



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJEMT_20575
Title of the Manuscript:	Do International Financial Reporting Standards Influence Malaysian and Nigerian Banks Earnings Management Goals?
Type of the 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 <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>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	- Many sentences are too long such that they are difficult to digest. As a rule of thumb, a good sentence consists of no more than 22 words - You choose Malaysian and Nigerian banks as the object of study. Why? With the lack of the-state-of-the-art, how you come up with the statement that IFRS should be globally adopted by banks? - The list of references does not reflect the cited references in the text. There is no 1-1 correspondence among those sets of references - Writing style of the cited references is not consistent especially when you use an "et al." abbreviation - To use an abbreviation you have to define it first. Once it has been defined, then you use it in the rest of the paper - Many statistical terminologies are used in the text. To make them clear, you need to elaborate them - There are so many unnecessary repetitions in the text - This paper is not well written - In lines 52-53 you write "the literature of the study". Do you mean "the results of literature study"? - In line 82 you mention Teoh, Welch, & Wong (1998). But, it does not exist in the list of	Thanks for the thorough review. Most of the observations are effected as highlighted in the manuscript. Few however, may likely need clarification. McFadden R^2 is also called Pseudo-R^2 and like normal R^2 measures the fitness of a logit model. In the case of observation 11, it is a result of previous study. Also, regarding observation 36, should I supply the annual reports used or data set extracted from those reports? Thanks once again.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	references 11. In line 97 you mention about “forecast” but then there is no discussion about it in the rest of the paper. So, what is the relevance? 12. In line 186 you cite Paglietti (2009). But, it does not exist in the list of references 13. Line 212. For transparency, the list of all Malaysian and Nigerian banks should be put in the text 14. Line 215. What do you want to say in the last sentence? 15. In lines 227-228 you write the definition of RR_{it}? Is it your own definition? If not, you need to cite the reference 16. Lines 232-233. Look at #7 for the definition of SPP_n 17. Line 234. It is strange that the error term is written without specifying the assumptions that must be fulfilled 18. Line 235. You have to explain why the concern is on the sign and not the magnitude of the coefficient. So, why you do not need to make statistical inference? 19. Line 239-240. You use logit model as a black box without any assumption. Since it a statistical model, in a good paper all assumptions are provided 20. Lines 248-249. Look at #7 for the definition of LNL_{it} 21. Line 251. Look at #10 for LNL_{it} 22. Lines 272-283 are not necessary because it is only a wording of Table 1 and it does not contain your own reflection 23. In lines 305-307, numbers are not necessary but sign 24. What does McFadden $R^2 = 32.8\%$ means? 25. Line 310. It is meaningless to say “statistically	
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	significant” without mentioning the level of significance 26. Lines 319-324. Similar comment to the #15 27. In line 326, what does McFadden $R^2 = 31.2\%$ means? 28. Similar comment as at # 17 for the last two words in lines 327-328 29. Similar to #14, lines 348-359 do not reflect your own interpretation 30. In lines 379-383, numbers are not necessary but sign 31. In line 385-386, what does McFadden $R^2 = 35.5\%$ means? 32. Line 387. What is the level of significance? 33. Lines 396-403. Numbers are not necessary but sign 34. Line 405. What does McFadden $R^2 = 35.8\%$ means? 35. Line 407. What is the level of significance? 36. The readers of this paper cannot verify the results in all Tables 1-7 because they have no access to the source of data. This is unusual in a scientific report	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		