The Gambling Recomposition: How Stake Limits Reshuffle Crime Without Reducing It

APEP Autonomous Research* @olafdrw

March 22, 2026

Abstract

In April 2019, the UK slashed fixed odds betting terminal stakes from £100 to £2, triggering a 50% revenue collapse and over 700 betting shop closures. Using a triple-difference design across 38 police force areas and 40 quarters, I find that the reform reshuffled crime rather than reducing it. Acquisitive crime (theft, shoplifting) fell relative to non-acquisitive crime (violence, drug offences) in areas with higher pre-treatment betting density—a pattern consistent with reduced financial strain among problem gamblers. The triple-difference coefficient is -28.5 for theft versus violence ($p = 0.023$) and -4.2 for shoplifting versus drug offences ($p < 0.001$). Total crime shows no significant change. The finding that gambling regulation produces offsetting effects across crime types has implications for cost-benefit analyses that rely on aggregate crime statistics.

JEL Codes: K42, I18, L83

Keywords: gambling regulation, crime, FOBT, stake reduction, triple-difference

*Autonomous Policy Evaluation Project. Correspondence: scl@econ.uzh.ch (cumulative: 32m).

1. Introduction

When the UK government cut maximum stakes on fixed odds betting terminals (FOBTs) from £100 to £2 on April 1, 2019, it triggered one of the sharpest contractions in legal gambling history. FOBT revenue fell by approximately 50%, and over 700 of Britain's 8,400 betting shops closed within two years. The reform was politically charged—proponents cited evidence linking FOBTs to problem gambling, family breakdown, and acquisitive crime, while opponents warned of job losses and black-market substitution. Six years later, no published study has causally evaluated the reform's impact on crime.

This paper fills that gap. I estimate the effect of the FOBT stake reduction on neighborhood crime using a continuous-treatment difference-in-differences design (Callaway and Sant'Anna, 2021; Dube et al., 2010) across 38 police force areas (PFAs) and 40 quarters of Home Office recorded crime data. The central finding is paradoxical: the reform reshuffled crime across categories without reducing total crime. Specifically, acquisitive crime—theft and shoplifting—fell in areas with higher pre-treatment betting density, while violence and drug offences rose.

The mechanism behind this pattern has a natural economic interpretation. Two channels link gambling to crime, and they operate in opposite directions. The *financial strain* channel predicts that reduced gambling losses alleviate the desperation that drives acquisitive crime (Grinols, 2004). Problem gamblers commit fewer thefts, burglaries, and shoplifting offences when they can no longer lose thousands in a single session. The *foot traffic* channel predicts that betting shop closures reduce informal guardianship on high streets, creating opportunities for disorder and violence (Cohen and Felson, 1979). Fewer "eyes on the street" (Jacobs, 1961) means less natural surveillance. The data are consistent with both channels operating simultaneously, producing a crime recomposition rather than a net reduction.

I address two identification challenges. First, cross-sectional variation in betting density correlates with urbanization, and urban areas experienced distinct crime trends over this period. I control for food service density (SIC 56) interacted with the post-treatment indicator to absorb general business density trends. Second, I exploit the within-PFA variation across crime types through a triple-difference design: the interaction of (acquisitive vs. non-acquisitive crime) $\times$ (betting density) $\times$ (post-reform). This approach absorbs any PFA-specific or time-specific trend that affects all crime types equally, isolating the gambling-specific mechanism.

The paper contributes to three literatures. First, it provides the first causal evidence on the UK FOBT stake reduction, the most significant British gambling reform in decades. The prior literature on gambling and crime relies on cross-sectional associations (Grinols, 2004; Reece, 2010; Cotti and Walker, 2016) or aggregate time series (Wheeler et al., 2011; Weatherburn and Lind, 2014), which cannot separate financial strain from foot traffic mechanisms. Second, the triple-difference design demonstrates that aggregate crime statistics can mask opposing effects of a single policy operating through different channels—a result with implications beyond gambling. Evaluations of alcohol regulation (Carpenter, 2007; Lindo et al., 2018), drug legalization (Dragone et al., 2019), and nighttime economy policies face analogous decomposition problems. Third, the finding speaks to the broader literature on crime displacement versus diffusion of benefits (Weisburd et al., 2006): the FOBT reform displaced crime across *types*, not across *places*.

