

Reviewer's Report

Journal:	Journal of Governance and Regulation		
Title of the paper:	Money Laundering in Indonesia: Information Transparency as a Prevention and Eradication Effort		
Date of the Review completion:	03 February 2023		
Please choose options that can characterize the paper:			
Originality and importance of the paper to the field of research:	Medium		
The structure of the paper:	Needs to be slightly corrected		
Please tick relevant for the abstract	The abstract provides an accurate summary of the manuscript (including aim, methods, key results and relevance of the study)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> yes	<input type="checkbox"/> no
	The abstract contains unnecessary information (please explain)	<input type="checkbox"/> yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> no
	Is the abstract of appropriate size? (150-200 words)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> yes	<input type="checkbox"/> no
Please tick relevant for the introduction	Does the introduction identify the purpose of the paper or hypothesis and set the paper within the broader research perspective?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> yes	<input type="checkbox"/> no
	The introduction puts the rest of the paper into perspective (explains paper's structure)	<input type="checkbox"/> yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> no
Methods used in the paper:	Contain minor mistakes		
	Does the methodology part allow replicating or reproducing results (to check them or to perform a similar study)?	<input type="checkbox"/> yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> no
	If empirical study: is the sample size large enough and was selected in an appropriate way (leave blank if not acceptable)?	<input type="checkbox"/> yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> no
Results and discussion:	Are the interpretations provided by the author(s) supported by the findings obtained in the study?	<input type="checkbox"/> yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> no
Are there any figures or tables that have to be corrected / deleted?	No, everything is fine		
	Are the figures and/or tables clear and you can understand their essence?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> yes	<input type="checkbox"/> no
Conclusions:	Do not reveal main findings of the paper		
	Conclusions are supported by the findings, analysis and interpretations of the author(s)	<input type="checkbox"/> yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> no
	Does the conclusion section repeat the abstract of the paper?	<input type="checkbox"/> yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> no
References	Are all references in the list used in the paper?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> yes	<input type="checkbox"/> no
	Are the number, relevance and "age" of the citations appropriate?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> yes	<input type="checkbox"/> no
Language of the paper:	Is adequate (small mistakes)		
Length of the paper:	Is appropriate		
What is your main verdict?	Accept paper with major revisions		
Field for the comments of the reviewer:			
<p>I think that the idea and the topic of this paper is interesting, but the manuscript should be revised. The author(s) makes extensive use of bibliography that is up to date, but not always necessary or relevant. The paper is a bit confusing in terms of hypothesis development (there are actually no hypothesis), methodology (no justification for the selected methods). In addition, the paper needs a lot of improvement at the theoretical and empirical levels.</p> <p>All other comments are added in the paper. Please try to consider these comments to develop the paper which is good and focus on acritical idea.</p>			