



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade</u>
Manuscript Number:	2014_BJEMT_9682
Title of the Manuscript:	The Impact of Accounting Ethics in Improving Managers' Behavior and Decision Making In the Jordanian Business Environment.
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:

(<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	1. In the abstract it is better to refer to the population and the attendants of the research. 2. There are too many titles before literature review that are not common in the scientific papers. You must bring them to the introduction (Study Problem, Study Importance, Study Objectives). 3. There is no conceptual theory to lead the reader to hypotheses. Please add this section before Literature Review. 4. The author must notice and review the latest papers on accounting ethics. Especially on international context. The literature review does not seem efficient (in particular there is a lack of papers after 2010). The reference of Wikipedia is not reliable in scientific papers you can also use of Webster). 5. There is the result of reliability but you can also speak about validity of your research. 6. You should present a section on your questionnaire and get more information on that, how many questions how much follow up how many distributed and how many gathered and.... 7. Why you used a mixed of attendants to answer to your questionnaires? It seems there are no reasons for that and it may affect	1. I've referred to the research population in the abstract 2. The study problem, objectives, and importance has been added to the introduction section 3. Hypotheses are included in part 4.3 under statistical analysis 4. I've added new references. 5. Reliability Test using Cronbach's Alpha was used to test the reliability. 6. The questionnaire itself has been added in the appendix section. 7. I think mixed attendants from different environments lead to better results, as ethics issue depends upon the attendants culture.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	on the results. In this case you should notice this as a limitation.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	1. The paper should rewrite to improve its English stile.	The manuscript has been thoroughly checked
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Please clarify the ethical issue	