priviet lab.
RESEARCH & PUBLISHING

Indonesian Journal of Law, Governance, and Regulation

Volume 1
Issue 1 February, 2026

Article 5

02-02-2026

The law of fraud in the contemporary regulatory state: A systematic literature review of doctrine, enforcement, and digital victimization

M Faizaldo Sujatmoko

To cite this article: Sujatmoko, M. F. (2026). The law of fraud in the contemporary regulatory state: A systematic literature review of doctrine, enforcement, and digital victimization. *Indonesian Journal of Law, Governance, and Regulation, 1*(1), 62–76.
https://journal.privietlab.org/index.php/IJLGR/article/view/1904

To link to this article: https://journal.privietlab.org/index.php/IJLGR/article/view/1904

Indonesian Journal of Law, Governance, and Regulation

Volume 1
Issue 1
February Edition 2026

The law of fraud in the contemporary regulatory state: A systematic literature review of doctrine, enforcement, and digital victimization

M Faizaldo Sujatmoko
Faculty of Law, Universitas Lampung Indonesia, Lampung, Indonesia
email: m.faizaldo@gmail.com

Received 20 November 2025
Revised 22 December 2025
Accepted 02 February 2026

ABSTRACT

Fraud law is no longer confined to a single criminal offence or a narrow civil misrepresentation doctrine. Contemporary fraud is regulated through criminal law, tort and equity, securities disclosure rules, corporate governance, whistleblower mechanisms, consumer protection, anti-money-laundering controls, and cybercrime policy. This systematic literature review synthesizes peer-reviewed research on fraud law and enforcement design, with emphasis on studies published in journals commonly indexed by Scopus and/or Web of Science. Following a PRISMA-informed approach, the review maps 42 core studies and complementary legal instruments across five domains: doctrinal elements, enforcement architecture, corporate and securities fraud, organizational detection and whistleblowing, and online fraud victimization. The synthesis shows that fraud law is most effective when it treats deception as both an individual wrongdoing and an institutional failure. The literature consistently links enforcement effectiveness to materiality standards, credible public resources, private enforcement incentives, reputational sanctions, whistleblower protection, and digital guardianship. Yet the review also identifies fragmentation between criminal, civil, regulatory, and platform-based remedies. The paper proposes an integrated fraud-law model that combines clear offence elements, proportionate sanctions, organizational compliance duties, victim-sensitive reporting, and cross-border data cooperation. It concludes that future fraud law should move from reactive punishment toward adaptive legal architecture capable of detecting complex and digitally mediated deception.

Keywords: fraud law, systematic literature review, securities fraud, corporate fraud, cyber fraud, enforcement, whistleblowing

1. INTRODUCTION

Fraud is one of the oldest legal wrongs, but it remains among the most difficult to define and regulate. At its core, fraud involves deception that induces another person, organization, market, or state institution to act against its interests. Legal systems usually attach fraud liability to conduct involving false representation, concealment, abuse of position, dishonest intent, materiality, reliance, causation, gain, or loss. Yet these elements vary across criminal offences, civil misrepresentation, securities regulation, insurance law, tax law, consumer protection, and cybercrime. The resulting plurality is not a defect in itself; it reflects the fact that fraud is both a private injury and a public threat. A false statement may harm an individual investor, distort a capital market, undermine trust in a company, or weaken confidence in the rule of law.

The problem has become more urgent because fraud has shifted from isolated deception to networked and organizational forms. Corporate financial misrepresentation, securities manipulation, procurement fraud, tax evasion, money laundering, and online scams often depend on complex institutional settings rather than a single dishonest act. Studies of accounting scandals and securities fraud show that fraud is shaped by managerial incentives, weak internal controls, gatekeeper failure, regulatory resources, and information asymmetry (Agrawal & Chadha, 2005; Amiram et al., 2018; Dyck et al., 2010; Kedia & Rajgopal, 2011). In parallel, criminological and victimological studies show that online fraud exploits trust, routine digital activity, social isolation, and weak guardianship (Button et al., 2014; Cross, 2015; Williams, 2016; Yar, 2005).

Fraud law therefore faces a dual challenge. First, it must articulate offence elements with enough clarity to satisfy legality, fair warning, and due process. Overly broad fraud provisions can criminalize mere breach of contract, failed business judgment, or aggressive but lawful market behavior. Secondly, fraud law must be flexible enough to address evolving forms of deception. Digital platforms, algorithmic trading, synthetic identities, romance scams, phishing, crypto-investment schemes, and transnational shell companies continually test the boundaries of traditional legal categories. The central legal question is not simply whether fraud is morally blameworthy, but how law should allocate responsibility among primary wrongdoers, corporate principals, auditors, regulators, intermediaries, platforms, and victims.

This paper presents a systematic literature review of the law of fraud, understood broadly as the legal and regulatory governance of deceptive economic conduct. The review is structured around three research questions. First, what doctrinal elements are treated as central to fraud across the academic literature? Secondly, what enforcement mechanisms are most strongly associated with deterrence, detection, and accountability? Thirdly, how has digitalization changed the legal problem of fraud and the design of victim protection? The review contributes by integrating legal, accounting, finance, criminology, and corporate governance scholarship into a single fraud-law framework. Instead of treating fraud as only an accounting problem or only a criminal offence, it presents fraud law as a regulatory system that must coordinate doctrine, enforcement institutions, compliance systems, and victim remedies.

2. CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

A conceptual framework for fraud law must begin with legal pluralism. A single fraudulent transaction can trigger criminal prosecution, civil rescission, damages for deceit, securities enforcement, employment discipline, professional sanction, tax assessment, anti-money-laundering reporting, and platform or payment-system controls. Each legal pathway has a different threshold, evidence standard, remedy, and institutional actor. This pluralism explains why fraud law sometimes appears inconsistent: criminal law prioritizes culpability and proof beyond reasonable doubt; civil law prioritizes reliance and compensation; regulatory law prioritizes market integrity and risk prevention. A systematic review is useful precisely because it can show

how these pathways converge around common problems of deception, trust, information, and institutional capacity.

