



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade</u>
Manuscript Number:	2014_BJEMT_12880
Title of the Manuscript:	Impairment Analysis of Non-current Assets Under DCF-based test.in the Industrial Jordanian Shareholding Companies
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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	1. Please proofread and greatly enhance the writing quality of this paper. There are considerable amount of errors or improper expressions that prevent the normal understanding of the audiences. For example: 1.1 "For this study, 30 industrial companies were selected out of the 73 during the study period ,descriptive design that entails the use of percentages."; 1.2 "Cash flows on noncurrent assets indicator gas certain impact on impairment loss."; 1.3 "Ha1:Economic (discount cash flow of non-current assets) and accounting indicators (operating cash flow on non-current assets)have statistically significant on impairment of non-current assets for 2005-2006." ... 2. Where are the "appendices (1) and (2)" mentioned in page 7 of the paper? I am looking for the list of	All these unintentional errors have been changed . All hypotheses have been reformulated There was no appendices , this expression was included in the draft , that has been missent to your esteemed journal .



SDI Review Form 1.6

	holding companies. 3. The author(s) need to address how the 30 companies are selected from the 73 population. Are there any specific criteria? Are the selection neutral and is therefore well-representing the pool? The selection of sample can be very easily attacked and labelled “data mining” and the selection of observations can significantly alter the conclusion(s). 4. What is the distribution among the industries of your 30 samples? The nature of industry is extremely influential to the size and ratio of CFO, non-currents, and impairments. 5. Merge Table 3 and 4. Table 4 does not deliver any new information. 6. The conclusion of “Impairment loss can be affected by the discounted rate, cash inflow and cash outflow” cannot be supported by any convincing evidence. I do not find any panel regression or time series causal regressions that prove this. According to hypotheses testing 7. The generally acceptable route of testing “There are no statistical differences for both economic (discount cash flow of non-current assets) and accounting	Please accept my apologize for this error. yes, these companies that are disclosing , measuring impairment as part from industrial sector.
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	indicators (operating cash flow on non-current assets) as an evidence indicate no impairment of non-current assets for 2005 compared to 2006..." is the WALD test but the author(s) do not use this testing procedure, nor explain the reasons of why no so. Not in this study 8. Please avoid the seminar type of writing, such as the "bullet points" format at the end of the paper. These are for the lecture slides purpose both not for publishable papers. Okay 9. Page 18, I do not think it is necessary to suggest that "Giving the economic and financial indicators (Present value, cash flow to noncurrent assets carrying amount), more adhere and attention to impairment loss accounting... From the stakeholders' perspective, the impairment accounting should be taken as an indicator for company' (actually should be company's) evaluation for decision-making." Such action and suggestion had been made by the well-known papers long time ago, and the policy advice in this paper is lack of creativity. Similar and well-known policy implementations might be found in Dechow, Richardson, and Tuna (2003); Richardson,	
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Teoh, and Wysocki (2004). It may agree or differ , the result is new for the Jordanian industrial companies .	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Please see above.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Please see above. Please , I have benefitted from your valuable comments	