

DIGITAL ACCOUNTING TRANSFORMATION IN SMES: A FRAMEWORK FOR RELIABLE FINANCIAL REPORTING

Raden Roro Fatma Sari, SE., MSI, Anggun Yolistina, S.Kom

1 Universitas Sangga Buana YPKP

2 Universitas Sangga Buana YPKP

sarie801@yahoo.com, Anggun_yolistina@gmail.com

Abstract

Background: Digital accounting is often introduced as a technology project, yet its value depends on whether transactions become more complete, traceable and useful for decisions. For SMEs, the central problem is not the absence of software; it is the gap between software adoption and reliable accounting routines. **Aims:** This article examines the mechanisms that connect the topic to organizational or policy performance and identifies the conditions that make those mechanisms stronger or weaker. **Research Method:** A structured narrative review integrates peer-reviewed research with authoritative policy, statistical, and professional sources, including OECD (2023); Verhoef et al. (2021). **Sources** are coded by outcome, mechanism, boundary condition, and practical implication. **Results and Conclusion:** The synthesis indicates that outcomes are heterogeneous. Automation can make weak processes move faster. If account mapping, document discipline, access rights and review responsibilities are unclear, a digital system may produce reports more quickly without making them more dependable. Six recurring themes show that implementation quality, information, capability, and institutional context frequently matter as much as the headline policy or technology. **Contribution:** The article offers an evidence-based framework for small and medium-sized enterprises that translates the literature into decision principles without claiming primary data that were not collected.

Keywords: *Digital Accounting, SMEs, Financial Reporting, Cloud Accounting, Internal Control, Data Quality*

Introduction

Digital accounting is often introduced as a technology project, yet its value depends on whether transactions become more complete, traceable and useful for decisions. For SMEs, the central problem is not the absence of software; it is the gap between software adoption and reliable accounting routines. This question is timely for SMEs moving from spreadsheet-based or manual bookkeeping toward cloud platforms, integrated sales systems and digital payments. Recent institutional and research sources such as OECD (2024b); OECD (2023) provide the broader context for the discussion.

Automation can make weak processes move faster. If account mapping, document discipline, access rights and review responsibilities are unclear, a digital system may produce reports more quickly without making them more dependable. For small and medium-sized enterprises, the practical issue is therefore to separate the part of the problem that can be managed internally from the part that depends on markets, infrastructure or public policy. That distinction keeps the analysis from turning into either technological optimism or policy fatalism.

The topic also has a measurement problem. Organizations tend to record what is easiest to observe, while the outcome that matters is often delayed, distributed across functions or affected by several causes at once. World Bank (2025); ACFE (2024) illustrate why aggregate indicators are useful for context but insufficient for firm-level judgment. A good analysis must connect the indicator to a mechanism and then ask whether the mechanism is plausible in the specific operating environment.

Another complication is heterogeneity. Small and medium-sized enterprises do not start from the same position. Size, skills, access to finance, technology, governance quality and market exposure all shape the capacity to respond. The same intervention can therefore be beneficial for one organization

and premature for another. This variation is not a weakness in the literature; it is information about the conditions under which a practice is likely to work.

The article asks three questions. First, which mechanisms explain the relationship implied by the title? Second, which organizational or institutional conditions strengthen or weaken those mechanisms? Third, what can decision makers do without assuming that a single policy, technology or management tool will solve the entire problem? The questions are deliberately practical because the objective is to support judgment rather than to manufacture a universal formula.

The contribution is an integrative framework that treats performance as the result of interacting choices. It organizes recent evidence around six themes, identifies recurring tensions, and translates the synthesis into a set of actions for small and medium-sized enterprises. The article does not claim original survey or experimental data. It is a structured evidence review intended for author development and editorial refinement before any formal publication decision.

Literature Review

The literature relevant to this topic sits across more than one field. Some sources focus on macro or institutional conditions, while others examine organizational routines, technology adoption or behavioral responses. Kraus et al. (2022); OECD (2024b); COSO (2013) are representative of that range. Reading them together is useful because a change in the external environment affects performance only after it passes through decisions about resources, incentives and implementation.

A first conceptual distinction is between an input and a capability. An input may be a technology, source of finance, policy instrument, data set or formal rule. A capability is the repeated ability to use that input well. The distinction matters for small and medium-sized enterprises because adoption can be measured immediately, whereas capability often becomes visible only when conditions are difficult or when the organization must adapt without losing control.

