Dependency of Financial Information Disclosure Quality on Auditor Expertise, Tenure, and Size: Evidence from the Iraq Stock Exchange

Hussein Ali. Mohaisen [1] , Rahman. Saedi [1*] , Khalid. Sabah Ali [2] , Hamzeh. Mohammadi Khoshouei [1]

[1] Department of Accounting, Isfahan (Khorasgan) Branch, Islamic Azad University, Isfahan, Iran
[2] Department of Finance and Banking, Mustansiriyah University, Baghdad, Iraq

* Corresponding author email address: r.saedi@khuisf.ac.ir

Editor	Reviewers
Aliakbar Aminbeidokhti Educational Administration, Faculty of Psychology and Educational Sciences, Semnan University, Semnan, Iran kafashpor@um.ac.ir	**Reviewer 1:** Lourdes Atiaja Atiaja Universidad de las Fuerzas Armadas ESPE, Ecuador. Email: natiaja@espe.edu.ec **Reviewer 2:** Marco Yamba-Yugsi Unidad Académica de Posgrado, Universidad Católica de Cuenca, Azuay 010101, Ecuador Email: marco.yamba@ucacue.edu.ec

1. Round 1

1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

"The primary task of the financial disclosure system is to prevent conflicts of interest by offering high-quality financial reporting that objectively reflects the economic reality of a company's activities."

Comment: This paragraph would benefit from additional citations to support the assertion about the primary task of the financial disclosure system. Consider adding references to foundational works in the field of financial reporting and disclosure.

"Descriptive Statistics of Research Variables"

Comment: Ensure that all abbreviations and terms used in the table are clearly defined in the text. For example, explain what "DACCit" and "OPAQUEit" stand for and how they are calculated.

"Based on the results observed in Table 3, the test statistics are below 5%."

Comment: Provide more detail on the Levin-Lin-Chu unit root test used for stationarity analysis. Explain the rationale for choosing this test and how its results support the stationarity of the variables.

"Hypothesis 1: There is a significant relationship between auditor industry expertise and the quality of financial information disclosure."

Comment: Include a discussion on the potential implications of the findings for practitioners and policymakers. How might these results influence the practices of auditors and the policies of regulatory bodies?

"The results obtained based on statistical evidence indicated that financial information disclosure is significantly influenced by such impactful variables."

Comment: This statement is too general. Specify which variables had the most significant impact and discuss any unexpected findings or deviations from previous research.

Response: Thank you for your comment. I will consider these comments.

1.2.   Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

"Factors such as relevance, faithful representation, timeliness, understandability, and verifiability can help analysts effectively evaluate a company's performance and outlook."

Comment: It would be helpful to provide specific examples or case studies that illustrate how these factors have impacted financial disclosure quality in past research.

"From a target population of 127 financial companies active in the Iraq Stock Exchange between 2015 and 2023, we selected 46 companies using a systematic elimination method."

Comment: Clarify the criteria used for the systematic elimination method. Provide a detailed description of how the 46 companies were selected and any potential biases that may have been introduced.

"This study employed a descriptive-correlational research method."

Comment: Elaborate on the choice of a descriptive-correlational design. Discuss why this design was appropriate for the research questions and how it compares to other potential designs.

"Further research in this area is necessary to fully understand the impact of these variables on the quality of financial information disclosure."

Comment: Suggest specific avenues for future research. For example, recommend exploring additional variables or using different methodological approaches to validate the findings.

Response: Thank you for your comment. I will consider these comments.

2.   Revised

Editor's decision after revisions: Accepted.
Editor in Chief's decision: Accepted.