

The Responsibility Of Business Actors In The Distribution of Blue-Labeled Skincare Products Through E-Commerce Based on Law Number 8 of 1999

Ardhelia Putri Salsabila, Christine S.T., Kansil
Faculty of Law, University of Tarumanagara, Jakarta, Indonesia
ardheliaputri.salsa@gmail.com

Abstract

This study analyzes the legal responsibility of business actors in distributing blue-labeled skincare products through e-commerce platforms, particularly in relation to violations of Law Number 8 of 1999 on Consumer Protection, BPOM regulations, and the Electronic Information and Transactions Law. The urgency of this research arises from the widespread circulation of unauthorized dermatological products sold without BPOM approval, posing serious health risks to consumers in the digital marketplace. Employing a normative juridical method with a statutory and literature approach, this study examines the fragmentation of regulatory frameworks, liability avoidance strategies, and the ineffectiveness of current enforcement mechanisms. The findings reveal that business actors exploit regulatory gaps to avoid accountability and that existing laws are reactive and insufficient for digital contexts. This research contributes novelty by integrating pharmaceutical and e-commerce law in analyzing liability and proposes regulatory reforms that include platform liability mandates, automated monitoring systems, and public awareness campaigns. The study concludes that stricter law enforcement, increased regulatory oversight, and comprehensive stakeholder education are essential to protect consumers and ensure legitimate commerce in Indonesia's digital era.

Keywords: *Blue Label; Business Actor Responsibility; E-Commerce; Skincare*

1. INTRODUCTION

The skincare industry has experienced unprecedented growth in recent years, driven by lifestyle changes, increased beauty awareness, and technological advancements.¹ In Indonesia, the cultural preference for fair skin has created substantial demand for skin brightening products, establishing a lucrative market for cosmetic formulations with whitening claims. This demand surge has unfortunately coincided with the proliferation of unauthorized blue-labeled skincare products distributed through e-commerce platforms without proper BPOM approval.²

The distribution of blue-labeled skincare products presents unique regulatory challenges distinct from conventional cosmetic products. These products, originally formulated by dermatologists for specific patients, contain active pharmaceutical ingredients that require specialized medical supervision.³ When distributed commercially without proper authorization, they pose significant health risks, including skin irritation, mercury poisoning, and long-term dermatological damage.

Recent BPOM enforcement data reveals alarming trends in unauthorized cosmetic distribution. In 2024, authorities identified 1,247 illegal cosmetic products in online circulation, with blue-

¹ Diva, "Rahasia Sukses Bisnis Skincare: Peluang Emas Di Industri Kecantikan," [tecnoglow.co.id](https://www.tecnoglow.co.id/blog/blog-3/rahasia-sukses-bisnis-skincare-peluang-emas-d-industri-kecantikan-12), 2025, <https://www.tecnoglow.co.id/blog/blog-3/rahasia-sukses-bisnis-skincare-peluang-emas-d-industri-kecantikan-12>.

² Refti Handini Listyani, "Kontruksi Kecantikan Warna Kulit Perempuan Indonesia (Studi Kasus Di Kota Surabaya)," *Paradigma* 13, no. 13 (2024): 61–70.

³ Syakirah Alisyah, "Penerbitan Skincare Beretiket Biru Yang Tidak Sesuai Ketentuan," 2024, <https://www.pom.go.id/siaran-pers/penertiban-skincare-beretiket-biru-yang-tidak-sesuai-ketentuan>.

labeled skincare comprising 62% of violations.⁴ These products often contain hydroquinone concentrations exceeding safe limits (above 2%), mercury compounds, and undisclosed corticosteroids. The digital marketplace's anonymity and cross-jurisdictional nature have enabled systematic regulatory circumvention, creating substantial consumer protection challenges.⁵

Previous research has addressed various aspects of cosmetic regulation and consumer protection, but significant gaps remain in analyzing business actor responsibilities within digital commerce contexts.⁶ Hamid investigated consumer awareness regarding unauthorized cosmetic products, finding widespread lack of understanding about regulatory requirements and safety implications. However, this research focused on consumer behavior rather than examining the legal responsibilities of business actors or the enforcement mechanisms available to regulatory authorities.⁷