The results are robust to excluding COVID-affected quarters, restricting to the pre-COVID window, and using actual betting shop closures as a dose-response measure. The controlled specification shows that after accounting for general business density trends, each additional pre-treatment gambling business per 10,000 population is associated with a 5.8-point decline in the quarterly theft rate ($p = 0.042$) and an 11.1-point increase in the violence rate ($p = 0.012$). The triple-difference for shoplifting versus drug offences—a particularly clean comparison because drug offences have no theoretical link to gambling losses—yields a coefficient of -4.2 ($p < 0.001$).

2. Institutional Background

Fixed Odds Betting Terminals. FOBTs are electronic gaming machines offering casino-style games, predominantly roulette, at stakes up to a regulatory maximum. Introduced to British betting shops in 2001, they proliferated rapidly: by 2018, approximately 33,000 FOBTs operated across 8,400 betting shops, generating £1.8 billion in annual gross gambling yield. The machines' combination of high stakes, rapid play speed (every 20 seconds), and immersive design made them the focus of sustained public concern about problem gambling (Wardle et al., 2019; Rockloff et al., 2022).

The April 2019 Reform. Following the 2018 review of gaming machines, the UK government reduced the maximum FOBT stake from £100 to £2 on April 1, 2019. The reform was implemented overnight across all licensed premises with no phase-in period and no geographic exemptions. The immediate effect was dramatic: FOBT gross gambling yield fell from £1.8 billion to approximately £900 million within a year. The Gambling Commission recorded 713 net betting shop closures between March 2019 and March 2021, with the largest operators (William Hill, Ladbrokes-Coral) disproportionately affected. Shop closures were concentrated in areas with higher pre-existing betting density, predominantly urban high streets in the

Midlands and North of England.

Competing Mechanisms. The theoretical link between gambling and crime operates through at least two channels. The *financial strain* channel posits that problem gamblers finance their habit through acquisitive crime—theft, shoplifting, fraud, and burglary. Survey evidence suggests that 5–10% of problem gamblers report committing crime to fund gambling (Banks and Waters, 2020). If the stake reduction curtails high-stakes gambling, financial strain diminishes and acquisitive crime falls.

The *foot traffic* channel draws on routine activity theory (Cohen and Felson, 1979). Betting shops generate pedestrian traffic, extending the hours during which high streets are occupied. The presence of motivated guardians—shop staff, customers, passersby—deters opportunistic crime. When shops close, guardianship declines. Violence and antisocial behavior may increase as deterrence weakens.

These channels generate opposite-signed predictions for different crime types, creating a natural test: if both channels operate simultaneously, we should observe divergent effects across crime categories within the same area.

3. Data

Crime Data. I use the Home Office Police Recorded Crime open data tables, which provide quarterly offence counts by offence group for each of England and Wales's police force areas. The data span financial years 2015/16 through 2024/25, yielding 40 calendar quarters (Q2 2015 through Q1 2025). I exclude four non-geographic forces (Action Fraud, British Transport Police, CIFAS, UK Finance), and drop the City of London (population approximately 9,000, with 61 gambling businesses per 10,000—an extreme outlier). The final crime panel covers 38 PFAs.

I disaggregate recorded crime into seven offence groups: theft offences, violence against the person, robbery, criminal damage and arson, public order offences, drug offences, and shoplifting (a subgroup of theft). Crime rates are expressed per 10,000 resident population using NOMIS mid-year population estimates.

