



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Advanced Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJARR_49071
Title of the Manuscript:	INTERNATIONAL FINANCIAL REPORTING STANDARD AND PERFORMANCE OF INSURANCE COMPANIES: EVIDENCE FROM NIGERIA
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 (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		
Minor REVISION comments	<p>a. The manuscript requires serious edition for incomplete words, omission of articles, repetitions, and tenses (see lines 23, 25, 33, 35, 36, 42, 72 etc). A title on page 121 was repeated in line 168.</p> <p>b. Objective No 1 should not be talking about adoption but only implementation because the country adopted IFRS in 2010. Objective Nos. 2 & 3 are not clearly stated, no mention was made of IFRS but quality financial report which is not the same with implementation of IFRS. The main objectives on line 82 should read specific objectives.</p> <p>c. The author should be more specific in stating the correct regulatory agency that was charged with the responsibility of transition to IFRS in Nigeria. The statement from line 98 to 102 disclosed that the author is not sure of the institution.</p> <p>d. There was no theory in the section of literature titled "theoretical review", that is to say, no theory was reviewed. The author(s) should find a suitable theory and discuss it in line with the topic of study. Examples are stakeholder and legitimacy theories.</p> <p>e. The work did not state the performance indicator to be used, either by expressing them in the objectives or explaining them as variables under methodology. Hence there was no source for the ROA and ROE in the analysis on Table 3 line 261.</p> <p>f. No literature was reviewed on implementation of IFRS and performance of companies instead it was on quality financial statements. No mention was also made about the particular IFRS for insurance companies. The literature should be beefed up in this area.</p> <p>g. Tables 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6 have no source for their contents.</p> <p>h. A study on performance requires quantitative data which should have been obtained from the financial statements of those companies. It was also possible to ascertain the level to which the companies adhere to or comply with IFRS or level of disclosure requirements of IFRS in the financial statements. A content analysis would have revealed the true position of the performance of the companies in relation to IFRS application.</p>	<p>Ok</p> <p>Ok</p> <p>Ok</p> <p>It has changed to Conceptual Review</p> <p>We used perceived finance Performance scale which is qualitative not quantitative.</p> <p>Please, there is no particular IFRS for insurance companies but universal financial reporting standard for all companies in the world.</p> <p>No, this study made used of scales to measure our variables, and the instruments were validated.</p>



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

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>	