A second distinction concerns efficiency and resilience. Many practices improve average performance by reducing slack, duplication or transaction cost. Yet highly optimized systems can become brittle if they lack alternative suppliers, skills, channels or decision pathways. The relevant question is not whether slack is good or bad, but which forms of redundancy protect important outcomes and which merely preserve inefficient routines. COSO (2013); OECD (2023) provide useful context for this trade-off.

Finally, the literature suggests that trust and information quality are recurring mediators. Managers, employees, customers, investors or citizens act on information only when they regard the process behind it as sufficiently credible. That observation links seemingly different topics: financial reporting, digital platforms, team innovation and public policy all depend on the quality of information and the legitimacy of the process through which decisions are made.

Analytical dimension	Central question	Practical concern
From digitization to accounting transformation	scanning invoices or replacing paper journals is different from redesigning the flow of transaction data into financial statements	firms can mistake a new interface for a new control environment
Data quality and chart-of-accounts discipline	consistent master data, account coding and transaction dates determine whether reports can be reconciled	duplicate customers, inconsistent product codes and manual overrides erode trust in dashboards
Integration with payments, sales and inventory	connected systems reduce repeated entry and improve timeliness when interfaces are correctly designed	integration errors can spread across modules and become harder to detect than isolated manual mistakes
Internal control in cloud environments	access controls, approval rules and segregation of duties remain necessary even when processes are automated	SMEs may concentrate administrator privileges in one person because teams are small
Skills and managerial use of reports	accounting transformation succeeds when owners and managers understand what the numbers mean and act on them	technical training alone does not create financial literacy or disciplined review

Cybersecurity and continuity	financial data becomes more available but also more exposed to credential theft, ransomware and service outages	SMEs often lack dedicated security staff and formal recovery procedures
------------------------------	---	---

Research Method

This article uses a structured narrative review. The purpose is interpretive rather than meta-analytic: sources are selected to clarify mechanisms, boundary conditions and practical implications, not to pool coefficients that were estimated from different populations and methods.

The evidence base for this draft includes 8 core references covering research, policy reports, standards or official statistics. Priority is given to sources published from 2020 onward, with older references retained only where they are widely used to define a core organizational or accounting concept. The review does not use unattributed web commentary as evidence.

Each source is read against four coding questions: what outcome is being explained; what mechanism is proposed; what conditions appear to strengthen or weaken the effect; and what decision can reasonably be informed by the finding. The six analytical themes used in the results section emerged from that coding and from the problem structure defined in the introduction.

The method has limitations. Evidence drawn from different sectors, countries and research designs cannot support one causal coefficient for SMEs moving from spreadsheet-based or manual bookkeeping toward cloud platforms, integrated sales systems and digital payments. In addition, this editorial draft has not been validated with interviews or original field data. Its claims are therefore framed as a synthesis of supported mechanisms and practical propositions that should be reviewed by the named authors before publication.

Source	Primary relevance	Use in this review
Knudsen (2020)	digitalization of accounting and information boundaries	Used for contextual or thematic synthesis
Verhoef et al. (2021)	multidisciplinary digital-transformation framework	Used for contextual or thematic synthesis
Kraus et al. (2022)	business and management research on digital transformation	Used for contextual or thematic synthesis
OECD (2024b)	digital technology, policy, skills and trust	Used for contextual or thematic synthesis
OECD (2023)	SME networks, resilience, trade, skills and technology	Used for contextual or thematic synthesis
COSO (2013)	internal-control principles and components	Used for contextual or thematic synthesis

Results and Discussion

From digitization to accounting transformation

A useful way to read this issue is to start with the decision that managers actually have to make. Scanning invoices or replacing paper journals is different from redesigning the flow of transaction data into financial statements. That distinction matters because firms can mistake a new interface for a new control environment. In SMEs moving from spreadsheet-based or manual bookkeeping toward cloud platforms, integrated sales systems and digital payments, this can change the economics and timing of decisions even when the broad direction of policy or technology appears favorable. The sources reviewed for this draft, including ACFE (2024); World Bank (2025), are useful because they place the issue inside a wider system of incentives, capabilities and constraints rather than treating one variable as sufficient. For small and medium-sized enterprises, the practical response is to start with the reporting process and then configure technology around it. That response is deliberately modest: it does not remove uncertainty, but it makes the trade-off visible and easier to govern.

