SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade**
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**	

	on the results. In this case you should notice this as a limitation.	
Minor REVISION comments	**1. The paper should rewrite to improve its English stile.**	
Optional/General comments	Please clarify the ethical issue	

Note: Anonymous Reviewer