Another significant study examined e-commerce platform roles in facilitating unregistered health product sales, highlighting platform operators' limited liability under current regulations. While valuable, this research did not specifically address the unique characteristics of dermatologist-formulated products or the complex regulatory landscape governing prescription-derived cosmetic distribution.⁸

This study addresses existing gaps by conducting a comprehensive analysis of business actor responsibilities in blue-labeled skincare distribution, examining the intersection of pharmaceutical regulation, consumer protection law, and e-commerce governance. The research provides novel insights by integrating dermatological product regulations with digital commerce legal frameworks, proposing enhanced platform accountability mechanisms and technological verification systems. This research aims to analyze the legal responsibility of business actors in distributing blue-labeled skincare products through e-commerce based on Law Number 8 of 1999, evaluate the effectiveness of current regulatory frameworks in preventing unauthorized product distribution, and propose regulatory reform strategies for enhanced consumer protection in digital marketplaces.

2. METHOD

This research employs a normative juridical method that examines legal rules as a system related to legal events.⁹ The study utilizes a statutory approach (statute approach) to analyze relevant

⁴ Yuyut Prayuti et al., *Menjawab Kompleksitas Hukum Di Tengah Masyarakat: Waris, Perlindungan Konsumen, Dan Perjanjian*, ed. Ahmad Jamaludin, 1st ed. (Indonesia: Widina Media Utama, 2024).

⁵ Hidayati and Aripin, "Consumer Protection Against Skincare Trade Not Yet Licensed By Bpom Through E-Commerce," *LOCUS Journal: Research & Community Service* 3, no. 11 (2024): 886–97, <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.58344/locus.v3i11.3272>.

⁶ Bex O'Higgins and Hajar and Fatorachian, "Consumer Trust in Artificial Intelligence in the UK and Ireland's Personal Care and Cosmetics Sector," *Cogent Business & Management* 12, no. 1 (December 12, 2025): 2469765, <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311975.2025.2469765>.

⁷ A H Hamid, *Hukum Perlindungan Konsumen Indonesia*, Cetakan ke (CV. SAH MEDIA, 2017).

⁸ Rio Christiawan, *Aspek Hukum Startup*, ed. Kurniawan Ahmad (Jakarta: Sinar Grafika, 2021).

⁹ M Fajar and Achmad Yulianto, *Dualisme Penelitian Hukum Normatif Dan Empiris*, Cetakan ke-IV (Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar, 2017).

legislation, including Law No. 8 of 1999 on Consumer Protection, BPOM regulations, and the electronic commerce law. Additionally, the conceptual approach (conceptual approach) examines theoretical frameworks underlying consumer protection principles and business actor liability concepts. The research focuses on an in-depth analysis of legal risks faced by consumers due to unauthorized blue-labeled skincare distribution through e-commerce platforms. Data collection encompasses primary legal sources (legislation, regulations, jurisprudence) and secondary sources (academic literature, government reports, enforcement data).

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3.1 Critical Analysis of Regulatory Framework Fragmentation and Enforcement Gaps

The examination of blue-labeled skincare distribution through e-commerce platforms reveals fundamental contradictions within Indonesia's regulatory ecosystem that create exploitable gaps for unauthorized product circulation.¹⁰ While Law Number 8 of 1999, BPOM Regulation No. 23 of 2019, and Law No. 19 of 2016 theoretically provide comprehensive coverage, their practical implementation demonstrates critical analytical flaws in regulatory coordination and enforcement capability.¹¹

Regulatory fragmentation creates jurisdictional ambiguities that business actors systematically exploit. Legal analysis reveals that Article 19 of Law No. 8 of 1999 establishes clear business actor responsibilities for product quality, safety, and consumer information provision. However, practical examination shows e-commerce platforms operate under ITE Law¹² provisions emphasizing platform neutrality, while cosmetic products fall under BPOM jurisdiction, and consumer protection remains under general consumer law oversight.¹³ This fragmentation enables blue-labeled skincare distributors to navigate regulatory silos, positioning themselves as mere intermediaries while avoiding substantive product responsibility. E-commerce platform structures complicate traditional liability determination through multiple intermediaries, temporary vendor accounts, and cross-jurisdictional elements. The distinction between “platform operators” and “product distributors” creates liability shields that traditional regulatory frameworks cannot effectively penetrate, demonstrating the gap between legal intentions and the reality of practical enforcement.