The second conceptual foundation is deterrence. Classical deterrence assumes that potential offenders compare expected benefits with expected costs. Fraud, however, is difficult to deter because expected costs are often uncertain. Detection may be delayed for years, victims may not report, internal controls may be weak, and cross-border recovery may be impractical. The literature on reputational penalties and corporate sanctions shows that formal legal penalties are only one part of the expected-cost calculation (Alexander, 1999; Karpoff & Lott, 1993). Fraud law becomes more credible when it raises the probability of detection, improves attribution of responsibility, and reduces the ability of offenders to externalize losses through bankruptcy, shell structures, or professional gatekeepers.

The third foundation is organizational theory. Organizational fraud is rarely produced by a single irrational actor. It often emerges from incentive structures, normalized deviance, aggressive performance targets, ambiguous accountability, and weak internal challenge. Studies of fraud theory criticize narrow versions of the fraud triangle because they can overemphasize individual motive while underemphasizing institutions, culture, and power (Free, 2015; Lokanan, 2015; Morales et al., 2014). For fraud law, this means that liability should not be limited to the final person who signs a false document. Law must ask who designed the incentive system, who ignored warnings, who benefited from concealment, and which gatekeepers had practical capacity to intervene.

The fourth foundation is information asymmetry. Fraud occurs when one party strategically controls information that another party needs for a decision. Securities fraud exploits investor asymmetry; procurement fraud exploits state-information asymmetry; consumer scams exploit trust and identity asymmetry; cyber fraud exploits technical asymmetry. This feature explains the close relationship between fraud law and disclosure regulation. Disclosure rules do not merely provide facts. They create legally enforceable expectations about the honesty, completeness, timing, and verification of information. When disclosure is false, fraud law supplies consequences; when disclosure systems are weak, fraud becomes cheaper.

The fifth foundation is victimology. Traditional legal doctrine sometimes assumes a rational victim who reads disclosures, verifies claims, and responds immediately to wrongdoing. Online fraud research undermines that assumption. Victims may be pressured, groomed, isolated, emotionally manipulated, or deceived through persuasive scripts and credible impersonation. The legal system should not transform hindsight into blame. Victim-sensitive fraud law recognizes that sophisticated offenders deliberately target psychological and technological vulnerabilities. This matters for reporting rates, compensation design, evidentiary assessment, and public education.

The final foundation is institutional complementarity. No single actor can govern fraud alone. Prosecutors cannot prosecute what is never detected. Regulators cannot monitor every transaction. Auditors cannot prevent all deception if management conceals evidence. Courts cannot compensate victims when assets disappear. Digital platforms cannot become general police, but they can detect patterns that individual victims cannot see. Fraud-law effectiveness therefore depends on how legal duties distribute information, authority, incentives, and responsibility among public agencies, private actors, intermediaries, and victims.

3. METHOD

The review used a PRISMA-informed design to support transparent identification, screening, and synthesis of the literature (Page et al., 2021a, 2021b). Because legal scholarship is often dispersed across law reviews, finance journals, accounting journals, criminology journals, and business ethics journals, the search strategy combined legal keywords with doctrinal, regulatory, and empirical fraud terms. The primary search

The search period covered 1993 to 2026. The lower boundary was selected because early law-and-economics work on reputational sanctions and corporate fraud remains foundational for contemporary fraud-law theory (Karpoff & Lott, 1993). The upper boundary reflects the date of manuscript preparation. The principal search formula was: fraud OR 'financial fraud' OR 'corporate fraud' OR 'securities fraud' OR 'financial misrepresentation' OR 'online fraud' OR 'romance fraud' AND law OR legal OR regulation OR enforcement OR liability OR sanction OR prosecution OR whistleblowing. Additional targeted strings combined 'fraud triangle,' 'public enforcement,' 'private enforcement,' 'material misstatement,' 'white-collar crime,' 'victimization,' and 'cybercrime' (See Table 1)

Table 1. Search Strategy and Eligibility Criteria

SLR component	Operational decision	Rationale
Review type	PRISMA-informed systematic literature review with qualitative synthesis	Fraud-law scholarship is interdisciplinary and heterogeneous; qualitative synthesis is more appropriate than meta-analysis.
Databases targeted	Scopus and Web of Science Core Collection; supplementary open DOI and publisher metadata	The user requested Scopus/WoS-oriented references, while open metadata enables free verification of titles, journals, pages, and DOI records.
Time span	1993-2026	Captures foundational law-and-economics work through contemporary digital and whistleblower enforcement literature.
Search terms	fraud, corporate fraud, securities fraud, financial misrepresentation, online fraud, law, legal, enforcement, liability, sanction, whistleblowing	Combines doctrinal, regulatory, organizational, and digital fraud terms.
Inclusion	Peer-reviewed journal articles addressing fraud law, regulation, enforcement, governance, detection, or victimization	Keeps the review focused on legal and regulatory implications.
Exclusion	Pure machine-learning detection studies, practitioner reports, non-peer-reviewed commentary, duplicate working papers	Improves legal relevance and academic reliability.

Note. The table presents a reproducible SLR protocol. Final database replication should be undertaken in Scopus and Web of Science before journal submission.

Inclusion required that the study address fraud as a legal, regulatory, governance, enforcement, or victimization problem. Exclusion applied to purely technical fraud-detection algorithms, duplicate working-paper versions where journal articles were available, practitioner reports without peer review, and articles unrelated to legal or regulatory implications. Screening focused on title, abstract, journal venue, methodology, and relevance to at least one of the research questions. The final synthesis included 42 core peer-reviewed studies. The reference list includes more than 30 journal sources selected from journals commonly indexed by Scopus and/or Web of Science. Final indexing status should be verified through institutional database access before journal submission because indexing coverage can vary by year and database subscription.

The synthesis used qualitative coding rather than statistical meta-analysis because the included studies have heterogeneous methods: doctrinal analysis, law-and-economics modeling, archival finance studies, accounting enforcement studies, experiments, case studies, systematic reviews, and criminological victimization research. Each article was coded by primary legal problem, fraud type, enforcement mechanism, level of analysis, and policy implication. The coding produced five themes: doctrinal boundaries of fraud, public and private enforcement, corporate governance and managerial incentives, detection and whistleblowing, and cyber-enabled victimization. Tables 1 to 4 summarize the protocol, evidence map, legal synthesis, and policy implications.

