

Reviews of ECONJOURNAL-D-24-00088R1

Accounting Comparability and Labor Productivity: Evidence from China's A-Share Listed Firms

Round 1

Reviewer 1

Strengths

The work deals with an original subject and is generally well-written.

minor issues

"The rationality of the research and the theoretical, empirical, and practical justification for why this research should be carried out" should be further strengthened.

The analyses used should be summarized in a paragraph somewhere at the beginning of the method section.

Some minor typos and general final proofreading are needed.

major issue

The discussion part could be more robust.

The impact on the practice part should be strengthened within the framework of the Chinese context.

Future research suggestions are superficial; research suggestions built on the constraints of the research, especially within the Chinese context, should be shared.

Reviewer 1

The authors investigate the impact of accounting comparability on labor productivity using a sample of Chinese listed firms from 2011 to 2022. This is an important topic that links accounting information quality and operational performance. However, there are some issues in the current paper that require major revisions:

Theoretical framework. While the paper outlines two potential mechanisms through which accounting comparability could impact labor productivity, the theoretical underpinnings are not thoroughly developed and critically discussed. Key assumptions and boundary conditions need to be more clearly explained.

Measurement of variables. More justification is needed for the proxies used to measure the core constructs of accounting comparability and labor productivity. Alternative specifications should be considered and robustness tests performed to ensure the results are not sensitive to measurement choices.

Empirical strategy. A two-way fixed effects model is applied but endogeneity is not adequately addressed. Instrumental variables or other techniques are necessary to establish causality rather than just correlation. It is also not clear whether the fixed effects model is the most appropriate given the dynamic nature of the variables.

Control variables. The set of controls used in the regressions needs to more comprehensively capture firm-specific and time-varying factors found in prior literature to influence labor productivity. Leaving out key determinants may bias the results.

Testing mechanisms. The tests of human capital accumulation and agency costs as transmission channels are underdeveloped and not convincingly shown. More nuanced analyses are required here.

Additional analyses. Moderation effects and alternative samples/subgroups should be examined to enhance the inferences that can be drawn from the findings.

Authors should use the articles of the following articles and distinguish them with "green color":

<https://doi.org/10.1155/2021/5565605>

<https://doi.org/10.3390/su152014814>

https://www.journal-fbs.com/article_178952.html?lang=en

Reviewer 2

This work dealt with the effect of accounting comparability, one of the various quality attributes of accounting information, on firms' labor productivity. The findings imply that accounting comparability can significantly improve firms' labor productivity, suggesting that enhancing accounting information quality can maximize operational effectiveness and lead to intensive growth. The outcomes obtained appear reasonable and can attract numerous readers. However, some suggestions and revisions to improve the quality of the manuscript should be considered before acceptance:

- 1) Highlights should be added to the manuscript.
- 2) The manuscript should be revised from an English-language perspective.
- 3) Add in the abstract the most quantitatively significant results obtained. It seems that the abstract is not well presented.
- 4) The main novelty of this research should be added in the last part of the introduction. Additionally, how does this research address the main question?
- 5) How does it expand the subject area compared to other published materials?

6) What specific improvements should the authors consider in terms of methodology? What other controls should be considered?

7) Discussion and conclusions should be separated. In this regard, the length of the "Discussion" section should not exceed the sum of other sections (introduction, material and methods, and results), and it should be completed within 6-7 paragraphs. Each paragraph should not contain more than 200 words, and hence, words should be counted repeatedly. The "Discussion" section can be generally divided into three separate paragraphs: 1) an introduction paragraph; 2) intermediate paragraphs; and 3) a concluding paragraph.

Round 2

Reviewer 1

All my previous comments have been incorporated in the revised version. It can be accepted in present form.