confused, or he does not care to communicate with the reader. I am not a native speaker of English. And I do not mind that the English has a 'foreign' tone. But I think that it is crucial that it is clear what the author means. Use sentences with a simple structure, and a most one side sentence.

Dimant certainly knows that it has often been discussed what corruption is. So he has no excuse for not trying to clarify. He uses the concept loosely for all kind of gray and black activity, almost as another term for economic dishonesty. I think it is confusing.

The cleanest definition uses the principal agent framework to define corruption as follows: Corruption occurs when an agent dealing with a third party colludes with that party to defraud the principal. The key point is that the two parties to the deal cheat the principal of at least one of the two. In the case of public sector corruption the principal may be a chain ending with 'the people'.

We really do not want to term all kinds of gray and black activity corruption. A drug mafia may bribe a custom official to close his eyes to a drug transport, or smuggle the drugs in on a boat at night, as is cheapest, but the key activity it the import and sale of the drugs. This is a criminal business, but it is not corruption. However, if it is defined as corruption the surely free trade makes it easier! If two businessmen sit down to make business in such a way that it escapes the taxman it might be criminal, but it is not corruption, etc.

We know that the strongest relation between any economic variable and corruption is from the level of incomes to corruption – and it is negative relation: The higher the income the lower is corruption. Causal testing is tricky business, but in this case a formal causality test has been published (in Economics Letters 103 (2009) 146–8).

We certainly know that most developed countries were much more corrupt 200 years ago. And this also applies the Asiatic Tigers only 50 years ago. This has not prevented development and it has then reduced corruption. This should be reflected in the paper.

There is even the theory that sometimes institutions are so restrictive that some corruption acts as grease making the system work! Pierre-Guillaume Méon has worked on that, and it seems that it is only in extreme cases. Normally corruption is a cost.

There may also be causality the other way, but as far as I know, it has not been proved by a formal test, though Johann Lambsdoff has tried.

Well I will not continue, but only restate that this paper is not ready for publication.