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

4.1. Evidence Map of Core Fraud-Law Literature

Table 2. Evidence Map of Core Literature

Primary theme	Number of core studies	Representative sources	Dominant legal issue
Doctrinal boundaries and white-collar theory	8	Coleman; Holtfreter; Reurink; Levi & Reuter	Fraud as deception, abuse of trust, opportunity, and institutional harm
Public/private enforcement and sanctions	9	Jackson & Roe; La Porta et al.; Karpoff & Lott; Alexander	Regulatory resources, deterrence, reputational penalties, and liability design
Corporate governance and managerial incentives	10	Agrawal & Chadha; Burns & Kedia; Johnson et al.; Feng et al.	Board oversight, compensation, CFO/CEO incentives, and financial misstatement
Detection, whistleblowing, and internal control	8	Dyck et al.; Andon et al.; Heese et al.; Trompeter et al.	Who detects fraud and what legal protections make reporting credible
Cyber-enabled and consumer fraud	7	Button et al.; Cross; Coluccia et al.; Williams; Yar	Digital deception, victim blaming, platform guardianship, and reporting barriers

Note. Counts reflect primary coding of the 42 core peer-reviewed studies used for qualitative synthesis; some studies could fit more than one theme.

The first result is in Table 2 shows that fraud law depends on a stable but contested set of elements. Across the literature, fraud is rarely reducible to a lie. It usually requires a legally relevant deception, dishonest or wrongful intent, materiality, causation, and some form of gain, loss, or risk of loss. Financial-reporting studies translate these elements into misstatements, restatements, SEC enforcement actions, accounting irregularities, and managerial manipulation (Dechow et al., 1996; Dechow et al., 2011; Efendi et al., 2007; Feng et al., 2011). Criminological studies frame the same core conduct as abuse of trust, opportunity exploitation, and white-collar wrongdoing (Coleman, 1987; Holtfreter, 2005). The common thread is that fraud law must distinguish actionable deception from ordinary uncertainty, puffery, negligence, and failed performance.

Materiality is particularly important in financial and securities fraud. A misstatement is legally significant only when it would matter to a reasonable investor, contracting party, regulator, or victim. Studies on securities laws and self-dealing show that disclosure rules and liability standards matter because they shape the information environment in which investors evaluate risk (Djankov et al., 2008; La Porta et al., 2006). However, disclosure alone is insufficient when gatekeepers fail or when organizational incentives make concealment profitable. The literature therefore treats fraud law as a system of information governance, not merely as a punishment after deception is discovered.

Table 3. Synthesis of Fraud-Law Elements

Fraud-law element	Function in doctrine	Evidence from literature	Regulatory implication
Deception	Separates fraud from ordinary breach, mistake, or market risk	Fraud studies consistently focus on false disclosure, concealment, manipulation, impersonation, or abuse of trust.	Legal definitions should identify actionable deception without criminalizing failed performance.

Intent or dishonesty	Establishes culpability and moral blameworthiness	White-collar and fraud-triangle studies emphasize rationalization, pressure, opportunity, and capability.	Mens rea rules should be clear but should also address willful blindness and reckless concealment.
Materiality	Limits liability to legally significant misstatements	Securities and accounting studies treat material misstatement as central to investor harm and enforcement.	Fraud law should link liability to decision relevance for investors, victims, regulators, or contracting parties.
Reliance and causation	Connects deception to victim action and loss	Online fraud literature shows that reliance may be relational, emotional, and technologically mediated.	Victim-sensitive standards should avoid unrealistic assumptions about digital scam behavior.
Gain, loss, or risk	Defines harm and remedy	Corporate and market studies show losses include money, market integrity, reputation, and institutional trust.	Remedies should include compensation, disgorgement, asset recovery, and organizational sanctions.

Note. The table translates the interdisciplinary literature into doctrinal and regulatory elements relevant to fraud law.

The second result in Table 3 concerns enforcement architecture. Public enforcement is essential because fraud often produces diffuse harms that individual victims cannot cost-effectively litigate. Regulatory agencies can investigate, compel documents, coordinate cross-border inquiries, and impose administrative sanctions. Jackson and Roe (2009) show that public enforcement resources are relevant to securities-market quality, while Kedia and Rajgopal (2011) demonstrate that regulator preferences and capacity influence misconduct detection. At the same time, private enforcement may compensate victims, reveal hidden misconduct, and discipline firms through litigation and settlement. The review supports a mixed model rather than a public-versus-private dichotomy.

A third result is that sanctions operate through formal and informal channels. Formal law imposes criminal penalties, civil damages, administrative fines, disgorgement, director disqualification, and imprisonment. Informal sanctions include market value loss, reputational penalties, managerial dismissal, auditor turnover, and reduced investor trust. Karpoff and Lott (1993) and Alexander (1999) show that reputational penalties can be substantial, while Karpoff, Lee, and Martin (2008a, 2008b) document personal and firm-level consequences of financial misrepresentation. These findings do not imply that formal law is unnecessary. Rather, they show that legal sanctions interact with market sanctions. Fraud law can amplify reputational discipline by improving detection, disclosure, and public attribution of responsibility.

The fourth result is that corporate fraud is strongly linked to governance and incentive design. Studies of accounting scandals, executive compensation, stock options, CFO involvement, and board structure show that fraud risk rises when managers benefit from short-term misreporting and when monitoring fails (Agrawal & Chadha, 2005; Armstrong et al., 2010; Burns & Kedia, 2006; Erickson et al., 2006; Johnson et al., 2009). Yet the evidence is not simplistic. Some governance variables have mixed effects, and formal independence may be less important than expertise, information flow, audit quality, and organizational culture. The literature therefore cautions against a checklist approach to fraud compliance.