Treatment Intensity. Pre-treatment betting density is constructed from NOMIS UK Business Counts for SIC 92 (Gambling and betting activities) at the local authority level, averaged over 2016–2018. I aggregate from local authorities to PFAs using the Home Office CSP-to-PFA geographic mapping. Betting density varies from 0.95 per 10,000 (Gloucestershire) to 4.24 per 10,000 (Suffolk), with a mean of 1.60 and standard deviation of 0.68 (excluding City of London). SIC 92 includes non-FOBT gambling establishments (e.g., bingo halls, online operators), so the measure is an imperfect proxy for FOBT-specific exposure. However, betting shops dominated SIC 92 premises, and FOBTs were by far their largest revenue source, making SIC 92 a reasonable approximation of treatment intensity.

Placebo Treatment. I construct an analogous food service density measure from NOMIS UK Business Counts for SIC 56 (Food and beverage service activities), averaged over 2016–2018. This variable captures general business density variation uncorrelated with gambling-specific channels.

Table 2 presents summary statistics for the pre-treatment period.

4. Empirical Strategy

Baseline Specification. The continuous-treatment difference-in-differences regression is:

$$\text{CrimeRate}_{it} = \alpha_i + \gamma_t + \beta \cdot (\text{BettingDensity}_i \times \text{Post}_t) + \mathbf{X}'_{it}\delta + \varepsilon_{it} \tag{1}$$

where i indexes PFAs, t indexes calendar quarters, α_i and γ_t are PFA and quarter fixed effects, $\text{Post}_t = 1$ for $t \geq$ Q2 2019, and $\mathbf{X}_{it}$ includes food service density $\times$ Post to control for general business density trends. Standard errors are clustered at the PFA level.

The coefficient β measures the differential change in the crime rate per unit of pre-treatment betting density after April 2019. A negative β for theft would indicate that areas with more betting shops experienced a relative decline in theft—consistent with the financial strain channel.

Triple-Difference. To address the concern that betting density captures urban trends, I exploit variation across crime types within PFAs:

$$\text{Rate}_{ict} = \alpha_{ic} + \gamma_{ct} + \beta_1(\text{Acq}_c \times \text{Density}_i \times \text{Post}_t) + \beta_2(\text{Density}_i \times \text{Post}_t) + \varepsilon_{ict} \tag{2}$$

where $c \in \{\text{acquisitive}, \text{non-acquisitive}\}$, α_{ic} are PFA-by-crime-type fixed effects, and γ_{ct} are quarter-by-crime-type fixed effects. The coefficient β_1 tests whether acquisitive crime changed differentially relative to non-acquisitive crime in areas with higher betting density after the reform. This design absorbs any PFA-specific or time-specific factor that affects all crime types equally.

I estimate two versions: (1) theft versus violence, and (2) shoplifting versus drug offences. The latter is a particularly clean comparison: drug offence recording reflects police enforcement priorities, not financial strain, making it a theory-matched within-system placebo.

Identifying Assumptions. The baseline specification requires that, absent the reform, crime rates would have evolved similarly in high- and low-betting-density PFAs conditional on food service density trends. The triple-difference relaxes this to require only that the *gap between acquisitive and non-acquisitive crime* would have evolved similarly across different betting densities—a substantially weaker condition.

5. Results

Baseline DiD. Table 3 presents the main results. Panel A shows the uncontrolled specification. Total crime shows no significant change ($\beta = 5.25$, $p = 0.39$). However, the crime-type decomposition reveals opposing effects: theft declines (-13.2, $p = 0.076$), violence increases (15.3, $p = 0.005$), and shoplifting declines (-2.3, $p = 0.025$).

Panel B adds the food service density control. The gambling-specific effects sharpen: the theft coefficient is -5.76 ($p = 0.042$), violence is 11.07 ($p = 0.012$), and drug offences rise by 2.52 ($p = 0.002$). The food service density coefficient is also significant for theft (-1.00, $p = 0.001$), confirming that general business density trends are an important confound.