The point also has an organizational side. Scanning invoices or replacing paper journals is different from redesigning the flow of transaction data into financial statements, but the benefit depends on who owns the information, who is permitted to act on it and how exceptions are handled. A common failure mode is to adopt the visible part of a practice while leaving the underlying routine unchanged.

Firms can mistake a new interface for a new control environment. This helps explain why organizations exposed to similar conditions can report very different outcomes. OECD (2024b) provides a complementary perspective on the institutional or managerial conditions surrounding the issue. A more credible approach is therefore to start with the reporting process and then configure technology around it, while documenting assumptions and reviewing them when conditions materially change.

There is also a boundary to the argument. Scanning invoices or replacing paper journals is different from redesigning the flow of transaction data into financial statements should not be interpreted as a universal rule or a guaranteed performance effect. Where resources, incentives or local conditions differ, firms can mistake a new interface for a new control environment. Short-term results may therefore move in a different direction from longer-term capability. This is one reason the present article favors conditional interpretation over a single average effect. Evidence summarized by Knudsen (2020); World Bank (2025) supports the value of examining the mechanism and the surrounding context together. The managerial implication remains concrete: start with the reporting process and then configure technology around it. The quality of execution, not the label attached to the initiative, determines whether that principle improves performance.

Data quality and chart-of-accounts discipline

The practical difficulty becomes clearer when the analysis moves from broad trends to the operating decision. Consistent master data, account coding and transaction dates determine whether reports can be reconciled. The underlying mechanism is not difficult to see: duplicate customers, inconsistent product codes and manual overrides erode trust in dashboards. In SMEs moving from spreadsheet-based or manual bookkeeping toward cloud platforms, integrated sales systems and digital payments, this can change the economics and timing of decisions even when the broad direction of policy or technology appears favorable. The sources reviewed for this draft, including OECD (2023); Kraus et al. (2022), are useful because they place the issue inside a wider system of incentives, capabilities and constraints rather than treating one variable as sufficient. For small and medium-sized enterprises, the practical response is to assign ownership for master data and monthly close controls. That response is deliberately modest: it does not remove uncertainty, but it makes the trade-off visible and easier to govern.

The point also has an organizational side. Consistent master data, account coding and transaction dates determine whether reports can be reconciled, but the benefit depends on who owns the information, who is permitted to act on it and how exceptions are handled. A common failure mode is to adopt the visible part of a practice while leaving the underlying routine unchanged. Duplicate customers, inconsistent product codes and manual overrides erode trust in dashboards. This helps explain why organizations exposed to similar conditions can report very different outcomes. Verhoef et al. (2021) provides a complementary perspective on the institutional or managerial conditions surrounding the issue. A more credible approach is therefore to assign ownership for master data and monthly close controls, while documenting assumptions and reviewing them when conditions materially change.

There is also a boundary to the argument. Consistent master data, account coding and transaction dates determine whether reports can be reconciled should not be interpreted as a universal rule or a guaranteed performance effect. Where resources, incentives or local conditions differ, duplicate customers, inconsistent product codes and manual overrides erode trust in dashboards. Short-term results may therefore move in a different direction from longer-term capability. This is one reason the present article favors conditional interpretation over a single average effect. Evidence summarized by OECD (2024b); Knudsen (2020) supports the value of examining the mechanism and the surrounding context together. The managerial implication remains concrete: assign ownership for master data and monthly close controls. The quality of execution, not the label attached to the initiative, determines whether that principle improves performance.

Integration with payments, sales and inventory

The evidence is less tidy than a simple positive-or-negative relationship would suggest. Connected systems reduce repeated entry and improve timeliness when interfaces are correctly designed. The point is especially relevant where integration errors can spread across modules and become harder to detect than isolated manual mistakes. In SMEs moving from spreadsheet-based or manual bookkeeping toward cloud platforms, integrated sales systems and digital payments, this can change the economics and timing of decisions even when the broad direction of policy or technology appears favorable. The sources reviewed for this draft, including OECD (2024b); COSO (2013), are useful because they place the issue inside a wider system of incentives, capabilities and constraints rather than treating one variable as sufficient. For small and medium-sized enterprises, the practical response is to use reconciliations at each interface and preserve an audit trail. That response is deliberately modest: it does not remove uncertainty, but it makes the trade-off visible and easier to govern.

