

Review of: "Corporate giving as earnings quality signal: some new evidence from Nigeria"

Prashant Gupta¹

¹ Mahindra École Centrale

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Following are the observations from the article.

1. Abstract

1. The article needs to provide a reason for re-examining the effect of CSR disclosure on earnings quality.
2. There are discussions on tabling a law for mandatory CSR spending. The author could replace the sentence stating that there is no law with the fact that it is under consideration.
3. The text under the heading of originality should be rewritten to enhance the reading experience. The author could explain what the critical result index is. Instead of using the word probably, the author could state it to the best of his knowledge.
4. Under the heading practical implications, if a law is already table, the policymakers are already paying attention to CSR. How can this be an implication, then? I understand that since there is no law, you want to bring the attention of policymakers so that a law can be framed. However, a law is already under consideration in Nigeria. Isn't it?

2. Introduction:

1. Many articles have been cited in the first paragraph. Are these papers on Nigeria? It should be added.
2. The last line of the first paragraph states that an essential aspect of research design needs to be included. Please mention which aspect.
3. The first sentence of the second paragraph mentions that the research design is practical significance focused. This should be explained.

3. Literature Review

1. Some facts and figures should be added to the section.
2. The first sentence of the second paragraph uses the word climates. What does it mean in the sentence?
3. The acronym of EM has been used in several places. The author should use the full form at the first usage and then use the acronym.
4. Three theories have been used here. The section should be rewritten to emphasize the relation of the theories with CSR, especially legitimacy theory.
5. The second last paragraph states that the central idea is the same. The author should mention what the central

idea is.

4. Methodology:

1. The period for the study stops in 2018. The reason is that the data was available till 2018, when the study was initiated. The data must now be available until 2022 as publicly listed firms are being used in the sample. The author suggests that the analysis be redone with updated data.
2. Financial companies have been removed from the sample due to their peculiar nature. The article should state the peculiar nature and why it necessitates the removal. Also, state the number of companies here to enhance the reading experience.
3. The study states that the number of observations is 300. Later the study states that it is 281 as 19 observations were removed. The author should be consistent in stating the number of observations.
4. The variable's code used in the study should be defined first. For example, ABS_DA was used without stating what it is. The reader will have to go to the table to understand its meaning. I suggest the author refrain from using codes in the text. If the variable is being used repetitively, the author should use the variable name at the first instance, state the code used for it and then use the code from the next instance.
5. The author states that corporate giving measures CSR because it is the most reliable in Nigeria. Why?
6. Why has the log transformation been used for corporate donation amount? The reason should be stated.
7. The methodology section should mention the table where the variables are defined.
8. The justification for using FE/RE should be provided.

5. Results:

6. Several sentences in the results should be shifted to the methodology section.

1. Outliers
2. Avoidance of pronounced gaps
3. Significant observations from descriptive statistics should be mentioned, if any.
4. Cite papers whenever the article mentions previous literature. It will provide authenticity.
5. Mention the table number referring to additional analysis.
6. The discussion should also include a logical explanation of the statistical results. The discussion should be in the context of Nigeria.
7. The paper mentions that the study is based on the fact that statistical analysis is not the only base for making conclusions about the theory. It mentions '...beyond the conventional wisdom of statistical significance...' Did the author mean that conclusions can be drawn despite statistically significant results? If yes, how? The article is not clear about it.
8. The discussion section should end with a 1-2 line conclusion of the findings.

7. Conclusion

1. The conclusion only mentions the agency theory and ignores the other two theories discussed.

2. The conclusion refers to the study by (Uyau & Dabor, 2017) as the earliest study. There must be other prior studies. Searching any journal database will give out many more papers published before 2017.
3. The conclusion mentions that the study provides necessary inputs. The author should expressly state what these inputs are.
8. The author must proofread the article as it is loosely written in most places. Several grammatical errors need to be corrected. Sentence continuity is an issue too. The article needs to be significantly improved as far as the writing quality is concerned. It feels like a draft.
9. The author should focus on discretionary accruals as the theme of the paper rather than the relationship between CSR and earning quality, as there are numerous similar studies on Nigeria.
10. The paper needs significant improvement before being considered for publication. The paper in its current form is not fit for publication.