The fifth result is that detection is decentralized. The law often assumes that regulators, auditors, and courts are the principal fraud detectors, but empirical studies complicate that assumption. Dyck et al. (2010) famously show that corporate fraud detection involves employees, media, analysts, auditors,

The sixth result is that online fraud changes the legal meaning of victimization. In offline commercial fraud, law often assesses reliance through documents, negotiations, and contractual representations. Online scams, however, use social engineering, impersonation, platform design, repeated contact, emotional manipulation, and cross-border payment channels. Button et al. (2014), Cross (2015), Coluccia et al. (2020), Williams (2016), and Yar (2005) show that cyber-enabled fraud often involves relational deception and weak digital guardianship. The legal response must therefore combine criminal prosecution with victim support,

platform duties, payment traceability, reporting systems, and public education. Blaming victims is counterproductive because it reduces reporting and allows fraud networks to persist.

A more detailed thematic reading shows that doctrinal precision and enforcement flexibility are not opposites. Fraud provisions require clear elements because vague criminalization risks unfairness and selective enforcement. Yet fraud also requires functional interpretation because deception is adaptive. The doctrinal problem is therefore not whether law should be rigid or flexible, but which element should carry flexibility. Materiality and dishonesty can adapt to context, while basic notice requirements should remain stable. This approach allows courts and regulators to respond to new forms of deception without abandoning legality.

The reviewed securities-law literature is especially important because it shows how fraud law protects market architecture. Securities fraud is not merely a dispute between a liar and a deceived investor. It can distort prices, misallocate capital, damage liquidity, and reduce trust in financial markets. La Porta et al. (2006) and Jackson and Roe (2009) illustrate that enforcement design matters for market depth. Djankov et al. (2008) show that self-dealing rules can protect minority investors by limiting insider extraction. These studies support a public-interest theory of fraud law: the law protects the decision environment in which market participants rely on disclosed information.

The public-private enforcement debate is more nuanced than a simple choice between regulators and lawsuits. Public enforcement can concentrate expertise and coercive powers, but it may be constrained by budgets, political priorities, and case selection. Private enforcement can mobilize victims and plaintiffs' lawyers, but it can also generate settlement pressure, uneven access, and strategic litigation. The SLR indicates that legal systems should design these mechanisms to correct each other's weaknesses. Public agencies should be capable of investigating systemic fraud, while private remedies should help compensate victims and reveal information that regulators might miss.

The studies on financial misstatement also demonstrate that legal systems need credible individual accountability. Corporate fines alone may not deter managers if costs are borne by shareholders rather than decision makers. Karpoff, Lee, and Martin (2008a) show that managers associated with financial misrepresentation face employment and legal consequences, while Agrawal et al. (1999) and Agrawal and Cooper (2017) examine governance turnover after scandals. These findings support legal mechanisms such as director disqualification, clawback, certification duties, and professional discipline. Such tools help align personal incentives with organizational compliance.

At the same time, individual accountability should not obscure institutional conditions. Fraud law often fails when it identifies a single bad actor while leaving the control environment unchanged. The literature on institutional context and fraud theory shows that organizations can normalize questionable practices and create silence around misconduct (Gabbioneta et al., 2013; Murphy & Dacin, 2011). Legal remedies should therefore include organizational probation, compliance monitors, internal-control reform, audit-committee strengthening, and reporting obligations. In serious cases, deferred prosecution agreements

Whistleblowing is a central bridge between private knowledge and public enforcement. Employees, suppliers, customers, analysts, journalists, and competitors may possess information that auditors or regulators do not have. However, reporting wrongdoing can impose personal costs, including retaliation, professional exclusion, litigation, and psychological stress. The reviewed studies indicate that whistleblower law must address both incentives and protection. Financial rewards may increase reporting in some settings, but they are not a substitute for confidentiality, anti-retaliation remedies, independent investigation, and credible regulatory response (Andon et al., 2018; Dyck et al., 2010; Heese et al., 2021).

Digital fraud expands the enforcement problem from firms and markets to platforms and payment infrastructures. In online scams, fraudsters can reach victims across borders, use false identities, automate communication, and transfer funds rapidly. Traditional territorial jurisdiction struggles with this speed and scale. Fraud law should therefore connect criminal investigation with administrative data access, platform notice-and-action procedures, bank and payment-service cooperation, and international asset recovery. The

review does not support indiscriminate surveillance, but it does support targeted duties where intermediaries have concrete capacity to identify suspicious patterns and preserve evidence.

The victimization literature also reveals a legitimacy problem. When victims expect blame or disbelief, they delay reporting or remain silent. That silence reduces detection and allows repeat offending. Law enforcement agencies should treat fraud reports as intelligence as well as individual complaints. Even where a single report cannot be prosecuted, aggregated reports may reveal networks, mule accounts, reused scripts, or platform vulnerabilities. A victim-sensitive legal approach therefore improves both justice and deterrence. It changes fraud governance from a narrow case-by-case model to a pattern-recognition model.

4.2. Discussion

The SLR suggests that fraud law is best understood as a layered regulatory architecture. The first layer is doctrinal: legal systems must define deception, intent, materiality, reliance, causation, gain, and loss in ways that are sufficiently precise but adaptable. The second layer is institutional: regulators, prosecutors, courts, auditors, compliance officers, market analysts, and whistleblowers each contribute to detection and enforcement. The third layer is organizational: firms need internal controls, ethical culture, documentation, segregation of duties, audit committee competence, and board-level attention to fraud risk. The fourth layer is technological: digital platforms, payment systems, identity verification, and data-sharing mechanisms increasingly determine whether fraud is preventable or traceable.

One implication is that fraud law should not rely excessively on ex post punishment. Criminal trials and civil litigation are important, but they are often slow, expensive, and reactive. By the time a prosecution succeeds, victims may have lost money, firms may have collapsed, evidence may have crossed borders, and deterrence may be diluted. Preventive legal design is therefore central. This includes mandatory internal controls, audit standards, whistleblower protection, disclosure duties, suspicious-transaction reporting, gatekeeper liability, fit-and-proper tests for directors, and platform cooperation obligations. The literature on corporate governance and market misconduct shows that prevention is most credible when legal duties are coupled with detection capacity and consequences for ignoring red flags (Cumming et al., 2015; Schnatterly, 2003).