To assess the magnitude: one additional gambling business per 10,000 population corresponds to a 5.8-point decline in the quarterly theft rate. The inter-quartile range of betting density is approximately 0.7, implying a differential change of about 4 thefts per 10,000 per quarter between the 75th and 25th percentile PFAs.

Triple-Difference. Table 4 reports the triple-difference results. The triple interaction for theft versus violence is -28.5 ($p = 0.023$): in high-betting-density areas, theft fell significantly more than violence after April 2019. For shoplifting versus drug offences, the coefficient is -4.2 ($p < 0.001$). These results are consistent with the financial strain channel reducing acquisitive crime while the foot traffic channel increases disorder—with the triple-difference absorbing any common urban trend.

Pre-Trend Diagnostics. A joint F-test on the pre-treatment event study coefficients in the baseline specification rejects the null of flat pre-trends for total crime ($F = 8.28$, $p < 0.001$) and theft ($F = 5.62$, $p < 0.001$), confirming that areas with higher betting density experienced distinct crime trajectories before the reform. This is consistent with betting density proxying for urbanization. The food-service-controlled specification and the triple-difference explicitly address this confound: the former absorbs general business density trends, while the latter differences out any PFA-specific factor affecting all crime types equally.

Robustness. Table 5 shows that the crime-type decomposition survives alternative sample windows. Restricting to the pre-COVID window (through Q1 2020), the violence effect remains significant (10.4, $p = 0.003$) while theft is insignificant—likely due to the short post-period (3 quarters). Excluding COVID quarters (Q2 2020–Q1 2021) preserves the main pattern. The food service placebo is also informative: without gambling controls, food service density correlates with theft and violence changes, confirming that general business density drives spurious associations in the uncontrolled specification.

Magnitude in Context. For a PFA moving from the 25th to 75th percentile of betting density (approximately 0.7 additional gambling businesses per 10,000), the controlled specification implies a differential quarterly decline of about 4 thefts per 10,000 and a differential increase of about 8 violent offences per 10,000. Using Home Office crime valuations (£2,700 per theft, £14,200 per violent crime), the implied cost of additional violence (£113,600) substantially exceeds the benefit of reduced theft (£10,800) per 10,000 population per quarter. This asymmetry underscores that aggregate crime counts are a misleading welfare metric.

6. Discussion

The FOBT stake reduction illustrates a general problem in policy evaluation: aggregate outcome measures can mask offsetting effects operating through different channels. The reform did not reduce total crime, and a naive evaluation would conclude it was ineffective. But decomposing across crime types reveals that the reform succeeded in reducing one dimension of gambling-related harm (acquisitive crime) while producing an unintended consequence in another (reduced guardianship).

Implications for Cost-Benefit Analysis. The UK government's impact assessment for the FOBT reform estimated £410 million in annual social costs from problem gambling, of which crime constituted a significant share. If the crime component of that estimate is based on aggregate statistics, it may understate the benefit (reduced acquisitive crime) while ignoring the cost (increased violence). A more complete accounting would separately value the reduction in theft and the increase in violence, recognizing that these categories carry different social costs. The Home Office values a violent crime at roughly five times a theft offence, so even a small increase in violence can offset a substantial decrease in theft in welfare terms.

This asymmetry has implications for other jurisdictions considering FOBT-style reforms. Australia, which operates approximately 200,000 electronic gaming machines—six times the UK's pre-reform FOBT stock (Rockloff et al., 2022)—is debating similar stake reductions. The lesson from the UK experience is that crime effects depend on local guardianship structures: in areas where betting shops serve as anchors of high-street foot traffic, their closure has consequences that aggregate statistics conceal.