¹⁰ Ermina Jaen, “Skincare Etiket Biru Masih Marak, Ini Penjelasan BPOM,” ed. Benny Hermawan, 2024, <http://rri.co.id/kesehatan/1021122/skincare-etiket-biru-masih-marak-ini-penjelasan-bpom>.

¹¹ “Undang-Undang Republik Indonesia Nomor 8 Tahun 1999 Tentang Perlindungan Konsumen” (1999).

¹² Falah Al Ghozali and Try Hardyanthi, “Perlindungan Konsumen Pada Platform E-Commerce: Regulasi Dan Peran Pemerintah,” *Ethics and Law Journal: Business and Notary* 2, no. 3 SE-article (July 29, 2024): 136–41, <https://doi.org/10.61292/eljbn.220>.

¹³ O. Bambang, “Perlindungan Hukum Terhadap Konsumen Atas Kenyamanan Keamanan Dan Keselamatan Dalam Mengonsumsi Barang Atau Jasa,” *Lex Privatum* 11, no. 1 (2023): 1–15, <https://doi.org/https://ejournal.unsrat.ac.id/index.php/lexprivatum/article/view/45760>.

The assessment of BPOM's enforcement capacity reveals significant resource constraints limiting effective oversight of rapidly expanding digital marketplaces.¹⁴ Legal expectations require comprehensive monitoring of all cosmetic products in circulation, but practical reality shows that traditional regulatory models designed for physical distribution channels prove inadequate for addressing the speed, anonymity, and decentralized nature of e-commerce transactions.¹⁵ With thousands of online vendors and millions of product listings, manual oversight becomes analytically impossible while automated detection systems remain technologically underdeveloped.

Legal expectations require comprehensive monitoring of all cosmetic products in circulation, but practical reality shows that traditional regulatory models designed for physical distribution channels prove inadequate for addressing the speed, anonymity, and decentralized nature of e-commerce transactions. With thousands of online vendors and millions of product listings, manual oversight becomes analytically impossible while automated detection systems remain technologically underdeveloped.

3.2 Analytical Examination of Business Actor Liability Avoidance Strategies

Distribution pattern analysis reveals sophisticated liability avoidance strategies employed by business actors exploiting legal ambiguities and enforcement limitations.¹⁶ The distinction between “direct selling by individuals” and “third-party resellers” represents strategic legal positioning designed to minimize regulatory accountability while maximizing market access for unauthorized products.

Business actors leverage information asymmetries to shift legal responsibility by claiming medical professional status without verification or presenting altered formulations as original doctor-prescribed products. This creates plausible deniability while accessing lucrative market segments, demonstrating how regulatory gaps enable systematic deception that technically avoids explicit fraud while achieving fraudulent outcomes.¹⁷ This analytical framework demonstrates how regulatory gaps enable systematic deception that technically avoids explicit fraud while achieving fraudulent outcomes.

¹⁴ Mohamad Kashuri and Taruna Ikrar, “The Strategic Role of the Indonesian FDA in Empowering Micro, Small, and Medium Enterprises in the Drug and Food Sectors: A Review,” *Borneo Journal of Pharmacy* 8, no. 1 SE-Pharmaceutical Regulations (March 1, 2025): 1–14, <https://doi.org/10.33084/bjop.v8i1.8432>.

¹⁵ Abdullah M Alnuqaydan, “The Dark Side of Beauty: An in-Depth Analysis of the Health Hazards and Toxicological Impact of Synthetic Cosmetics and Personal Care Products,” *Frontiers in Public Health* 12, no. 1 (2024): 1–19, <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.3389/fpubh.2024.1439027>.

¹⁶ N Sari and W Tan, “Analisis Hukum Produk Kosmetika Yang Di Impor Untuk Digunakan Secara Pribadi Oleh Konsumen,” *Jurnal Pendidikan Kewarganegaraan Undiksha* 9, no. 3 (2021): 959–73, <https://doi.org/10.23887/jpku.v9i3.40173>.