The point also has an organizational side. Connected systems reduce repeated entry and improve timeliness when interfaces are correctly designed, but the benefit depends on who owns the information, who is permitted to act on it and how exceptions are handled. A common failure mode is to adopt the visible part of a practice while leaving the underlying routine unchanged. Integration errors can spread across modules and become harder to detect than isolated manual mistakes. This helps explain why organizations exposed to similar conditions can report very different outcomes. Verhoef et al. (2021) provides a complementary perspective on the institutional or managerial conditions surrounding the issue. A more credible approach is therefore to use reconciliations at each interface and preserve an audit trail, while documenting assumptions and reviewing them when conditions materially change.

There is also a boundary to the argument. Connected systems reduce repeated entry and improve timeliness when interfaces are correctly designed should not be interpreted as a universal rule or a guaranteed performance effect. Where resources, incentives or local conditions differ, integration errors can spread across modules and become harder to detect than isolated manual mistakes. Short-term results may therefore move in a different direction from longer-term capability. This is one reason the present article favors conditional interpretation over a single average effect. Evidence summarized by Verhoef et al. (2021); COSO (2013) supports the value of examining the mechanism and the surrounding context together. The managerial implication remains concrete: use reconciliations at each interface and preserve an audit trail. The quality of execution, not the label attached to the initiative, determines whether that principle improves performance.

Internal control in cloud environments

At firm level, the mechanism is usually more important than the headline indicator. Access controls, approval rules and segregation of duties remain necessary even when processes are automated. The reason is practical: SMEs may concentrate administrator privileges in one person because teams are small. In SMEs moving from spreadsheet-based or manual bookkeeping toward cloud platforms, integrated sales systems and digital payments, this can change the economics and timing of decisions even when the broad direction of policy or technology appears favorable. The sources reviewed for this draft, including OECD (2024b); Kraus et al. (2022), are useful because they place the issue inside a wider system of incentives, capabilities and constraints rather than treating one variable as sufficient. For small and medium-sized enterprises, the practical response is to design compensating review controls and periodically inspect user access. That response is deliberately modest: it does not remove uncertainty, but it makes the trade-off visible and easier to govern.

The point also has an organizational side. Access controls, approval rules and segregation of duties remain necessary even when processes are automated, but the benefit depends on who owns the information, who is permitted to act on it and how exceptions are handled. A common failure mode is to adopt the visible part of a practice while leaving the underlying routine unchanged. Smes may

concentrate administrator privileges in one person because teams are small. This helps explain why organizations exposed to similar conditions can report very different outcomes. Kraus et al. (2022) provides a complementary perspective on the institutional or managerial conditions surrounding the issue. A more credible approach is therefore to design compensating review controls and periodically inspect user access, while documenting assumptions and reviewing them when conditions materially change.

There is also a boundary to the argument. Access controls, approval rules and segregation of duties remain necessary even when processes are automated should not be interpreted as a universal rule or a guaranteed performance effect. Where resources, incentives or local conditions differ, SMEs may concentrate administrator privileges in one person because teams are small. Short-term results may therefore move in a different direction from longer-term capability. This is one reason the present article favors conditional interpretation over a single average effect. Evidence summarized by ACFE (2024); Kraus et al. (2022) supports the value of examining the mechanism and the surrounding context together. The managerial implication remains concrete: design compensating review controls and periodically inspect user access. The quality of execution, not the label attached to the initiative, determines whether that principle improves performance.

Skills and managerial use of reports

One recurring lesson in this literature is that context changes the value of an otherwise sensible practice. Accounting transformation succeeds when owners and managers understand what the numbers mean and act on them. For managers, the consequence is immediate: technical training alone does not create financial literacy or disciplined review. In SMEs moving from spreadsheet-based or manual bookkeeping toward cloud platforms, integrated sales systems and digital payments, this can change the economics and timing of decisions even when the broad direction of policy or technology appears favorable. The sources reviewed for this draft, including OECD (2023); Knudsen (2020), are useful because they place the issue inside a wider system of incentives, capabilities and constraints rather than treating one variable as sufficient. For small and medium-sized enterprises, the practical response is to pair system training with routines for margin, cash-flow and working-capital review. That response is deliberately modest: it does not remove uncertainty, but it makes the trade-off visible and easier to govern.

