

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEBA_85141
Title of the Manuscript:	A research of the accounting impact of the new standard on debt restructuring
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:

(<https://www.journalajebo.com/index.php/AJEBA/editorial-policy>)

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	<p>Provide a detailed description of data used in the collected and analysed study for the current topic “A research of the accounting impact of the new standard on debt restructuring”.</p> <p>Provide a detailed discussion of results, especially in terms of comparing the results with findings in the literature on the subject and discussion on policy-related implications of the results. The manuscript should be edited thoroughly for language. Methods: Need improvement in the organization.</p> <p>The authors should consider the following seriously:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Abstract has a grammatical mistake.2. Abstract is not focused.3. Rationale for using dynamic population dynamics and investments. is not properly spelt out.4. At the end of the introduction the author should spell out the sections with numbers.5. Some intuitive graphs or scattered plots may be presented in the introductory section to motivate readers to justify the linkages between population dynamics and investments.6. Section numbering is not done and subsections are not mentioned with numbers. The organization is slightly scattered and need more discipline.7. I can propose some orders as follows: <p>1. Introduction; 2. Literature Review; 2.1 Theoretical literature; 2.2 Empirical Literature; 3. Theory and Econometric Model; 4. Results and Interpretation; 5. Robustness of Results; 6. Conclusion and Policy Suggestion. The manuscript is weak. The Methodological details are missing. Thus, I recommend major revision My specific comment follows;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Author needs to give a detailed analysis of all the methods.2. Little more detailed analysis of policy implication <p>The author can provide a solid statistical theoretical basis that the item is not deleted. Because the purpose of your research is to build a model. If the instrument is not statistically valid, then your further built model is not fit. In my opinion, even though an instrument has a very established theoretical basis, in reality, the factor loading value did not prove, to meet the requirements, so it should be removed. Because it could be, it will be the difference between your research and other research, right?</p> <p>The interpretation is not sufficient as the authors need to test the effect of the proposed relationships and thus come out with meaningful conclusions. I believe that the paper in its current form has fewer contributions. As the previous comment has not yet been addressed, the interpretation needs revisions as well. Please make sure that all references are being cited in the text. I think it is best for this initial model to have its methodological delimitation The manuscript should be organized well and arranged correctly according to the ethics of the journal and the standards COPE. Authors also should consider the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Authors should provide a streamlined objectives/aim of the study, motivation for conducting the study and the potential contribution of the findings to methodology or relevant policy.- Provide an extensive literature review on the subject studied.- Provide a detailed description of the methods used.- Results must provide answers to the questions raised in the objectives or hypothesis.- Provide a detailed discussion of the results. Discuss the implications of the results on relevant policy or strategy.- The conclusions must be based on the most important conclusions that can be drawn from the results. <p>the author needs to highlight the finding of the study in the abstract and the introduction sections.</p> <p>There are serious problems with the method of the study. I mentioned it in detail in the referee report.</p> <p>The findings of the study have not been fully explained. After the problems in the method are resolved, the new findings to be obtained should be rewritten by comparing them with the findings in the literature.</p> <p>Interpretation should be more satisfying and persuasive.</p>	