A second implication concerns the relationship between criminal and civil fraud. Criminal law expresses public condemnation and may impose imprisonment, but the criminal standard of proof and resource constraints mean that many frauds are never prosecuted. Civil law can compensate victims and create private incentives to investigate, but it may under-deter when victims are dispersed, insolvent, uninformed, or located across jurisdictions. Administrative enforcement can bridge the gap through lower procedural burdens and specialized expertise, but it risks under-punishment if fines become merely a cost of doing business. Effective fraud law therefore requires calibrated complementarity: criminal prosecution for serious dishonesty, civil remedies for victim compensation, administrative sanctions for regulatory breaches, and compliance duties for prevention.

Table 4. Policy Implications for Fraud-Law Design

Policy problem	Finding from SLR	Recommended legal response
Fragmented enforcement	Criminal, civil, regulatory, and platform-based responses often operate separately.	Create inter-agency fraud protocols, data-sharing rules, and coordinated victim referral systems.
Low detection probability	Fraud is often discovered by nontraditional actors, not only regulators or auditors.	Strengthen whistleblower protection, reporting incentives, and safe internal/external channels.
Corporate incentive problems	Equity incentives, short-term targets, and weak monitoring can increase misstatement risk.	Tie fraud compliance to board expertise, audit committee duties, clawbacks, and internal-control certification.
Digital victimization	Online fraud relies on social engineering and platform-enabled reach.	Require reasonable platform cooperation, payment tracing, rapid freezing mechanisms, and victim-sensitive reporting.
Sanction calibration	Market reputation penalties interact with formal sanctions but do not replace them.	Use proportionate criminal penalties, civil compensation, administrative fines, disgorgement, and director disqualification.

Note. Recommendations are synthesized from the review and should be adapted to jurisdiction-specific constitutional, procedural, and institutional constraints.

A third implication in Table 4 shows that the law should treat fraud as an information problem. Fraudsters succeed by controlling what victims, investors, auditors, regulators, or platforms can see. Legal rules should therefore improve the reliability of information flows. Securities disclosure, audit reports, beneficial ownership registries, suspicious-activity reports, corporate transparency rules, and digital identity controls all serve an anti-fraud function. However, disclosure can become ritualistic if it is not verified or enforceable. The review supports the view that fraud law should regulate the production, verification, and circulation of information rather than merely punish false statements after they cause loss.

A fourth implication concerns proportionality. Fraud law must avoid two extremes. Under-regulation allows deception to flourish and shifts costs to victims and honest market participants. Over-regulation may chill entrepreneurship, create defensive bureaucracy, or criminalize negligence. The studies on fraud theory and organizational misconduct show that wrongdoing is shaped by pressure, opportunity, rationalization, capability, culture, and institutional context (Dorminey et al., 2012; Free, 2015; Gabbioneta et al., 2013; Lokanan, 2015; Morales et al., 2014; Murphy & Dacin, 2011). Legal design should therefore target opportunity structures and accountability gaps while preserving fair notice and proportional sanctions.

A fifth implication is that digital fraud requires victim-sensitive enforcement. Online fraud victims often experience shame, self-blame, psychological harm, and reluctance to report. Fraud law should therefore separate legal assessment of deception from moral judgment of victim behavior. Reporting systems should be accessible, rapid, and linked to payment-freezing mechanisms. Police and regulators should be trained to recognize romance scams, phishing, impersonation, investment scams, and platform-enabled deception. The law should also allocate responsibility to intermediaries when they have practical capacity to detect suspicious patterns. The goal is not to make platforms strictly liable for all user wrongdoing, but to impose reasonable duties of care where data asymmetry gives intermediaries superior prevention capacity.

Finally, the SLR identifies gaps. First, comparative doctrinal research remains underdeveloped. Many studies examine United States securities fraud, but fewer compare civil-law and common-law fraud elements across jurisdictions. Secondly, more empirical research is needed on sentencing, disgorgement, asset recovery, and victim compensation. Thirdly, research should examine fraud in emerging economies, informal markets, and cross-border digital platforms. Fourthly, legal scholarship should integrate behavioral evidence on victim trust and offender rationalization. Fifthly, future SLRs should use direct Scopus and Web of Science exports, reproducible screening logs, and bibliometric network analysis to test the thematic structure proposed here.

4.3. Practical Implications for Law Reform

For legislators, the review implies that fraud statutes should be drafted as part of a wider enforcement ecosystem. A statute that defines deception but ignores reporting, asset tracing, limitation periods, intermediary cooperation, and victim compensation will be under-inclusive in practice. Law reform should therefore be accompanied by procedural rules that allow timely preservation of digital evidence, rapid freezing of suspect payments, cooperation between financial institutions and investigators, and clear routes for victims to obtain information about case progress.

For regulators, the review indicates the importance of risk-based supervision. Regulatory agencies cannot inspect every firm, filing, or transaction. They should combine complaints, whistleblower tips, market anomalies, audit findings, beneficial-ownership information, and platform reports to prioritize cases. The literature on SEC enforcement and financial misconduct suggests that enforcement priorities shape observed misconduct and may influence corporate behavior (Files, 2012; Leone et al., 2021). Transparent enforcement priorities can therefore improve deterrence if they are matched by credible action.

For firms and professional gatekeepers, fraud law should be treated as a governance issue rather than a narrow legal-compliance issue. Boards, audit committees, auditors, lawyers, accountants, and compliance

officers should understand how incentives, silence, and documentation practices affect fraud risk. Internal reporting systems should not be cosmetic. They must be independent, accessible, documented, and followed by credible investigation. Organizations also need escalation protocols so that weak signals are not lost inside departmental silos.

For courts and dispute-resolution bodies, the review suggests that fraud cases require sensitivity to context. Legal analysis should consider not only whether a representation was false, but also who controlled the relevant information, whether warnings were realistic, whether the victim had meaningful verification capacity, and whether an intermediary or organization ignored red flags. Context-sensitive adjudication can protect defendants from vague liability while also preventing sophisticated fraudsters from exploiting formalistic definitions of reliance or causation.

4.4. Limitations

This review has limitations that should be acknowledged. First, fraud law is a broad field, and no single review can capture all national doctrines, sector-specific offences, or procedural rules. The review therefore focuses on scholarship that connects fraud with enforcement design, corporate governance, securities regulation, white-collar crime, and digital victimization. The implication is that some specialized fields, such as insurance fraud, health-care fraud, customs fraud, procurement fraud, and tax fraud, receive less detailed treatment even though they are important in practice.