¹⁷ Ade Oktarino et al., *Dunia Di Era Transformasi Digital*, ed. Januardi Nasir (Tidak disebutkan (kemungkinan perlu ditambahkan penerbit), 2024).

E-commerce platform roles reveal how technological intermediation creates liability shields traditional regulatory frameworks cannot penetrate effectively.¹⁸ Platforms position themselves as neutral facilitators while benefiting economically from unauthorized product sales, creating paradoxes where profit incentives conflict with regulatory compliance obligations.¹⁹

The analysis demonstrates how blue-labeled skincare distribution exploits consumer vulnerabilities through pseudo-medical authority claims.²⁰ Business actors leverage consumer desire for professional-grade products while avoiding regulatory oversight that genuine medical formulations require, illustrating how market demand for exclusive access creates opportunities for regulatory circumvention.

3.3 Strategic Analysis of Consumer Protection Mechanism Inadequacies

The evaluation of consumer protection mechanisms reveals systematic inadequacies enabling continued unauthorized product distribution despite comprehensive legal frameworks.²¹ Reliance on consumer complaints as primary detection mechanisms creates flaws where violations persist until adverse outcomes generate sufficient complaint volume to trigger regulatory attention. This demonstrates a fundamental disparity where legal protection mechanisms exist theoretically but fail in practical implementation.²²

While information disclosure requirements appear theoretically protective, they prove insufficient when business actors provide technically accurate but substantively misleading information.²³ Blue-labeled skincare distributors comply with basic labeling requirements while omitting crucial safety information, demonstrating how formal compliance can mask actual consumer endangerment.

The examination of compensation mechanisms reveals significant barriers effectively denying consumer access to legal remedies.²⁴ Article 23 of Law No. 8 of 1999 regarding burden of proof places substantial evidentiary requirements on consumers, creating scenarios where regulatory compliance becomes more important than actual consumer protection. Legal analysis shows the law intends to protect consumers through accessible remedies, but practical examination reveals requirements for consumers to establish causal relationships between product use and adverse

¹⁸ A.S Jameel and Ahmad, "The Role of Information and Communication Technology on Knowledge Sharing among the Academic Staff during COVID-19 Pandemic," in *2020 2nd Annual International Conference on Information and Sciences (AiCIS)* (Fallujah, Iraq: IEEE, 2020).

¹⁹ D. Y. Jin, *Globalization and Media in the Digital Platform Age* (Routledge, 2018).

²⁰ Deonisia Arlinta, "Kosmetik Beretiket Biru Tidak Boleh Sembarangan Digunakan," 2024, <https://www.kompas.id/baca/humaniora/2024/10/14/kosmetik-beretiket-biru-tidak-boleh-sembarangan-digunakan>.

²¹ Leon G Schiffman and Joseph Wisenblit, *Consumer Behavior*, 11th ed. (Harlow: Pearson Education, 2015).

²² Hendro Ponco Raharjo, Cokorde Istri Dian Laksmi Dewi, and I Wayan Putu Sucana Aryana, "Perlindungan Hukum Pembeli Atas Ketidaksesuaian Kualitas Barang Dan Jasa Berdasarkan Undang-Undang Perlindungan Konsumen," *Jurnal Syntax Admiration* 5, no. 9 SE- (October 2, 2024): 3667–79, <https://doi.org/10.46799/jsa.v5i9.1623>.

²³ Xingbin Zhan et al., "A Modified Artificial Bee Colony Algorithm for the Dynamic Ride-Hailing Sharing Problem," *Transportation Research Part E: Logistics and Transportation Review* 150 (2021): 102124, <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tre.2020.102124>.

²⁴ M Syamsudin, "The Failure of the Court to Protect Consumers: A Review of Consumer Dispute Resolution in Indonesia," *Journal of Consumer Policy* 44, no. 1 (2021): 117–30, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10603-020-09470-0>.

effects create evidentiary burdens most consumers cannot meet, particularly with cosmetic products, where effects may be delayed or subtle.²⁵ This represents a systematic inadequacy in translating legal protection principles into practical enforcement outcomes, highlighting the critical gap between normative expectations and empirical reality in Indonesia's consumer protection framework.