Review Form 1.6

	<p>There are few citations in the sections after the literature part. The findings of the study should be compared with the literature. Models should be clearly explained. Deficiencies in the study should be corrected by considering studies in reputable journals. The article should be revised considering how good work should be written.</p> <p>Author or authors (henceforth authors) indicate that their results show that there are risk spillover effects across regions in both crisis and stable periods. This result supports the government's decision to require all the new accounting standard on debt restructuring</p> <p>Authors should consider the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Language editing and proof reading is highly recommended for academic writing2. if the research problem and hypotheses can be stated clearly, it will be easy to understand the findings to the reader3.It is recommended to re-write the conclusion with more details while addressing the research problem and hypotheses while elaborating the implications. Further, it is suggested to add the significance of the study for the government, policy makers and other regulatory bodies, general public and other interested parties. <p>The paper needs a real revision as per comments which mentioned above.</p> <p>Additionally, I have here few observations:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1) justification of study is missing.2) literature review needs up-gradation. Some papers relating to the topic and subject of the study can be added.3) update references. <p>Methods: Please explain how could use the current model correctly by providing real examples.</p> <p>Finally, the methods need to be modified and to be satisfied to reach for the requested results of the study, because the methods are still weak somehow and should be revised in my opinion.</p> <p>The methods need to be specific and chosen according to real and correct hypotheses.</p> <p>The conclusion section still does not improve well according to the data analysis. Please develop it as should as be.</p> <p>However, the authors should consider some issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The authors did not use a multiple linear regression model.• The authors have to understand from the mathematical point of view must introduce the graphical representations of the input data and the obtained results for all hypotheses.• This study could provide the opportunity and space for authors and researchers from various other countries to conduct other studies in the same field based on this study and its results.• The mathematical modelling must be introduced to introduce for all readers all aspects, which characterize a regression analysis.• The results should compare with other approaches, other than linear regression.• It appears that the paper is prepared in a rush.• The author needs to do more thorough works on the literature. <p>The authors should also consider the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The study variables used in descriptive statistics are correct and sound and provide a statistical and logical description of the study problem.• The hypotheses of the study are sound, correct and logical, but the authors can formulate them more clearly and broadly.• Except otherwise stated, all regressing macroeconomic data that are not stationary can result in a spurious result, which can be misleading in policy direction.• There is a need to improve on the literature.• English writing ability needs to be strengthened.• I recommend the authors present the novelty of this research compared to previous research.• The authors must develop conclusions.• Language editing is mandatorily required to improve the quality of the paper.• References should be written in a unified format.	
--	---	--

Review Form 1.6

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It would be very useful to add in the "Introduction" section the purpose, objectives and hypothesis of the research. • The state the equation describing the method used and noticed that is still weak. • The literature section is missing in the study. This section should be written directly after the introduction section and should contain a large number of related previous studies. <p>Thus, all macroeconomic data are expected to be subjected to a unit root test first to determine their stationarity. If data are found out not to be stationary at all, then there is no need to regress them.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The authors need to give a brief description of relevant theories. • State the equation did not describe the method used. • The empirical part of this paper may need to be strengthened. <p>Therefore, the authors must adhere to the technical and standard journal ethics, add the missing parts in the study and arrange them according to the principles of the journal's moral and guiding policy, according to the principles to be followed.</p> <p>There are missing parts in the study (Ethics and Editorial Policies), such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Authorship (Author Contributions) • Raw Data • Data Deposition • Related Works • Reporting Standards • Declarations section • Additional information • Statistical resources <p>The authors should cite and consider these following papers to the current study:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) Baker L., Fasb Updates Accounting for Debt Restructuring Tax-News.com, New York, 13 October 2010 b) Calandrini C., Ristrutturazione del debito e crisi dell'impresa, [Debt restructuring and enterprise crisis] brief considerations on OIC 6, in Il Fallimentarista, Giuffrè Editore, March 2013 c) Document of the National Union of Young Chartered Accountants of 25 May 2010. d) Goodman B., Braunstein D.N., Reinstein A., Gregory G. W., Explaining Auditors' Going Concern Decisions: Assessing Management Capability, in Journal of Applied Business Research Vol. 11, n.3, 1995. e) Kleinman G., Anandarajan A. , The Usefulness of off-balance sheet variables as predictors of auditors' going concern opinions: an empirical analysis in Managerial Auditing Journal, Vol. 14, issue 6, 1999. f) Koh D. H. C., Low C. , Going Concern Prediction using data mining techniques, in Managerial Auditing Journal, Vol. 19, issue n.3, 2004 g) Martin R. D., Going-concern Uncertainty Disclosures and Conditions: Comparison of French, German and US Practices, in Journal of International Accounting, Auditing and Taxation, Vol. 9, Issue 2, June 2000 h) Hall, M. Accounting information and managerial work. <i>Account. Organ. Soc.</i> 2010, 35, 301–315. [CrossRef] i) Socea, A.-D. Managerial decision-making and financial accounting information. <i>Procedia-Soc. Behav. Sci.</i> 2012, 58, 47–55. [CrossRef] j) Nilsson, F.; Stockenstrand, A.K. <i>Financial Accounting and Management Control. The Tensions and Conflicts between Uniformity and Uniqueness</i>; Springer: Berlin/Heidelberg, Germany, 2015. Available online: http://www.microlinkcolleges.net/elib/files/undergraduate/Management/Financial%20Accounting%20And%20Manageme.pdf (accessed on 20 September 2021). k) Jones, D.M.C. Accounting for human assets. <i>Manag. Decis.</i> 1973, 11, 183–194. [CrossRef] l) Singh, A. Proposed Lease Accounting Changes: Implications for the Restaurant and Retail Indus-tries. <i>J. Hosp. Tour. Res.</i> 2012, 36. [CrossRef] m) Brennan, N.; Gray, S.J. The impact of materiality: Accounting's best kept secret. <i>Asian Acad. Manag. J. Account. Financ.</i> 2005, 1, 1–31. n) Holthausen, R.W.; Watts, R.L. The relevance of the value-relevance literature for financial accounting standard setting. <i>J. Account. Econ.</i> 2001, 31, 3–75. [CrossRef] o) McKee, T.E.; Aasmund, E. Current materiality guidance for auditors. <i>CPA J.</i> 2000, 54–58. Available online: https://openaccess.nhh.no/nhh-xmlui/bitstream/handle/11250/166032/A51_00.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y (accessed on 30 December 2021).
--	--

