



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	ABSTRACT: The findings of the study are not clearly mentioned into abstract and what factors are significant are not mentioned clearly. The paper needs to mention them. 6. Method: <i>“100 copies of the questionnaire were delivered by hand on the respondents, 92 copies were returned (percentage of 92%); these 92 copies were accepted and used in the pilot analysis (percentage of 92%) of the original distributed copies)”-----</i> If 92 copies are used for pilot study then what about actual sample size (valid accepted cases) for data analysis? Generally, pilot study is conducted before actual data analysis to know the reliability, validity and accuracy of the questionnaires. 6.1: Statistical Analysis: 1) This paper needs to provide a Table of AVE root squared. 2) It needs to provide a Table of Hypothesis	The abstract has been modified 6. Method The questionnaire number were 100, the valid questionnaires were 92 copies. The pilot study was 20 copies. I've corrected it. 6.1: 1. AVE table has been added table-5 2. Hypothesis results were presented in the conclusions 3. Another 3rd hypothesis has been added and explained.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	testing with clear demonstration. 6.3 Study Hypothesis: In this study 3 hypotheses are mentioned in the model according to factors, but author has explained 2 hypotheses only. The paper needs to be clearly explained.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	-This paper does not clearly and successfully illustrate the PLS practice in a survey research. -If the paper discloses the questionnaire it would be more convincing. - If the paper discloses the calculation Table of AVE and CR it would be more convincing.	- Another two tables has been added (table-5 and table-6) to the study in addition to its explanations - The questionnaire has been added in the appendix - AVE and CR has been included.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	-It is an interesting topic that "The Impact of Accounting Ethics in Improving Managers' Behavior and Decision Making In the Jordanian Business Environment." - The results are useful. -The contribution of the research needs to be explained clearly. -The paper needs careful revision and the language problems should be fixed. Please clarify the ethical issues	