# Article information:

Detection of fintech P2P lending issues in Indonesia: Heliyon  
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# Article summary:

1. Fintech is a growing industry in Indonesia, with 164 registered and licensed fintech (P2P lending) companies at the end of 2019.

2. Illegal fintech lending practices have mechanisms beyond the responsibility and authority of the Financial Services Authority (OJK), including the risk of collection and distribution of personal data.

3. The study found five main issues in fintech P2P lending in Indonesia: public awareness about P2P lending, data leakage and restriction of data access, personal data fraud, illegal fintech lending, and product marketing ethics.

# Article rating:

Appears moderately imbalanced: The article provides some useful information, but is missing several important points or pieces of evidence that would be required to present the discussed topics in a balanced and reliable way. You are encouraged to seek a more balanced perspective on the presented issues by exploring the provided research topics and looking at different information sources.

# Article analysis:

The article discusses the growth of fintech P2P lending in Indonesia and the challenges it faces, including illegal lending practices and personal data protection. The study uses a case study approach and Focus Group Discussion techniques to obtain data from stakeholders in the industry. The article provides a comprehensive overview of the current state of fintech P2P lending in Indonesia, including its regulation, growth, and challenges.

However, the article has some potential biases and limitations. Firstly, it focuses mainly on the negative aspects of fintech P2P lending in Indonesia, such as illegal lending practices and personal data protection issues. While these are important issues that need to be addressed, the article does not provide a balanced view of the industry's benefits and positive impact on financial inclusion.

Secondly, the article relies heavily on qualitative research methods such as case studies and focus group discussions. While these methods can provide valuable insights into stakeholders' perspectives, they may not be representative of the broader population's views or experiences.

Thirdly, some claims made in the article are unsupported by evidence or missing evidence to support them fully. For example, while it is mentioned that 1,350 illegal fintech platforms have been blocked since early 2018 until now by SWI and Kemenkominfo, there is no information provided on how this number was obtained or what criteria were used to determine which platforms were illegal.

Finally, while possible risks are noted in the article regarding personal data protection and illegal lending practices, there is little discussion about potential solutions or ways to mitigate these risks effectively.

In conclusion, while this article provides valuable insights into fintech P2P lending in Indonesia's current state and challenges faced by stakeholders in the industry, it has some potential biases and limitations that should be considered when interpreting its findings. A more balanced view of both positive and negative aspects of fintech P2P lending would provide a more comprehensive understanding of its impact on financial inclusion in Indonesia.

# Topics for further research:

* Benefits of fintech P2P lending in Indonesia
* Financial inclusion in Indonesia and its challenges
* Personal data protection regulations in Indonesia
* Best practices for mitigating illegal lending practices in fintech P2P lending
* Impact of fintech P2P lending on Indonesia's economy
* Comparison of fintech P2P lending regulations in Indonesia with other countries
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