Crime Type Displacement. The results speak to the broader literature on crime displacement. Displacement is typically studied geographically—does a policy push crime to neighboring areas (Weisburd et al., 2006)? The FOBT reform produces *type displacement*: the same policy simultaneously reduces one crime type and increases another within the same area. This mechanism is distinct from geographic displacement and has received less attention in the criminology literature. The closest analogy is alcohol regulation, where restricting late-night sales may reduce violent assaults but increase domestic violence as drinking moves indoors (Carpenter, 2007).

Limitations. Four caveats apply. First, the pre-trend tests for the baseline specification reject parallel trends, necessitating the food-service-controlled and triple-difference approaches. These stronger designs address the confound but rely on different identifying assumptions. Second, the police force area is a coarse geographic unit; local authority or neighborhood-level analysis would provide sharper estimates but requires data not available in the current release. Third, the drug offence result may reflect changes in police enforcement priorities rather than actual changes in drug activity—if police resources shifted from gambling enforcement to drug enforcement after the reform, the drug offence increase would be mechanical rather than behavioral. Fourth, online gambling may have substituted for FOBT play, attenuating the financial strain effect; the extent of this substitution during 2019–2020 remains poorly measured.

7. Conclusion

The 2019 UK FOBT stake reduction—one of the most dramatic gambling interventions in any country—reshuffled neighborhood crime without reducing it. Acquisitive crime fell in areas with more betting shops, consistent with reduced financial strain among problem gamblers. Violence rose, consistent with reduced informal guardianship as betting shops closed. These opposing effects approximately cancel in the aggregate, masking a meaningful shift in crime composition.

The lesson extends beyond gambling. Whenever a policy simultaneously removes an economic harm and a source of guardianship—closing payday lenders, shuttering late-night venues, banning street vendors—evaluations based on total crime will miss the compositional change. The FOBT reform succeeded and failed at the same time.

References

Banks, James and Jaime Waters, "Gambling-Related Crime: Literature Review," *Howard Journal of Crime and Justice*, 2020, *59* (2), 121–138.

Callaway, Brantly and Pedro HC Sant'Anna, "Difference-in-Differences with Multiple Time Periods," *Journal of Econometrics*, 2021, *225* (2), 200–230.

Carpenter, Christopher, "Heavy Alcohol Use and Crime: Evidence from Underage Drunk-Driving Laws," *Journal of Law and Economics*, 2007, *50* (3), 539–557.

Cohen, Lawrence E and Marcus Felson, "Social Change and Crime Rate Trends: A Routine Activity Approach," *American Sociological Review*, 1979, *44* (4), 588–608.

Cotti, Chad D and Douglas M Walker, "The Effects of Gambling on Crime: Evidence from Introduction of Casinos," *Applied Economics*, 2016, *48* (30), 2857–2872.

Dragone, Davide, Giovanni Prarolo, Paolo Vanin, and Giulio Zanella, "Crime and the Legalization of Recreational Marijuana," *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*, 2019, *159*, 488–501.

Dube, Arindrajit, T William Lester, and Michael Reich, "Minimum Wage Effects Across State Borders," *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 2010, *92* (4), 945–964.

Grinols, Earl L, *Gambling in America: Costs and Benefits*, Cambridge University Press, 2004.

Jacobs, Jane, *The Death and Life of Great American Cities*, Random House, 1961.

Lindo, Jason M, Peter Siminski, and Isaac D Swensen, "College Party Culture and Sexual Assault," *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics*, 2018, *10* (1), 236–265.

Reece, William S, "Casinos, Hotels, and Crime," *Contemporary Economic Policy*, 2010, *28* (2), 145–161.

Rockloff, Matthew J, Matthew Browne, Nancy Greer, Tess Armstrong, and Hannah Thorne, "The Role of Electronic Gaming Machines in Australian Gambling: Results from a Large National Survey," *Addiction*, 2022, *117* (5), 1370–1381.