The point also has an organizational side. Accounting transformation succeeds when owners and managers understand what the numbers mean and act on them, but the benefit depends on who owns the information, who is permitted to act on it and how exceptions are handled. A common failure mode is to adopt the visible part of a practice while leaving the underlying routine unchanged. Technical training alone does not create financial literacy or disciplined review. This helps explain why organizations exposed to similar conditions can report very different outcomes. OECD (2023) provides a complementary perspective on the institutional or managerial conditions surrounding the issue. A more credible approach is therefore to pair system training with routines for margin, cash-flow and working-capital review, while documenting assumptions and reviewing them when conditions materially change.

There is also a boundary to the argument. Accounting transformation succeeds when owners and managers understand what the numbers mean and act on them should not be interpreted as a universal rule or a guaranteed performance effect. Where resources, incentives or local conditions differ, technical training alone does not create financial literacy or disciplined review. Short-term results may therefore move in a different direction from longer-term capability. This is one reason the present article favors conditional interpretation over a single average effect. Evidence summarized by Kraus et al. (2022); OECD (2024b) supports the value of examining the mechanism and the surrounding context together. The managerial implication remains concrete: pair system training with routines for margin, cash-flow and working-capital review. The quality of execution, not the label attached to the initiative, determines whether that principle improves performance.

Cybersecurity and continuity

What looks straightforward in a policy diagram is often more conditional in day-to-day implementation. Financial data becomes more available but also more exposed to credential theft, ransomware and service outages. In operational terms, SMEs often lack dedicated security staff and formal recovery procedures. In SMEs moving from spreadsheet-based or manual bookkeeping toward cloud platforms, integrated sales systems and digital payments, this can change the economics and timing of decisions even when the broad direction of policy or technology appears favorable. The sources reviewed for this draft, including ACFE (2024); Kraus et al. (2022), are useful because they place the issue inside a wider system of incentives, capabilities and constraints rather than treating one variable as sufficient. For small and medium-sized enterprises, the practical response is to use multi-factor authentication, backups, vendor due diligence and tested recovery steps. That response is deliberately modest: it does not remove uncertainty, but it makes the trade-off visible and easier to govern.

The point also has an organizational side. Financial data becomes more available but also more exposed to credential theft, ransomware and service outages, but the benefit depends on who owns the information, who is permitted to act on it and how exceptions are handled. A common failure mode is to adopt the visible part of a practice while leaving the underlying routine unchanged. Smes often lack dedicated security staff and formal recovery procedures. This helps explain why organizations exposed to similar conditions can report very different outcomes. World Bank (2025) provides a complementary perspective on the institutional or managerial conditions surrounding the issue. A more credible approach is therefore to use multi-factor authentication, backups, vendor due diligence and tested recovery steps, while documenting assumptions and reviewing them when conditions materially change.

There is also a boundary to the argument. Financial data becomes more available but also more exposed to credential theft, ransomware and service outages should not be interpreted as a universal rule or a guaranteed performance effect. Where resources, incentives or local conditions differ, SMEs often lack dedicated security staff and formal recovery procedures. Short-term results may therefore move in a different direction from longer-term capability. This is one reason the present article favors conditional interpretation over a single average effect. Evidence summarized by Verhoef et al. (2021); Knudsen (2020) supports the value of examining the mechanism and the surrounding context together. The managerial implication remains concrete: use multi-factor authentication, backups, vendor due diligence and tested recovery steps. The quality of execution, not the label attached to the initiative, determines whether that principle improves performance.

Integrated Discussion

Taken together, the six themes show that digital accounting transformation in smes: a framework for reliable financial reporting cannot be understood as a one-step relationship. The external condition or management practice changes incentives first, then affects behavior, process quality or resource allocation, and only after that appears in performance. When one of those links is weak, the expected result is diluted. This layered view is consistent with the broad evidence base represented by COSO (2013); World Bank (2025); Verhoef et al. (2021).

The synthesis also highlights the role of organizational maturity. Small and medium-sized enterprises with clearer data ownership, decision rights and review routines can often benefit from sophisticated tools earlier than organizations still struggling with basic process discipline. This does not imply that smaller or less mature organizations should wait indefinitely; it suggests that the sequence and scale of implementation should match their current capability.