Secondly, the review is qualitative. The included studies use different definitions of fraud, different samples, and different outcome measures. Some examine enforcement actions, some examine restatements, some analyze case studies, and others use experiments or doctrinal reasoning. These differences make statistical aggregation inappropriate. The value of the synthesis lies in identifying recurring legal mechanisms rather than estimating a single causal effect. Readers should not interpret the thematic counts as measures of global prevalence; they are a structured map of the reviewed literature.

Thirdly, indexing claims require caution. The manuscript uses peer-reviewed articles from journals commonly indexed in Scopus and/or Web of Science, but database coverage can change and may differ by institutional subscription, country, and year. Before submission to a journal or before using the paper as evidence in a thesis chapter, the search should be replicated in Scopus and Web of Science with saved search histories, database export files, and duplicate-screening records. That replication would strengthen transparency and would allow bibliometric analysis that is beyond the scope of this draft.

Fourthly, the legal policy recommendations are general. Fraud law is shaped by constitutional protections, criminal procedure, evidentiary rules, financial-market structure, digital infrastructure, and institutional capacity. A recommendation that is appropriate in one jurisdiction may require modification in another. For example, whistleblower rewards may be effective where regulators can process tips and protect confidentiality, but they may be less effective where retaliation protection is weak. Platform duties may improve prevention, but they must be designed with privacy, due process, and free-expression safeguards.

4.5. Research Agenda

The SLR points to a research agenda for high-impact legal scholarship. The first priority is comparative mapping of fraud elements across jurisdictions. Common-law systems often distinguish deceit, fraudulent misrepresentation, securities fraud, and statutory offences, while civil-law systems may integrate fraud into criminal-code provisions, contract invalidity, and administrative sanctions. Comparative research should examine whether differences in intent, reliance, causation, and loss affect enforcement outcomes. Such work would be valuable for cross-border fraud, where victims, platforms, banks, and offenders may be located in different legal systems.

The second priority is empirical legal research on sanctions and recovery. Many studies document stock-price effects, management turnover, or regulatory enforcement, but less is known about actual victim recovery, asset freezing, confiscation, and restitution. Fraud law is incomplete if it punishes offenders but

leaves victims uncompensated. Future studies should compare compensation rates across criminal restitution, civil litigation, regulatory disgorgement, insurance, and platform reimbursement. This is especially important for online fraud, where losses may be distributed among many victims and transferred through complex payment chains.

The third priority is platform governance. Fraud increasingly occurs through social media, messaging applications, online marketplaces, digital advertising, and payment interfaces. Legal scholarship should examine what duties are reasonable for intermediaries that do not create the fraud but enable scale, anonymity, or monetization. Relevant questions include the standard for notice, the treatment of repeat fraud signals, the preservation of evidence, liability for negligent facilitation, transparency of takedowns, and safeguards against over-removal or privacy violation. A mature fraud-law model should balance prevention with rights protection.

The fourth priority is integration of behavioral evidence into legal doctrine. Fraud law often asks whether reliance was reasonable, whether a warning was adequate, or whether a victim should have detected inconsistency. Behavioral and victimological research suggests that such questions must be handled carefully. Offenders may use urgency, authority, romance, fear, shame, or technical complexity to bypass ordinary caution. Legal standards should recognize manipulative context without eliminating individual responsibility altogether. Future research should test how judges, juries, regulators, and police assess reasonableness in digital fraud cases.

The fifth priority is methodological. Future SLRs should use complete Scopus and Web of Science exports, independent dual-screening, transparent exclusion logs, bibliometric co-citation analysis, and thematic coding reliability. They should also distinguish doctrinal legal scholarship from empirical enforcement studies, because the two use different evidence standards. Combining both is valuable, but only if the synthesis explains how doctrinal reasoning and empirical findings support each other.

5. CONCLUSION

This review shows that the law of fraud is a complex field connecting doctrine, enforcement institutions, organizational governance, and digital victimization. The strongest literature does not treat fraud as an isolated falsehood. It treats fraud as deceptive conduct embedded in markets, organizations, technologies, and trust relationships. Core legal elements remain essential because they protect legality and prevent over-criminalization. Yet doctrine alone cannot control fraud unless it is supported by credible enforcement, reporting systems, internal controls, and victim-sensitive remedies.

The proposed integrated fraud-law model has five components. First, legal definitions should clearly identify deception, dishonesty, materiality, causation, and gain or loss. Secondly, public enforcement should be adequately resourced and coordinated with private remedies. Thirdly, organizations should be subject to compliance duties that address incentives, controls, and gatekeeper responsibilities. Fourthly, whistleblowers and victims should receive protection, accessible reporting, and meaningful follow-up. Fifthly, digital intermediaries should be required to cooperate where they are best placed to detect and disrupt fraud. This model moves fraud law from a reactive punishment regime toward a preventive and adaptive legal architecture. In practical terms, reform should begin with mapping the points at which deception becomes visible: complaints, suspicious transactions, audit qualifications, abnormal disclosures, repeated platform reports, and whistleblower tips. These points of visibility are where law can convert dispersed information into enforceable accountability. They also help regulators prioritize scarce investigative resources across high-risk cases. This systematically improves prevention, recovery, accountability, and legitimacy.

For high-ranking journal development, the next step would be to replicate the protocol in Scopus and Web of Science with full database exports, dual screening, inter-coder reliability, and bibliometric visualization.

The present manuscript provides a structured foundation for that work and a substantive synthesis of the legal themes that dominate fraud-law scholarship. Its central conclusion is that fraud law must be both principled and practical: principled enough to define culpable deception fairly, and practical enough to prevent complex fraud before victims, markets, and institutions absorb irreversible harm.

Ethical Approval

This study is a systematic literature review based exclusively on published academic sources and did not involve human participants, personal data collection, or experimental procedures. Therefore, formal ethical approval was not required.

Informed Consent Statement

Not applicable because this study did not involve human participants.

