

Reviewer's Report

Journal:	Journal of Governance and Regulation		
Title of the paper:	DIGITAL AND ELECTRONIC TRANSACTIONS AGAINST VOM IN INDONESIA		
Date of the Review completion:	20 October 2021		
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:	Is easy to follow and understand		
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 type="checkbox"/> yes	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> yes	<input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> yes	<input type="checkbox"/> no
Methods used in the paper:	Suit the aim of the research		
	Does the methodology part allow replicating or reproducing results (to check them or to perform a similar study)?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> yes	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> yes	<input type="checkbox"/> no
Results and discussion:	Are the interpretations provided by the author(s) supported by the findings obtained in the study?		
Are there any figures or tables that have to be corrected / deleted?	Yes, some corrections need to be done (please explain)		
	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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> yes	<input type="checkbox"/> no
	Does the conclusion section repeat the abstract of the paper?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> yes	<input type="checkbox"/> no
References	Are all references in the list used in the paper?		
	Are the number, relevance and "age" of the citations appropriate?	<input type="checkbox"/> yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> no
Language of the paper:	Is low, major revisions needed		
Length of the paper:	Is appropriate		
What is your main verdict?	Accept paper with the changes that should be made by the author/authors		

Field for the comments of the reviewer:

The abstract has to be written in order to highlight the gap in the literature that the paper is filling, the relevance of the research and the relevance for the future study. Moreover, it doesn't have to present typing mistakes.

The literature review should be enlarged, especially when talking about the paragraph about payment system and the VoM paragraph. It is not clear how you derive the hypothesis from the literature that is presented. Moreover, the gap in the literature that the study wants to fill is not evident, and it should be highlighted, otherwise the paper loses relevance.

Conclusions are scarce, they have to be improved, also including references that are aligned with the results achieved.

Finally, the paper should be sent for proofreading.