3.4 Comprehensive Analysis of Enforcement Mechanism Failures and Systemic Vulnerabilities

The assessment of enforcement mechanisms reveals fundamental systemic vulnerabilities enabling unauthorized blue-labeled skincare distribution persistence despite regulatory prohibition.²⁶ BPOM's traditional oversight model, designed for conventional distribution channels, proves analytically inadequate for addressing the dynamic, decentralized nature of e-commerce platforms.²⁷ The enforcement gap analysis demonstrates how limited regulatory resources create strategic opportunities for violators.²⁸ With thousands of online vendors and millions of product listings, manual oversight becomes analytically impossible, while automated detection systems remain technologically underdeveloped.²⁹ This analytical finding reveals how regulatory capacity limitations create de facto safe havens for unauthorized product distribution.

The examination of penalty structures reveals inadequate deterrent effects relative to potential profits from unauthorized sales. Administrative fines often represent minor costs compared to revenue from unregulated product sales, creating scenarios where violation becomes economically rational.³⁰ This cost-benefit analysis demonstrates fundamental flaws in current penalty frameworks.

The cross-jurisdictional analysis reveals additional enforcement complications when e-commerce platforms operate across multiple regulatory domains.³¹ Business actors exploit jurisdictional ambiguities by establishing operations in regions with weaker enforcement while accessing consumers in regions with stronger regulations but limited extraterritorial enforcement capacity.

²⁵ R Mulyati, *Perlindungan Hukum Merek Terkenal Untuk Barang Dan Atau Jasa Tidak Sejenis Dalam Hukum Merek Indonesia* (Jakarta: Kencana, 2023).

²⁶ Alisyah, "Penerbitan Skincare Beretiket Biru Yang Tidak Sesuai Ketentuan."

²⁷ Biro Kerja Sama dan Hubungan Masyarakat, "Kepala BPOM Taruna Ikrar Rilis Daftar Kosmetik Yang Dinyatakan Mengandung Bahan Dilarang Atau Berbahaya Di Peredaran Termasuk Media Online," 2024, <https://www.pom.go.id/siaran-pers/kepala-bpom-taruna-ikrar-rilis-daftar-kosmetik-yang-dinyatakan-mengandung-bahan-dilarang-atau-berbahaya-di-peredaran-termasuk-di-media-online-periode-november-2023-s-d-oktober-2024>.

²⁸ Cynthia Afriani Utama, Sidharta Utama, and Fitriany Amarullah, "Corporate Governance and Ownership Structure: Indonesia Evidence," *Corporate Governance: The International Journal of Business in Society* 17, no. 2 (January 1, 2017): 165–91, <https://doi.org/10.1108/CG-12-2015-0171>.

²⁹ Jonas Pöhler et al., "Keeping the Human in the Loop: Are Autonomous Decisions Inevitable?," *i-com*, 24, no. 1 (2025): 9–25, <https://doi.org/doi:10.1515/icom-2024-0068>.

³⁰ Aisyah Salsafia Purwani, "Perbedaan Pemasaran Pada Zaman Old Dan Zaman Now," 2021, <https://www.kompasiana.com/aisyahsalsafia/619edbd09dc02915ef1baa82/perbedaan-strategi-pemasaran-pada-zaman-old-vs-zaman-now>.

³¹ Neelam Chawla and Basanta Kumar, "E-Commerce and Consumer Protection in India: The Emerging Trend," *Journal of Business Ethics* 180, no. 2 (2022): 581–604, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-021-04884-3>.

3.5 Analytical Framework for Regulatory Reform and Enhanced Consumer Protection

The comprehensive analysis reveals that effective consumer protection in digital skincare markets requires fundamental regulatory paradigm shifts rather than incremental enforcement improvements. The traditional approach of product-by-product oversight proves analytically insufficient for addressing systematic platform-enabled violations.³²

Enhanced consumer protection requires platform accountability mechanisms, shifting enforcement responsibility from overwhelmed regulatory agencies to economically motivated private actors.³³ By requiring platforms to implement verification systems and assume liability for unauthorized products, regulatory frameworks could leverage market mechanisms for enhanced enforcement effectiveness.

