



Paper: “How the Adoption of Government Interventions has Affected Income Inequality and Poverty in Some African Countries”

Submitted: 09 April 2025

Accepted: 19 May 2025

Published: 31 May 2025

Corresponding Author: Daniel Abayaakadina Atuilik

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2025.v21n13p66

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Robert Szucs
University of Debrecen, Hungary

Reviewer 2: Arlinda Ymeraj
European University of Tirana, Albania

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2025

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.

The copyrights of the report are on the publisher and the data can be used for research purposes.

ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Reviewer Name: Dr. Róbert Szűcs	
University/Country: University of Debrecen, Hungary	
Date Manuscript Received: 04.05.2025	Date Review Report Submitted: 05.05.2025
Manuscript Title: HOW THE ADOPTION OF GOVERNMENT INTERVENTIONS HAS AFFECTED INCOME INEQUALITY AND POVERTY IN SOME AFRICAN COUNTRIES	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 67.04.2025	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	5
The title is precise, descriptive, and clearly reflects the main theme of the article, namely the impact of government interventions on income inequality and poverty in African countries. It aligns well with the content and purpose of the study.	
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	4
The abstract effectively summarizes the objectives, countries studied, and key findings. The method (Machine Learning) is mentioned, but there could be more clarity and structure, particularly in distinguishing results from implications.	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3

The article is generally understandable, but numerous minor grammatical issues and awkward phrasings appear throughout. Examples include missing articles, run-on sentences, and unclear wordings (“...poverty will reduce by 0.21%, 0.09%, 0.5% and 0.47% respectively...” could be cleaner). These reduce overall readability and professional tone.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
The methods section explains the regression model used (Elastic Net), variables, and data sources. While the machine learning technique is appropriate and described adequately, some parts are overly technical without corresponding interpretive clarity for a broader scientific audience.	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
The results are comprehensive and presented in tables and narrative form. The article correctly uses R-squared, RMSE, and other validation measures. However, some inconsistencies or lack of clarity in interpreting statistical results (e.g., sign confusion or unexplained variation) slightly diminish the clarity.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
The conclusions draw directly from the analysis and effectively summarize the study's key findings and policy implications. The discussion is rooted in both theoretical frameworks and empirical data, with thoughtful interpretation.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
The references include a broad and relevant mix of recent and foundational literature. The citations are correctly formatted and support the discussion throughout the paper.	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	X
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

This article demonstrates solid academic rigour and originality, with strong empirical analysis. Slight improvements in grammar and writing style enhance its clarity and impact.

Reviewer A:

Recommendation: Accept Submission

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

The title is very clear, adequate to the content of the article. The title prepares the audience to get knowledge about a very interesting and important topic.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results. I have never read such a concise abstract, respecting all the rules of academic writing.

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

There are no grammatical errors neither spelling mistakes in this article

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

The study methods are explained very clearly. In addition, the author has employed very pertinent methods.

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain any errors.

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

The conclusion is accurate, straight to the point, supported by the content, very well formulated.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

The list of references is comprehensive and appropriate.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

5

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, no revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Congratulations. A very interesting topic, addressed and elaborated in a simple, effective and clear manner, maintaining a strong academic point of view. The strong focus on "each country public policies" and analysis versus to them add values to the article in general and makes it a useful resource document for any other country in similar circumstances. I find extremely valuable the conclusion that "each policy has a unique and country-specific impact on both income inequality and poverty, therefore to reverse the current trends of diverging inequality, each country must implement complementary policies that simultaneously address both poverty and income inequality". I wish the audience, especially those who design Poverty Alleviation Program Development in World Bank or other International Organizations, in charge of ODA, share the same opinion.