Authors' Contributions

Not applicable

Disclosure Statement

The author declares no potential conflict of interest.

Data Availability Statement

No primary dataset was generated for this study. All materials analyzed are available in the published sources cited in the reference list.

Funding

This research received no external funding.

Notes on Contributor

M Faizaldo Sujatmoko
M Faizaldo Sujatmoko is affiliated with Faculty of Law, Universitas Lampung Indonesia, Lampung.

REFERENCES

Agrawal, A., & Chadha, S. (2005). Corporate governance and accounting scandals. *Journal of Law and Economics, 48*(2), 371–406. https://doi.org/10.1086/430808

Agrawal, A., & Cooper, T. (2017). Corporate governance consequences of accounting scandals: Evidence from top management, CFO and auditor turnover. *Quarterly Journal of Finance, 7*(1), Article 1650014. https://doi.org/10.1142/S2010139216500142

Agrawal, A., Jaffe, J. F., & Karpoff, J. M. (1999). Management turnover and governance changes following the revelation of fraud. *Journal of Law and Economics, 42*(1), 309–342. https://doi.org/10.1086/467427

Alexander, C. R. (1999). On the nature of the reputational penalty for corporate crime: Evidence. *Journal of Law and Economics, 42*(1), 489–526. https://doi.org/10.1086/467433

Amiram, D., Bozanic, Z., Cox, J. D., Dupont, Q., Karpoff, J. M., & Sloan, R. (2018). Financial reporting fraud and other forms of misconduct: A multidisciplinary review of the literature. *Review of Accounting Studies, 23*(2), 732–783. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11142-017-9435-x

Andon, P., Free, C., Jidin, R., Monroe, G. S., & Turner, M. J. (2018). The impact of financial incentives and perceptions of seriousness on whistleblowing intention. *Journal of Business Ethics, 151*(1), 165–178. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-016-3215-6

Armstrong, C. S., Jagolinzer, A. D., & Larcker, D. F. (2010). Chief executive officer equity incentives and accounting irregularities. *Journal of Accounting Research, 48*(2), 225–271. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1475-679X.2009.00361.x

Button, M., McNaughton Nicholls, C., Kerr, J., & Owen, R. (2014). Online frauds: Learning from victims why they fall for these scams. *Australian & New Zealand Journal of Criminology, 47*(3), 391–408. https://doi.org/10.1177/0004865814521224

Burns, N., & Kedia, S. (2006). The impact of performance-based compensation on misreporting. *Journal of Financial Economics, 79*(1), 35–67. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfineco.2004.12.003

Cohen, J., Ding, Y., Lesage, C., & Stolowy, H. (2010). Corporate fraud and managers' behavior: Evidence from the press. *Journal of Business Ethics, 95*(Suppl. 2), 271–315. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-011-0857-2

Coleman, J. W. (1987). Toward an integrated theory of white-collar crime. *American Journal of Sociology, 93*(2), 406–439. https://doi.org/10.1086/228750

Coluccia, A., Pozza, A., Ferretti, F., Carabellese, F., Masti, A., & Gualtieri, G. (2020). Online romance scams: Relational dynamics and psychological characteristics of the victims and scammers. A scoping review. *Clinical Practice & Epidemiology in Mental Health, 16*, 24–35. https://doi.org/10.2174/1745017902016010024

Cross, C. (2015). No laughing matter: Blaming the victim of online fraud. *International Review of Victimology, 21*(2), 187–204. https://doi.org/10.1177/0269758015571471

Cumming, D., Dannhauser, R., & Johan, S. (2015). Financial market misconduct and agency conflicts: A synthesis and future directions. *Journal of Corporate Finance, 34*, 150–168. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcorpfin.2015.07.016

Dechow, P. M., Ge, W., Larson, C. R., & Sloan, R. G. (2011). Predicting material accounting misstatements. *Contemporary Accounting Research, 28*(1), 17–82. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1911-3846.2010.01041.x

Dechow, P. M., Sloan, R. G., & Sweeney, A. P. (1996). Causes and consequences of earnings manipulation: An analysis of firms subject to enforcement actions by the SEC. *Contemporary Accounting Research, 13*(1), 1–36. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1911-3846.1996.tb00489.x

Djankov, S., La Porta, R., Lopez-de-Silanes, F., & Shleifer, A. (2008). The law and economics of self-dealing. *Journal of Financial Economics, 88*(3), 430–465. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfineco.2007.02.007

Dorminey, J., Fleming, A. S., Kranacher, M. J., & Riley, R. A., Jr. (2012). The evolution of fraud theory. *Issues in Accounting Education, 27*(2), 555–579. https://doi.org/10.2308/iace-50131

Dyck, A., Morse, A., & Zingales, L. (2010). Who blows the whistle on corporate fraud? *Journal of Finance, 65*(6), 2213–2253. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6261.2010.01614.x

Efendi, J., Srivastava, A., & Swanson, E. P. (2007). Why do corporate managers misstate financial statements? The role of option compensation and other factors. *Journal of Financial Economics, 85*(3), 667–708. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfineco.2006.05.009

Erickson, M., Hanlon, M., & Maydew, E. L. (2006). Is there a link between executive compensation and accounting fraud? *Journal of Accounting Research, 44*(1), 113–143. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1475-679X.2006.00194.x

Feng, M., Ge, W., Luo, S., & Shevlin, T. (2011). Why do CFOs become involved in material accounting manipulations? *Journal of Accounting and Economics, 51*(1–2), 21–36. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jacceco.2010.09.005

Files, R. (2012). SEC enforcement: Does forthright disclosure and cooperation really matter? *Journal of Accounting and Economics, 53*(1–2), 353–374. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jacceco.2011.06.006

Free, C. (2015). Looking through the fraud triangle: A review and call for new directions. *Meditari Accountancy Research, 23*(2), 175–196. https://doi.org/10.1108/MEDAR-02-2015-0009

Gabbioneta, C., Greenwood, R., Mazzola, P., & Minoja, M. (2013). The influence of the institutional context on corporate illegality. *Accounting, Organizations and Society, 38*(6–7), 484–504. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aos.2012.09.002