Technological solutions, including automated product verification systems and blockchain-based supply chain tracking, could address information asymmetries currently enabling unauthorized distribution.³⁴ Regulatory modernization must embrace technological innovation rather than rely solely on traditional oversight mechanisms to achieve effective consumer protection outcomes. Consumer education programs must address underlying demand factors creating markets for unauthorized products. By enhancing consumer understanding of regulatory requirements and safety implications, protection strategies could address root causes rather than merely implementing reactive enforcement measures.

4. CONCLUSION

The analytical examination of blue-labeled skincare distribution through e-commerce reveals fundamental systemic failures in Indonesia's regulatory framework, enabling widespread consumer endangerment despite comprehensive legal prohibitions. Regulatory fragmentation creates exploitable jurisdictional gaps while enforcement mechanism inadequacies allow systematic violation of consumer protection principles established in Law No. 8 of 1999. Business actors employ sophisticated liability avoidance strategies, exploiting information asymmetries and technological intermediation to circumvent regulatory accountability while accessing lucrative unauthorized product markets. Current enforcement approaches prove insufficient because they operate on reactive principles, addressing violations only after consumer exposure, while penalty structures provide inadequate deterrents relative to potential violation profits. Effective consumer protection requires paradigmatic regulatory shifts toward platform accountability mechanisms, technological verification systems, and proactive

³² Kepala Badan Pengawas Obat dan Makanan, "Peraturan Badan Pengawas Obat Dan Makanan Nomor 7 Tahun 2024 Tentang Standar Cara Pembuatan Obat Yang Baik" (2024).

³³ Wida Khansa Nabila and Dimas Angga Negoro, "Pengaruh Digital Marketing, Customer Engagement, Dan Brand Awareness Terhadap Purchase Intention Produk Fashion Lokal Pada Generasi Z," *Jurnal Pendidikan Tambusai* 7, no. 3 SE-Articles of Research (September 3, 2023): 20207–18, <https://doi.org/10.31004/jptam.v7i3.9462>.

³⁴ Felicia Felicia et al., "Tantangan Dan Peluang Blockchain Di Era Digital Dalam Bidang Keamanan Data Dan Transaksi Digital," *Journal of Comprehensive Science* 3, no. 11 SE-Articles (December 4, 2024): 5131–47, <https://doi.org/10.59188/jcs.v3i11.2887>.

enforcement strategies addressing root causes rather than symptoms. The research demonstrates how digital marketplace dynamics undermine traditional regulatory approaches, necessitating integrated reform strategies leveraging technological innovation and market mechanisms for enhanced consumer protection.

