

Blind Review
Muqtasid Journal

1. Does the title of the manuscript concisely and precisely describe the contents of the manuscript?

Comments:

The title is concise and describes the contents of the text well, but there is misleading between "Islamic economics" (in the title) and "Islamic economic law" (in the body of the discussion).

2. Does the abstract explain completely and concisely the objectives and scope, methods, conclusions, and implications of the research?

Comments:

The abstract is too long, and does not describe the problem being studied

3. Does the introduction clearly describe the problem and scope of the research, the definitions of the research variables, the research gap, and the novelty of the research being carried out?

Comments:

The introduction has described the research gap and phenomenon gap well. From this description it is known that this study is more appropriate for the field of Islamic economic law.

4. Are the methods and Approaches used relevant to the research problem and objectives?

Comments:

Methods and approaches are described in a very general manner. So, it is not explained technical and specific matters for this research.

5. Does the results of the discussion been arranged in detail and clear?

Comments:

The results of the discussion were analyzed using an Islamic economic law approach, so that many Islamic legal terms emerged, such as Fatwa of MUI, Law in several countries, illat law, gharar, subhat, haram and so on.

6. Does the conclusions been drawn up briefly and covering the essence of the writing, conformity/contradiction with the results of other writings, logical reasoning according to facts, implications of theoretical/applied results?

Comments:

The conclusion has been written in accordance with the discussion carried out, namely the analysis of Islamic economic law on cryptocurrency. However, this is not in line with the perspective set out at the beginning, namely the Islamic economic perspective.

7. Does the literature used up-to-date (within the last 10 years) and adequate?

Comments:

The literature used is very up-to-date.

8. Does the information in the manuscript classified as new?

Comments:

The information is quite interesting, but not new.

9. Does the conceptual framework arrange logically and systematically?

Comments:

The framework is quite logical and systematic.

10. Does the table present the data concise and clear?

Comments:

No, table. There is a picture, but explain nothing.

11. Does the mapping concept is representative enough?

Comments:

he mapping concept needs to be focused on the Islamic economic aspects, while reducing/changing the portion of the legal aspects.

12. Does the manuscript is suitable for Muqtasid Journal?

Comments:

Quite appropriate, with a note that it needs to be refocused on (Islamic) economic perspective.

13. Conclusions about the manuscript in general:

Comments:

Need to replace the analysis approach

14. Recommendations (accept/minor revision/major revision/reject):

Comments:

major revision