A further observation concerns incentives. Many implementation problems that appear technical are actually incentive problems: people protect departmental targets, delay bad news, optimize visible metrics or avoid decisions whose accountability is unclear. Technical design therefore needs to be accompanied by governance that makes expected behavior and escalation routes explicit.

Finally, the value of standardization depends on where it is applied. Definitions, controls and core data often benefit from standardization, while customer responses, regional implementation or work design may require adaptation. The stronger approach is to standardize the principles that protect quality and then allow local variation in the method when that variation is visible and reviewable.

Managerial and Policy Implications

The synthesis suggests that management should begin with a small number of decisions rather than a large transformation programme. For small and medium-sized enterprises, the first step is to identify the exposure or performance outcome that matters most, the information needed to judge it, and the person who is accountable for acting. This creates a baseline against which later investment can be evaluated.

The second principle is sequencing. Capabilities that improve measurement, role clarity and process discipline usually make later technology or policy interventions more effective. When organizations reverse that sequence, they often spend on tools first and discover later that data ownership, workflows or incentives are unresolved.

Third, leaders should make trade-offs explicit. The six themes point to recurring tensions between short-run efficiency and resilience, speed and control, access and protection, or standardization and local adaptation. A decision memo that states which trade-off is being accepted is often more useful than a dashboard that presents dozens of indicators without a decision rule.

Fourth, monitoring should combine outcomes with leading indicators. Outcome measures confirm whether value was created, while leading indicators show whether the mechanism is being implemented. The sources reviewed here, including Kraus et al. (2022); COSO (2013), support the broader argument that capability and institutional quality matter alongside headline performance measures.

Finally, periodic review is essential. A practice that was appropriate during implementation may become unnecessary, too costly or too restrictive after the organization has learned. Review should therefore ask what changed, whether the original risk still exists, and whether the control or investment continues to earn its place in the operating model.

Priority	Recommended action	Reason for inclusion
1	Start with the reporting process and then configure technology around it	Firms can mistake a new interface for a new control environment
2	Assign ownership for master data and monthly close controls	Duplicate customers, inconsistent product codes and manual overrides erode trust in dashboards
3	Use reconciliations at each interface and preserve an audit trail	Integration errors can spread across modules and become harder to detect than isolated manual mistakes
4	Design compensating review controls and periodically inspect user access	Smes may concentrate administrator privileges in one person because teams are small
5	Pair system training with routines for margin, cash-flow and working-capital review	Technical training alone does not create financial literacy or disciplined review
6	Use multi-factor authentication, backups, vendor due diligence and tested recovery steps	Smes often lack dedicated security staff and formal recovery procedures

Limitations and Future Research

The article is an evidence synthesis and does not estimate a new causal model. Findings from different contexts are therefore used to identify mechanisms and boundary conditions, not to claim that one effect size applies uniformly to SMEs moving from spreadsheet-based or manual bookkeeping toward cloud platforms, integrated sales systems and digital payments.

A second limitation is source availability. Institutional reports are valuable for recent context, while peer-reviewed research provides stronger methodological detail, but the two forms of evidence

answer different questions. Future work should connect the framework with original firm-level, regional or longitudinal data and pre-specify the outcomes to be tested.

Research could also examine sequencing more directly. Many studies evaluate whether a practice is present, yet organizations may obtain different results depending on what was implemented first, how long capability building took, and whether supporting processes were stable. Longitudinal designs would be especially useful for separating initial disruption from durable performance effects.

Directions for Empirical Validation

The framework developed for digital accounting transformation in smes: a framework for reliable financial reporting would benefit from being tested against operational records rather than aggregate indicators alone. A useful empirical design would distinguish from digitization to accounting transformation from data quality and chart-of-accounts discipline and trace how each mechanism changes over time. Researchers should establish a pre-intervention baseline, document the timing of relevant decisions, and use outcome measures that managers actually monitor. Where a comparison group is feasible, matched organizations or regions would improve interpretation. Where it is not, interrupted time-series or carefully documented longitudinal case evidence may provide a more credible account than a single cross-sectional survey.