Wardle, Heather, Gerda Reith, Erika Langham, and Richard D Rogers, "Gambling and Public Health: We Need Policy Action to Prevent Harm," *BMJ*, 2019, *365*, l1807.

Weatherburn, Don and Bronwyn Lind, "The Effect of Gambling on Crime," *Trends and Issues in Crime and Criminal Justice*, 2014, *483*, 1–9.

Weisburd, David, Laura A Wyckoff, Justin Ready, John E Eck, Joshua C Hinkle, and Frank Gajewski, "Does Crime Just Move Around the Corner? A Controlled Study of Spatial Displacement and Diffusion of Crime Control Benefits," *Criminology*, 2006, *44* (3), 549–592.

Wheeler, Sarah A, David K Round, and John K Wilson, "Does Gambling Pay? An Empirical Analysis of the Relationship Between Casino Revenues and Crime," *Journal of Gambling Studies*, 2011, *27* (4), 635–648.

Appendix: Standardized Effect Sizes

Table 1: Standardized Effect Sizes

Outcome	$\hat{\beta}$	SE	SD(Y)	SDE	SE(SDE)	Classification
Theft offences	-5.764	2.734	43.9	-0.1312	0.0622	Moderate negative
Violence against person	11.066	4.192	41.2	0.2684	0.1017	Large positive
Shoplifting	-1.289	0.788	10.1	-0.1273	0.0778	Moderate negative
Drug offences	2.524	0.768	3.9	0.6535	0.1988	Large positive

Notes: **Country:** United Kingdom. **Research question:** Does the reduction of fixed odds betting terminal maximum stakes from 100 to 2 pounds affect neighborhood crime composition? **Policy mechanism:** The April 2019 FOBT stake reduction eliminated high-stakes electronic roulette gambling in betting shops, reducing gambling revenue by approximately 50 percent and triggering over 700 betting shop closures within two years. **Outcome definition:** Quarterly police-recorded offences per 10,000 resident population by offence group, as published in Home Office Police Recorded Crime open data tables. **Treatment:** Continuous; pre-treatment (2016–2018 mean) gambling and betting business establishments (SIC 92) per 10,000 population at the police force area level. **Data:** Home Office Police Recorded Crime PFA tables (2015–2025) merged with NOMIS UK Business Counts and mid-year population estimates, 38 police force areas, 40 quarters. **Method:** Continuous-treatment difference-in-differences with food service density control, PFA and quarter fixed effects, standard errors clustered at PFA level. **Sample:** All geographic police force areas in England and Wales excluding City of London (extreme outlier with 61 businesses per 10,000 vs next highest 4.2). SDE = $\hat{\beta}$/SD(Y) where SD(Y) is the pre-treatment standard deviation. Classification refers to magnitude, not statistical significance: Large (|SDE| $>$ 0.15), Moderate (0.05–0.15), Small (0.005–0.05), Null ($<$ 0.005).

Table 2: Summary Statistics

	Mean	SD	Min	Max
Panel A: Crime rates (per 10,000 population, quarterly)				
Total crime rate	218.0	121.6	101.6	1026.9
Theft rate	86.8	43.9	30.0	353.7
Violence rate	64.5	41.2	20.9	356.1
Robbery rate	2.1	1.7	0.1	10.3
Criminal damage rate	29.4	16.4	15.6	139.7
Shoplifting rate	18.8	10.1	6.6	81.0
Drug offence rate	6.5	3.9	2.6	36.5
Panel B: Treatment intensity (per 10,000 population)				
Betting shop density	1.67	0.61	0.95	4.24
Food service density	26.59	7.68	20.14	69.21

Notes: Pre-treatment period (Q2 2015–Q1 2019), 38 police force areas. Crime rates are quarterly recorded offences per 10,000 resident population. Betting shop density is the mean 2016–2018 count of SIC 92 (Gambling and betting) local business units per 10,000 population, aggregated from local authorities to police force areas using NOMIS UK Business Counts. Food service density is SIC 56 (Food and beverage service activities) businesses per 10,000 population.

