

**Title:** Shortfall of Domestic Resources to Eradicate Extreme Poverty by 2030

## **Summary**

This paper explores the potential fulfilment of SDG1, which focuses on eradicating poverty by 2030. The analysis is structured around three distinct scenarios: (1) poverty eradication achieved exclusively through economic growth, (2) implementation of two extreme tax schedules, and (3) global redistribution to address poverty.

The topic is highly relevant, as achieving the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) remains a pressing global challenge, with poverty eradication at its core. However, as it stands, the paper does not fully meet the standard expected for publication in The Journal of Development Studies. In the following comments, I outline major areas for improvement that I believe will strengthen the paper's contribution and overall impact.

## **Major comments**

I encourage the authors to ensure that the text is clear and concise. For instance, terms such as "imputation of national growth rates" and "extreme tax schedules" should be clearly explained for a broader audience. Another example of unclear statements can be found in the introduction (second paragraph). "I fix the rate (at 100%) and find the required taxation threshold". From the very beginning of the paper, it is not clear what this sentence means. The first paragraph of Section 3.4 reads, "Figure 2 presents the (additional) tax rate". What does additional mean? Additional to the antipoverty cap?

The authors need to better articulate the specific contribution of their work. The paper appears to be an updated application of previous studies, particularly those by Bolch et al. (2022). However, the novelty of the current study is not sufficiently clear. For example, while the authors highlight the imputation of national growth rates and the use of a poverty line aligned with SDG1, these aspects are not sufficiently emphasized or contextualized within the broader literature. How does this paper advance the field beyond being an update? Does it offer new insights into the policy implications of SDG1? Are the results of the scenarios robust to different assumptions about economic growth or redistribution? These points should be explicitly addressed to establish the paper's unique contribution.

The literature review needs significant improvement. In the last paragraph of the introduction, the authors briefly mention that their work is related to studies on global income distribution but fail to explain how and why. In addition, I wonder how do the scenarios modeled in this paper compare with similar exercises in the literature? Are there methodological or theoretical advancements introduced here? Strengthening the link to prior research will help readers understand the relevance and placement of the study within the broader academic debate.

While the three scenarios provide a useful framework, they are not adequately justified. Why were these specific scenarios chosen? Are they exhaustive or representative of potential pathways to achieving SDG1?

For the growth-only scenario, is the assumption of uniform distribution of economic growth realistic? What do historical trends or projected economic conditions say? Assuming that these trends prevail in the upcoming years, how could they affect the results?

In the global redistribution scenario, how are political feasibility and implementation challenges addressed? These considerations are critical for translating the findings into actionable insights.

Related to taxation scenarios, I wonder if the antipoverty cap would not generate new poor individuals. If the whole income share up to a certain threshold is completely redistributed to the bottom, all individuals with incomes above that level would automatically have zero income and become poor.

A thorough discussion of the study's limitations is essential to enhance its credibility and contextualize its findings. This discussion should be integrated into the final sections of the paper to provide a balanced perspective and acknowledge potential constraints. For instance, the scenarios are based on specific assumptions about global trends and policies, which may not account for heterogeneity across countries and regions. A discussion about these contextual factors would help frame the study's conclusions more accurately. The study focuses primarily on economic variables, such as growth, taxation, and redistribution.

However, non-economic factors like education, healthcare access, and social protection systems also play critical roles in poverty reduction. Acknowledging the exclusion of these dimensions would provide a more nuanced view of the analysis.