REFERENCES

- Alisyah, Syakirah. "Penerbitan Skincare Beretiket Biru Yang Tidak Sesuai Ketentuan," 2024. <https://www.pom.go.id/siaran-pers/penertiban-skincare-beretiket-biru-yang-tidak-sesuai-ketentuan>.
- Alnuqay dan, Abdullah M. "The Dark Side of Beauty: An in-Depth Analysis of the Health Hazards and Toxicological Impact of Synthetic Cosmetics and Personal Care Products." *Frontiers in Public Health* 12, no. 1 (2024): 1–19. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.3389/fpubh.2024.1439027>.
- Arlinta, Deonisia. "Kosmetik Beretiket Biru Tidak Boleh Sembarangan Digunakan," 2024. <https://www.kompas.id/baca/humaniora/2024/10/14/kosmetik-beretiket-biru-tidak-boleh-sembarangan-digunakan>.
- Bambangan, O. "Perlindungan Hukum Terhadap Konsumen Atas Kenyamanan Keamanan Dan Keselamatan Dalam Mengkonsumsi Barang Atau Jasa." *Lex Privatum* 11, no. 1 (2023): 1–15. <https://doi.org/https://ejournal.unsrat.ac.id/index.php/lexprivatum/article/view/45760>.
- Chawla, Neelam, and Basanta Kumar. "E-Commerce and Consumer Protection in India: The Emerging Trend." *Journal of Business Ethics* 180, no. 2 (2022): 581–604. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-021-04884-3>.
- Christiawan, Rio. *Aspek Hukum Startup*. Edited by Kurniawan Ahmad. Jakarta: Sinar Grafika, 2021.
- Diva. "Rahasia Sukses Bisnis Skincare: Peluang Emas Di Industri Kecantikan." [tecnoglow.co.id](https://www.tecnoglow.co.id), 2025. <https://www.tecnoglow.co.id/blog/blog-3/rahasia-sukses-bisnis-skincare-peluang-emas-d-industri-kecantikan-12>.
- Felicia, Felicia, Elvilie Elvilie, Calista Calista, Sebastian Areen Chic, Muhammad Fardian Bilqisthi, and Joosten Joosten. "Tantangan Dan Peluang Blockchain Di Era Digital Dalam Bidang Keamanan Data Dan Transaksi Digital." *Journal of Comprehensive Science* 3, no. 11 SE-Articles (December 4, 2024): 5131–47. <https://doi.org/10.59188/jcs.v3i11.2887>.
- Ghozali, Falah Al, and Try Hardyanthi. "Perlindungan Konsumen Pada Platform E-Commerce: Regulasi Dan Peran Pemerintah." *Ethics and Law Journal: Business and Notary* 2, no. 3 SE-article (July 29, 2024): 136–41. <https://doi.org/10.61292/eljbn.220>.
- Hamid, A H. *Hukum Perlindungan Konsumen Indonesia*. Cetakan ke. CV. SAH MEDIA, 2017.
- Hidayati, and Aripin. "Consumer Protection Against Skincare Trade Not Yet Licensed By Bpom Through E-Commerce." *LOCUS Journal: Research & Community Service* 3, no. 11 (2024): 886–97. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.58344/locus.v3i11.3272>.
- Jaen, Ermina. "Skinecare Etiket Biru Masih Marak, Ini Penjelasan BPOM." Edited by Benny Hermawan, 2024. <http://rri.co.id/kesehatan/1021122/skinecare-etiket-biru-masih-marak-ini-penjelasan-bpom>.
- Jameel, A.S, and Ahmad. "The Role of Information and Communication Technology on Knowledge Sharing among the Academic Staff during COVID-19 Pandemic." In *2020 2nd Annual International Conference on Information and Sciences (AiCIS)*. Fallujah, Iraq: IEEE, 2020.

