



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade</u>
Manuscript Number:	2014_BJEMT_9516
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessment The Impact of Zakat on Aggregate Consumption and Poverty: Evidence from Egypt
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	• Abstract: Should be written in a comprehensive way. A good abstract consists of introduction, objective(s), methodology and finding(s) of the study. • Introduction: Rewrite! First paragraph is written too long. Some facts need clarification. (eg: poverty line of two dollars per day- what is the base of this assumption?) • LR: Should be revised- some studies were not discussed at all, like Kahf (1989), Febianto et al. (2011), Yaumidin (2009) and Ahmad (2004). • The conventional part should be written off as it has nothing to do with the study. • Part 6 (Page 18): The author should provide enough information on how the calculation was made. Results given are not clearly discussed. • Concluding remarks: (1) There is unfinished work shown by the author (Line 565 page 21); (2) Need policy implication of the study.	Abstract: I have edited, thanks Introduction: The World Bank and other international institutes assumed \$2 a day as the poverty line. The data discussed in the introduction are from the UNDP, Human Development Report in 2006. LR: Kahf (1989) study is discussed in literature review part, page 4, line 96. Febianto, et al (2011) paper is discussed in literature part, page 5, line 120. Yaumidin (2009) and Ahmad (2004) contributions are discussed in literature part, page 5, lines 130. The conventional part is added to be clear that Zakat can do a role in eradicating the poverty problem which the conventional economy fails in. Part 6: I have edited/ corrected some words and sentences to be more clearer, thanks Concluding remarks: 1- Ok, I did it, thanks 2- OK, I added policy implication, thanks



SDI Review Form 1.6

	• References: (1) Some references are not found in the reference list (eg.: Human Development Report (2010), Kahf (1989) etc. (2) Please check the reference put in the reference list, some are not well-written.	References: 1- Human Development Report for 2006 and 2010 are there. Please look at (UNDP, Human Development Report, 2006 and 2010), line 638 and Kahf (1989) is there as well (Please look at Kahf, Monzer. 1989. Zakat: Unresolved Issues in the Contemporary Fiqh. <i>Journal of Islamic Economics</i> , 2(1), pp. 1-22) line 614-615. 2- I have corrected the mistakes in the reference list, thanks
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		