

Journal Name: [Journal of Global Economics, Management and Business Research](#)
 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.	

<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>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:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. "Transforming Wealth Management: A Comprehensive Digital Maturity Framework"2. "Enhancing Wealth Management Through Digital Maturity: A Framework and Practical Tool"	
--	---	--

<p>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.</p>	<p>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:</p> <p>Additions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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). 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. <p>Deletions/Refinements:</p> <p>Repetition: Avoid repeating phrases like "digital maturity model" too often and replace with synonyms or contextual references to improve readability.</p>	
<p>Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.</p>	<p>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.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>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.</p>	

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.	
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:	Abdullah Bah
Department, University & Country	University of Sierra Leone, Sierra Leone