

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Economics, Management and Trade</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JEMT_96735</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>"Closing the Wealth Gap:A Two-Faceted Approach Theory"</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

### General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journaljemt.com/index.php/JEMT/editorial-policy> )

### PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments  <b>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)  <b>2. Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)  <b>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b>  <b>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>  <b>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b>  <b>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b> <b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The economy related to income inequality is an actual theme of research, which is significant for future insights and potential solutions.</li> <li>2. The title of this manuscript is adequate.</li> <li>3. The abstract is comprehensive.</li> <li>4. The structure of the manuscript is good.</li> <li>5. The manuscript represents scientific insight into income inequality and theories regarding various arguments and evidence supporting it.</li> <li>6. References are reasonable.</li> <li>7. This article is engaging and straightforward, but some corrections are needed.</li> </ol>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments <b>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	There are many redundancies, missing determiners, and grammatical errors. English writing needs additional work. Some of the words repeatedly appear in this manuscript.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	Some of your sentences may need to be clarified and easier to follow, so I rewrote them for clarity. I also rewrote some parts of your manuscript, so consider implementing it.	

### PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	<b>Kristijan Krstic</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of Kragujevac, Serbia</b>