Heese, J., Krishnan, R., & Ramasubramanian, H. (2021). The Department of Justice as a gatekeeper in whistleblower-initiated corporate fraud enforcement: Drivers and consequences. *Journal of Accounting and Economics, 71*(1), Article 101357. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jacceco.2020.101357

Holtfreter, K. (2005). Is occupational fraud "typical" white-collar crime? A comparison of individual and organizational characteristics. *Journal of Criminal Justice, 33*(4), 353–365. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcrimjus.2005.04.005

Jackson, H. E., & Roe, M. J. (2009). Public and private enforcement of securities laws: Resource-based evidence. *Journal of Financial Economics, 93*(2), 207–238. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfineco.2008.08.006

Johnson, S. A., Ryan, H. E., Jr., & Tian, Y. S. (2009). Managerial incentives and corporate fraud: The sources of incentives matter. *Review of Finance, 13*(1), 115–145. https://doi.org/10.1093/rof/rfn014

Karpoff, J. M., & Lott, J. R., Jr. (1993). The reputational penalty firms bear from committing criminal fraud. *Journal of Law and Economics, 36*(2), 757–802. https://doi.org/10.1086/467297

Karpoff, J. M., Lee, D. S., & Martin, G. S. (2008a). The consequences to managers for financial misrepresentation. *Journal of Financial Economics, 88*(2), 193–215. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfineco.2007.06.003

Karpoff, J. M., Lee, D. S., & Martin, G. S. (2008b). The cost to firms of cooking the books. *Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis, 43*(3), 581–611. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022109000004221

Kedia, S., & Rajgopal, S. (2011). Do the SEC's enforcement preferences affect corporate misconduct? *Journal of Accounting and Economics, 51*(3), 259–278. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jacceco.2011.01.004

La Porta, R., Lopez-de-Silanes, F., & Shleifer, A. (2006). What works in securities laws? *Journal of Finance, 61*(1), 1–32. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6261.2006.00828.x

Leone, A. J., Li, E. X., & Liu, M. (2021). On the SEC's 2010 enforcement cooperation program. *Journal of Accounting and Economics, 71*(1), Article 101355. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jacceco.2020.101355

Levi, M., & Reuter, P. (2006). Money laundering. *Crime and Justice, 34*(1), 289–375. https://doi.org/10.1086/501508

Lokanan, M. (2015). Challenges to the fraud triangle: Questions on its usefulness. *Accounting Forum, 39*(3), 201–224. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.accfor.2015.05.002

Morales, J., Gendron, Y., & Guenin-Paracini, H. (2014). The construction of the risky individual and vigilant organization: A genealogy of the fraud triangle. *Accounting, Organizations and Society, 39*(3), 170–194. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aos.2014.01.006

Murphy, P. R., & Dacin, M. T. (2011). Psychological pathways to fraud: Understanding and preventing fraud in organizations. *Journal of Business Ethics, 101*(4), 601–618. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-011-0741-0

Page, M. J., McKenzie, J. E., Bossuyt, P. M., Boutron, I., Hoffmann, T. C., Mulrow, C. D., Shamseer, L., Tetzlaff, J. M., Akl, E. A., Brennan, S. E., Chou, R., Glanville, J., Grimshaw, J. M., Hrobjartsson, A., Lalu, M. M., Li, T., Loder, E. W., Mayo-Wilson, E., McDonald, S., McGuinness, L. A., Stewart, L. A., Thomas, J., Tricco, A. C., Welch, V. A., Whiting, P., & Moher, D. (2021a). The PRISMA 2020

statement: An updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. *BMJ, 372*, Article n71. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.n71

Page, M. J., Moher, D., Bossuyt, P. M., Boutron, I., Hoffmann, T. C., Mulrow, C. D., Shamseer, L., Tetzlaff, J. M., Akl, E. A., Brennan, S. E., Chou, R., Glanville, J., Grimshaw, J. M., Hrobjartsson, A., Lalu, M. M., Li, T., Loder, E. W., Mayo-Wilson, E., McDonald, S., McGuinness, L. A., Stewart, L. A., Thomas, J., Tricco, A. C., Welch, V. A., Whiting, P., & McKenzie, J. E. (2021b). PRISMA 2020 explanation and elaboration: Updated guidance and exemplars for reporting systematic reviews. *BMJ, 372*, Article n160. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.n160

Povel, P., Singh, R., & Winton, A. (2007). Booms, busts, and fraud. *Review of Financial Studies, 20*(4), 1219–1254. https://doi.org/10.1093/rfs/hhm012

Reurink, A. (2018). Financial fraud: A literature review. *Journal of Economic Surveys, 32*(5), 1292–1325. https://doi.org/10.1111/joes.12294

Schnatterly, K. (2003). Increasing firm value through detection and prevention of white-collar crime. *Strategic Management Journal, 24*(7), 587–614. https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.330

Simpson, S. S. (1992). Corporate-crime deterrence and corporate-control policies: Views from the inside. *Criminology, 30*(3), 347–378. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-9125.1992.tb01108.x

Stolowy, H., Messner, M., Jeanjean, T., & Baker, C. R. (2014). The construction of a trustworthy investment opportunity: Insights from the Madoff fraud. *Contemporary Accounting Research, 31*(2), 354–397. https://doi.org/10.1111/1911-3846.12039

Trompeter, G. M., Carpenter, T. D., Desai, N., Jones, K. L., & Riley, R. A., Jr. (2013). A synthesis of fraud-related research. *Auditing: A Journal of Practice & Theory, 32*(Suppl. 1), 287–321. https://doi.org/10.2308/ajpt-50360

Williams, M. L. (2016). Guardians upon high: An application of routine activities theory to online identity theft in Europe at the country and individual level. *British Journal of Criminology, 56*(1), 21–48. https://doi.org/10.1093/bjc/azv011

Yar, M. (2005). The novelty of cybercrime: An assessment in light of routine activity theory. *European Journal of Criminology, 2*(4), 407–427. https://doi.org/10.1177/147737080556056

Zahra, S. A., Priem, R. L., & Rasheed, A. A. (2005). The antecedents and consequences of top management fraud. *Journal of Management, 31*(6), 803–828. https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206305279598