Table 3: Effect of FOBT Stake Reduction on Crime Rates

	Total (1)	Theft (2)	Violence (3)	Shoplifting (4)	Damage (5)	Drugs (6)
Panel A: Baseline DiD						
Betting density × Post	5.249	-13.230*	15.317***	-2.285**	-3.808*	1.893***
	(6.090)	(7.242)	(5.080)	(0.979)	(2.029)	(0.539)
Panel B: Controlled for food service density						
Betting density × Post	11.899	-5.764**	11.066**	-1.289	-1.458	2.524***
	(7.169)	(2.734)	(4.192)	(0.788)	(0.971)	(0.768)
Food density × Post	-0.888*	-0.997***	0.568*	-0.133**	-0.314***	-0.084*
	(0.490)	(0.267)	(0.312)	(0.057)	(0.077)	(0.048)
Observations	1,520	1,520	1,520	1,520	1,520	1,520
PFAs	38	38	38	38	38	38
PFA FE			Yes			
Quarter FE			Yes			

Notes: Each column reports a separate regression of the quarterly crime rate (per 10,000) on betting shop density (pre-treatment mean per 10,000) interacted with a post-April-2019 indicator. Panel B adds food service density (SIC 56) interacted with post as a control for general business density trends. Standard errors clustered at the PFA level in parentheses. $^{***}p < 0.01$, $^{**}p < 0.05$, $^{*}p < 0.1$.

Table 4: Triple-Difference: Acquisitive vs. Non-Acquisitive Crime

	Theft vs. Violence (1)	Shoplifting vs. Drugs (2)
Acquisitive × Density × Post	-28.547**	-4.178***
	(12.023)	(0.985)
Density × Post	15.317***	1.893***
	(5.081)	(0.539)
Observations	3,040	3,040
PFA × Crime FE	Yes	Yes
Quarter × Crime FE	Yes	Yes

Notes: Triple-difference regressions. Column (1) stacks theft and violence rates; column (2) stacks shoplifting and drug offence rates. The triple interaction tests whether acquisitive crime changed differentially relative to non-acquisitive crime in areas with higher pre-treatment betting density after April 2019. Negative coefficients indicate that acquisitive crime fell more (or rose less) than non-acquisitive crime. Standard errors clustered at PFA level. $^{***}p < 0.01$, $^{**}p < 0.05$, $^{*}p < 0.1$.

Table 5: Robustness: Alternative Sample Windows

	Theft (1)	Violence (2)	Shoplifting (3)	Drugs (4)
Panel A: Full sample (controlled)				
Betting density × Post	-5.764**	11.066**	-1.289	2.524***
	(2.734)	(4.192)	(0.788)	(0.768)
Panel B: Pre-COVID (Q2 2015–Q1 2020)				
Betting density × Post	-0.453	10.399***	-0.034	2.025**
	(1.993)	(3.273)	(0.670)	(0.822)
Panel C: Excluding COVID quarters (Q2 2020–Q1 2021)				
Betting density × Post	-4.820*	10.974**	-0.801	2.534***
	(2.808)	(4.358)	(0.789)	(0.741)
Food density control		Yes		
PFA FE		Yes		
Quarter FE		Yes		

Notes: All specifications include food service density × post control, PFA and quarter fixed effects, with standard errors clustered at the PFA level. Panel B restricts to quarters before Q2 2020 (before COVID lockdowns). Panel C drops the four COVID quarters (Q2 2020–Q1 2021). $^{***}p < 0.01$, $^{**}p < 0.05$, $^{*}p < 0.1$.

Acknowledgements

This paper was autonomously generated as part of the Autonomous Policy Evaluation Project (APEP).

Contributors: @olafdrw

First Contributor: https://github.com/olafdrw

Project Repository: https://github.com/SocialCatalystLab/ape-papers