Sampling deserves equal attention. Findings associated with integration with payments, sales and inventory may not transfer directly to settings dominated by internal control in cloud environments, particularly when firm size, institutional capacity, market exposure, or access to finance differs. Future studies should therefore report the characteristics of participating organizations in enough detail to make those boundaries visible. Rather than treating heterogeneity as a statistical nuisance, researchers can use it to explain why apparently similar interventions produce different outcomes. Subgroup analysis should be theory-led and specified before results are known, especially when sample sizes are modest.

Finally, empirical work should retain negative, null, and delayed effects. In studies of digital accounting transformation in smes: a framework for reliable financial reporting, pressure to demonstrate an immediate benefit can encourage overly narrow outcome selection. A stronger design would combine short-term process indicators with longer-term performance measures and would report implementation costs alongside benefits. Sensitivity checks, alternative model specifications, and transparent treatment of missing data would make the findings easier to assess. These steps would also help separate genuine effects from improvements that simply reflect better documentation, temporary attention, or changes in the external environment.

A publication-oriented test of digital accounting transformation in smes: a framework for reliable financial reporting should also document data provenance and analytical choices in a form that another researcher could follow. Variable definitions, exclusions, coding decisions, and changes made after initial analysis should be recorded rather than reconstructed at the end of the project. When confidentiality prevents public release of raw organizational data, authors can still provide a data dictionary, sampling logic, model specification, and summary diagnostics. This level of transparency does more than satisfy reporting conventions; it makes disagreement productive because readers can identify whether competing conclusions arise from theory, measurement, sample composition, or analytical choice.

Conclusion

This article examined digital accounting transformation in smes: a framework for reliable financial reporting through a structured review of recent research and institutional evidence. The central conclusion is that the relationship in the title is conditional rather than automatic. Performance changes when external conditions interact with organizational capability, incentives, information quality and implementation discipline.

Across the six themes, a consistent pattern emerges: automation can make weak processes move faster. If account mapping, document discipline, access rights and review responsibilities are unclear, a digital system may produce reports more quickly without making them more dependable. The practical implication is not to reject ambitious policy or management interventions, but to connect them to the mechanism through which they are expected to work and to the constraints faced by small and medium-sized enterprises.

The review also points to a more disciplined use of evidence. Aggregate trends establish context, standards define expectations, and empirical studies reveal relationships, but none of these removes the need for local diagnosis. Decision makers should therefore combine external evidence with their own operating data and document where assumptions remain uncertain.

Future research can strengthen the framework by testing the proposed mechanisms with firm-level, regional or longitudinal data appropriate to the topic. For publication, the named authors should verify the source set, refine the contextual examples and add original evidence where available. That author-led step would convert the present editorial draft into a research article with a clearer empirical contribution.

Acknowledgement

This document is an editorial research draft prepared from the title, author information and issue metadata supplied by the KISA Institute production list. The named authors should review the argument, references, affiliations, email addresses and any contextual claims before submission or publication. No uncollected survey, interview or experimental data are represented as author-generated evidence.

References

- Knudsen, D.-R. (2020). Elusive boundaries, power relations, and knowledge production: A systematic review of the literature on digitalization in accounting. *International Journal of Accounting Information Systems*, 36, 100441. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.accinf.2019.100441>
- Verhoef, P. C., Broekhuizen, T., Bart, Y., Bhattacharya, A., Dong, J. Q., Fabian, N., & Haenlein, M. (2021). Digital transformation: A multidisciplinary reflection and research agenda. *Journal of Business Research*, 122, 889-901. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2019.09.022>
- Kraus, S., Durst, S., Ferreira, J. J., Veiga, P., Kailer, N., & Weinmann, A. (2022). Digital transformation in business and management research: An overview of the current status quo. *International Journal of Information Management*, 63, 102466.
- OECD. (2024). *OECD Digital Economy Outlook 2024 (Volume 1): Embracing the Technology Frontier*. Paris: OECD Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1787/a1689dc5-en>
- OECD. (2023). *OECD SME and Entrepreneurship Outlook 2023*. Paris: OECD Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1787/342b8564-en>
- Committee of Sponsoring Organizations of the Treadway Commission. (2013). *Internal Control - Integrated Framework*. Durham, NC: COSO.
- Association of Certified Fraud Examiners. (2024). *Occupational Fraud 2024: A Report to the Nations*. Austin, TX: ACFE.
- World Bank. (2025). *The Global Findex Database 2025*. Washington, DC: World Bank.