

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	South Asian Journal of Social Studies and Economics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_SAJSSSE_127275
Title of the Manuscript:	CHALLENGES AND APPROACHES IN VALUING ASSETS AND LIABILITIES IN CONTEMPORARY ECONOMIC CONDITIONS - A REVIEW
Type of the Article	Review Article

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript is valuable to the scientific community as it tackles the critical issue of asset and liability valuation in today's economic environment. It highlights the complexities of fair value and historical cost accounting, providing insights into their impacts on financial reporting and market stability. The proposed hybrid approach offers a promising solution to mitigate volatility while aligning asset valuations with economic realities. The manuscript is timely and relevant, making a significant contribution to the discourse on financial reporting standards and economic stability. However, further clarity on the practical implementation of the hybrid model would enhance its applicability.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title "Challenges and Approaches in Valuing Assets and Liabilities in Contemporary Economic Conditions - A Review" is suitable, but it could be more specific to better reflect the manuscript's focus on the contrasting valuation methods and the proposed hybrid approach. An alternative title could be: "Valuation of Assets and Liabilities in Contemporary Economies: Challenges, Approaches, and a Hybrid Solution" This revision maintains the essence of the original title while emphasizing the key themes of challenges, approaches, and the proposed solution.	

Review Form 3

<p>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</p>	<p>The abstract presents an insightful exploration of asset and liability valuation in the context of contemporary economic conditions. However, several areas could be improved for clarity, depth, and coherence. Below is a list of suggested improvements:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Clarity and Conciseness: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The abstract could benefit from more clarity in some parts. For example, the first sentence is long and could be divided for better readability. Consider rephrasing to emphasize the importance of valuation in financial reporting before delving into specific approaches. ○ The phrase "especially during economic downturns" might be too broad and could be more specific to the context of the paper, such as "particularly during market instability or financial crises." 2. Refining Focus: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The abstract focuses on both asset and liability valuation but primarily discusses asset valuation. The role of liability valuation seems underdeveloped. Including a brief mention of the importance of liability valuation and its relationship to asset valuation could provide a more balanced view. ○ The use of "intangible and digital assets" is a significant point, but it feels a bit abrupt. Expanding on how these new asset types challenge valuation methods could be beneficial to tie it into the broader discussion. 3. Flow and Structure: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The sentence "Key case studies, such as the 2008 financial crisis, highlight the risks of fair value's market-driven valuations" could be better integrated into the discussion of fair value accounting. It might be helpful to first explain the risks of fair value accounting before introducing the case study. ○ Transitioning from the challenges posed by traditional methods to the solution (hybrid approach) feels somewhat abrupt. A more gradual transition would make the argument for a hybrid approach stronger. 4. Depth of Analysis: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The abstract mentions "complex asset types" but does not explain them in detail. Providing a clearer explanation of these assets, such as why intangible and digital assets are particularly challenging for valuation, would make the argument more compelling. ○ The hybrid approach is presented as a solution, but it would be helpful to briefly outline how this hybrid model might work or what specific elements from fair value and historical cost would be combined. This would add more depth to the suggestion. 5. Keywords: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The keywords are relevant but could be expanded. Consider adding terms like "Hybrid Valuation Method," "Market Volatility," or "Financial Crises" to capture the broader themes discussed in the abstract. 6. Methodology: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ There is mention of "an analysis of existing literature and historical data," but there is no indication of the methodology used. Including a brief mention of how the literature was analyzed (e.g., systematic review, comparative analysis) could enhance the academic rigor of the abstract. 7. Implications: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The implications section could be expanded. For instance, it could highlight how the proposed hybrid approach could improve financial decision-making, policy creation, or market stability in practical terms, not just in theoretical terms. 8. Technical Terminology: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Consider elaborating on terms like "fair value" and "historical cost accounting" for readers who may not be familiar with these concepts. A brief definition or context would improve accessibility. 	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>Yes appropriate</p>	
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>This manuscript is scientifically robust as it effectively addresses the complexities of asset and liability valuation using established accounting methods, such as fair value and historical cost. By incorporating case studies like the 2008 financial crisis, the paper grounds theoretical concepts in real-world examples. The proposed hybrid approach is a well-considered solution that balances the strengths and weaknesses of both valuation methods. Overall, the manuscript is technically sound, supported by credible literature and historical data, ensuring its scientific reliability.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>The references in the manuscript are valuable but may not be recent enough. To ensure the paper is up-to-date, I recommend incorporating references from 2021 to 2025, especially on hybrid valuation methods, economic volatility, and digital asset valuation. This would strengthen the manuscript's relevance and ensure it reflects the latest research in the field.</p>	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language quality of the article requires minor revisions for clarity and readability. While the content is generally suitable for scholarly communication, some sentences could be refined for better flow and precision. Ensuring consistency in terminology and improving sentence structure would enhance the overall readability of the paper. However, the article's core concepts and analysis are sound.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The methodology is weak and un-scholarly, The paper is good to be published upon revision	

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Sani Inusa Milala
Department, University & Country	Universiti tun Hussein on Malaysia UTHM, Malaysia