Review Form 1.6

	*All texts in the main file of the manuscript which highlighted in yellow colour should be revised and improved.	
Minor REVISION comments	Comments to authors: (Additional Evaluation) <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The manuscript requires a professional language revision (proofreading). The authors must follow the publishing rules and the editorial policies of this journal well, and adjust the manuscript according to the rules of this journal and in an orderly manner. The manuscript is within the scope of the journal. It is preferable to separate the study literature from the hypotheses and to make each of them in its part. It is preferable to support and strengthen the introduction better than that, and the focus must be on clarification more. It is better to link references at the beginning of the paragraphs rather than at the end. The hypotheses of the study are laid down systematically and in a logical sequence, and they should be clear and readable for the readers. In the methods section, we must focus on the most important terrorist incidents that took place in the period mentioned in the study. The most important causes and factors that led to such incidents must be clarified and the possible means to properly control them. In my opinion, the authors of this study can make better and more appropriate recommendations based on the findings of the study they reached. The econometric model used in the study to achieve its objectives is a good and appropriate model for the study, through which more results can be settled if the authors set more research variables than the current ones. In the Future Studies section, it is important to have an explanation of major and important reasons for conducting future studies on this topic for the current study. Authors must support their recommendations in this part and direct them to other researchers to conduct this study in world-leading universities and institutes and to be at the center of their interests. Researchers need to update the development of these theories. The novelty of the study should be indicated in a special section at the end of the study after the conclusions section. The theories of the study are still not clear and need more explanations. The study was incorrect organized and needs to be organized well. Language editing and proofreading are highly recommended for academic writing. If the research problem and hypotheses can be stated clearly, it will be easy to understand the findings to the reader It is recommended to re-write the conclusion with more details while addressing the research problem and hypotheses while elaborating the implications. Further, it is suggested to add the significance of the study for the government, policymakers and other regulatory bodies, general public and other interested parties. The justification of the study is missing. Literature review needs up-gradation. Some papers relating to Heliyon can be added. Update references. 	
Optional/General comments		

[Review Form 1.6](#)

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:	Nemer Badwan
Department, University & Country	Palestine Economic Policy Research Institute – MAS, Palestine