

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Economics, Management and Trade
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEMT_117258
Title of the Manuscript:	Impact of Fintech, Mineral Resources, and Social Capital on Climate Quality: A Perspective of Institutional Quality
Type of the Article	Research Article

Review Form 1.7

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
<p><u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>Yes, (Climate Quality is the dependent variable, with Fintech, Institutional Quality, Mineral Resources, and Social Capital as independent variables). So, the title is suitable.</p> <p>Need improvement.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Needs improvement in references.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Abstract need to be improved in introduction (the goal of the study, crucial background), methods (basic study design), results (summary of major findings), and discussion (Interpretations, conclusions, broader implications, future research). 2. The introduction is a weak; it may be improved to give the reader a clear idea about the study. The introduction should objectively present the topic and the main concepts and literature, explaining the relevance and topicality of the subject (suggestion: 1 paragraph). Based on that, it should describe a research gap, problem, and aim (suggestion: 2 or 3 paragraphs, with 1 highlighting the objective). The idea is to emphasize the research gap, providing stronger arguments about its relevance, impact, and innovation. Please present the problem statement and research objectives. 3. Review of literature is convincing. 4. Methodology and data description is convincing. 5. Results is convincing. 6. Better, discussion can be separated. Discussion and implications explain how the results answered the research question and may suggest future areas for research. Also, the discussion needs to be supported by recent references. Further, the implications must be categorized into theoretical, practical, social, and economic categories. 7. Consider re-drawing the conclusions in light of the proposed modifications, showing the synthesis of the results clearly and concisely in their conceptual and theoretical articulations and future research directions according to the proposed objectives and methodology. 8. References need to be updated to the recent articles. It's already 2024, so the author(s) must include more articles from 2020-2024 to support the writing. 	

Review Form 1.7

Minor REVISION comments		
1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Need professional proofreading before publication.	
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Jayendra P Sankar
Department, University & Country	College of Administrative and Financial Sciences, University of Technology, Bahrain