- Jin, D. Y. *Globalization and Media in the Digital Platform Age*. Routledge, 2018.
- Kashuri, Mohamad, and Taruna Ikrar. "The Strategic Role of the Indonesian FDA in Empowering Micro, Small, and Medium Enterprises in the Drug and Food Sectors: A Review." *Borneo Journal of Pharmacy* 8, no. 1 SE-Pharmaceutical Regulations (March 1, 2025): 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.33084/bjop.v8i1.8432>.
- Kepala Badan Pengawas Obat dan Makanan. Peraturan Badan Pengawas Obat Dan Makanan Nomor 7 Tahun 2024 Tentang Standar Cara Pembuatan Obat Yang Baik (2024).
- Listyani, Refti Handini. "Kontruksi Kecantikan Warna Kulit Perempuan Indonesia (Studi Kasus Di Kota Surabaya)." *Paradigma* 13, no. 13 (2024): 61–70.
- Masyarakat, Biro Kerja Sama dan Hubungan. "Kepala BPOM Taruna Ikrar Rilis Daftar Kosmetik Yang Dinyatakan Mengandung Bahan Dilarang Atau Berbahaya Di Peredaran Termasuk Media Online," 2024. <https://www.pom.go.id/siaran-pers/kepala-bpom-taruna-ikrar-rilis-daftar-kosmetik-yang-dinyatakan-mengandung-bahan-dilarang-atau-berbahaya-di-peredaran-termasuk-di-media-online-periode-november-2023-s-d-oktober-2024>.
- Mulyati, R. *Perlindungan Hukum Merek Terkenal Untuk Barang Dan Atau Jasa Tidak Sejenis Dalam Hukum Merek Indonesia*. Jakarta: Kencana, 2023.
- Nabila, Wida Khansa, and Dimas Angga Negoro. "Pengaruh Digital Marketing, Customer Engagement, Dan Brand Awareness Terhadap Purchase Intention Produk Fashion Lokal Pada Generasi Z." *Jurnal Pendidikan Tambusai* 7, no. 3 SE-Articles of Research (September 3, 2023): 20207–18. <https://doi.org/10.31004/jptam.v7i3.9462>.
- O'Higgins, Bex, and Hajar and Fatorachian. "Consumer Trust in Artificial Intelligence in the UK and Ireland's Personal Care and Cosmetics Sector." *Cogent Business & Management* 12, no. 1 (December 12, 2025): 2469765. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311975.2025.2469765>.
- Oktarino, Ade, Mohd Iqbal, Suryo Widianoro, Novi Rahayu, Robby Candra, Susanti Usman, Sri Wulan W Ratih, et al. *Dunia Di Era Transformasi Digital*. Edited by Januardi Nasir. Tidak disebutkan (kemungkinan perlu ditambahkan penerbit), 2024.
- Pöhler, Jonas, Nadine Flegel, Tilo Mentler, and Kristof Van Laerhoven. "Keeping the Human in the Loop: Are Autonomous Decisions Inevitable?," *i-com*, 24, no. 1 (2025): 9–25. <https://doi.org/doi:10.1515/icom-2024-0068>.
- Prayuti, Yuyut, Gunawan, Happy Yulia Anggraeni, Elis Herlina, Mia Rasmiaty, Ida Kurniasih, Ridwan Jaelani, et al. *Menjawab Kompleksitas Hukum Di Tengah Masyarakat: Waris, Perlindungan Konsumen, Dan Perjanjian*. Edited by Ahmad Jamaludin. 1st ed. Indonesia: Widina Media Utama, 2024.
- Purwani, Aisyah Salsafia. "Perbedaan Pemasaran Pada Zaman Old Dan Zaman Now," 2021. <https://www.kompasiana.com/aisyahsalsafia/619edbd09dc02915ef1baa82/perbedaan-strategi-pemasaraan-pada-zaman-old-vs-zaman-now>.
- Raharjo, Hendro Ponco, Cokorde Istri Dian Laksmi Dewi, and I Wayan Putu Sucana Aryana. "Perlindungan Hukum Pembeli Atas Ketidaksiesuaian Kualitas Barang Dan Jasa Berdasarkan Undang-Undang Perlindungan Konsumen." *Jurnal Syntax Admiration* 5, no. 9 SE- (October 2, 2024): 3667–79. <https://doi.org/10.46799/jsa.v5i9.1623>.
- Sari, N, and W Tan. "Analisis Hukum Produk Kosmetika Yang Di Impor Untuk Digunakan Secara Pribadi Oleh Konsumen." *Jurnal Pendidikan Kewarganegaraan Undiksha* 9, no. 3 (2021): 959–73. <https://doi.org/10.23887/jpku.v9i3.40173>.
- Schiffman, Leon G, and Joseph Wisenblit. *Consumer Behavior*. 11th ed. Harlow: Pearson Education, 2015.

- Syamsudin, M. “The Failure of the Court to Protect Consumers: A Review of Consumer Dispute Resolution in Indonesia.” *Journal of Consumer Policy* 44, no. 1 (2021): 117–30. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10603-020-09470-0>.
- Undang-Undang Republik Indonesia Nomor 8 Tahun 1999 tentang Perlindungan Konsumen (1999).
- Utama, Cynthia Afriani, Sidharta Utama, and Fitriany Amarullah. “Corporate Governance and Ownership Structure: Indonesia Evidence.” *Corporate Governance: The International Journal of Business in Society* 17, no. 2 (January 1, 2017): 165–91. <https://doi.org/10.1108/CG-12-2015-0171>.
- Zhan, Xingbin, W Y Szeto, C S Shui, and Xiqun (Michael) Chen. “A Modified Artificial Bee Colony Algorithm for the Dynamic Ride-Hailing Sharing Problem.” *Transportation Research Part E: Logistics and Transportation Review* 150 (2021): 102124. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tre.2020.102124>.