

Journal Name:	<u>Journal of Global Economics, Management and Business Research</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JGEMBR_12652
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessing Digital Maturity in Wealth Management: Development of a Comprehensive Maturity Model
Type of the Article	

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

PART 1: Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript is of significant importance to the scientific community as it addresses a critical gap in digital transformation research by presenting a specialized digital maturity model tailored to the wealth management industry. It provides a structured framework for assessing and enhancing digital capabilities, which is crucial in an era of rapid technological advancement and evolving client expectations. Furthermore, the integration of the model into the ABILI platform demonstrates practical applicability, offering real-world insights and strategic guidance for firms navigating digital challenges.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title, "Assessing Digital Maturity in Wealth Management: Development of a Comprehensive Maturity Model," is clear and descriptive, but it could be slightly refined to better reflect the practical applicability of the research and the integration of the ABILI platform. Here are some alternative suggestions: 1. "Transforming Wealth Management: A Comprehensive Digital Maturity Framework" 2. "Enhancing Wealth Management Through Digital Maturity: A Framework and Practical Tool"	

Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract is generally comprehensive, but it could be improved by addressing a few areas for clarity and balance. Here are some suggestions for improvement: Additions: 1. Methodology Clarity: Briefly describe the process of how the maturity model was developed and validated (e.g., specific methods or frameworks used, number or profile of industry experts consulted). 2. Scope of the Model: Highlight whether the model covers specific dimensions of digital maturity (e.g., client engagement, operational efficiency, innovation) to give a clearer picture of its focus. Deletions/Refinements: Repetition: Avoid repeating phrases like "digital maturity model" too often and replace with synonyms or contextual references to improve readability.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The manuscript appears to be scientifically correct in terms of presenting a structured approach to developing and applying a digital maturity model for wealth management firms.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references provided in the manuscript are generally sufficient and include a mix of academic articles, white papers, books, and industry insights, which is suitable for a study on digital maturity in wealth management.	

Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language quality of the article appears to be generally suitable for scholarly communication.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(if agreed with the 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 detail)</i> There do not appear to be any explicit ethical issues in the manuscript.	
Are there competing interest issues in this manuscript?	There is a potential for competing interest issues, but they are not explicitly stated.	

	These concerns could arise primarily from the following areas: Potential Competing Interests: 1. Affiliation with AbiliCor: ○ The manuscript discusses the integration of the digital maturity model into the ABILI platform, which is developed by AbiliCor. If the authors are affiliated with or funded by AbiliCor, this relationship should be disclosed to ensure transparency and avoid perceived bias in favor of the platform.	
If plagiarism is suspected, <u>please provide related proofs or web links.</u>	There are no significant signs of plagiarism in the manuscript.	

PART 3: Declaration of Competing Interest of the Reviewer:

I declare that I have no competing interest as a reviewer

PART 4: Objective Evaluation:

Guideline	MARKS of this manuscript
Give OVERALL MARKS you want to give to this manuscript	>8-9

(Highest: 10 Lowest: 0) <u>Guideline:</u> Accept As It Is: (>9-10) Minor Revision: (>8-9) Major Revision: (>7-8) Serious Major revision: (>5-7) Rejected (with repairable deficiencies and may be reconsidered): (>3-5) Strongly rejected (with irreparable deficiencies.): (>0-3)	
---	--

Editorial Comments (This section is reserved for the comments from journal editorial office and editors):

	Author's Feedback

Reviewer Details:

This section is mandatory to prepare the Reviewer Certificate.

Please complete this section carefully. Reviewer Certificate will be generated by using this information only.

Your Certificate will be wrong, if you provide incorrect information.

Please note modification of certificate will not be possible after generation.

Certificate will not be issued if incomplete information is provided.

Name of the Reviewer	Abdullah Bah
Department of Reviewer	Banking and Finance
University or Institution of Reviewer	Institute of Public Administration and Management, University of Sierra Leone
Country of Reviewer	Sierra Leone
Position: (Professor/lecturer, etc.) of Reviewer	Lecturer
Email ID of Reviewer	bahabdullah001@gmail.com
WhatsApp Number of Reviewer (Optional)	+23276625303
Write 5-8 Keywords regarding expertise of Reviewer	Financial Reporting, Corporate Finance, Investment Strategies, Macroeconomics, Business Valuation, Risk Management, Financial Markets, Financial Statement Analysis.

