Improving of rating assessment of the financial condition of companies

Obidjon Xamidov, Yusuf Sunnatov, Nodir Salikhov

Bukhara State University, Bukhara City, M. Iqbol, 11, 200100, Uzbekistan

Abstract. In the article, based on the generalized conditional reference balance, a rating methodology was developed that assesses the quality of the accounting balance of companies. Based on the quality of the accounting balance of companies, 4 quality gradations were established to divide them into groups. Also, in order to know the position of the companies in the top power, the financial size of the companies, which is a new economic term, was introduced and its calculation methodology was given. Based on the financial size of the companies, the financial size was divided into 9 steps to determine their overall comparative value. In order to determine the position of the companies included in each level in the financial top strength, a methodology for determining the financial rating within the ranking level was developed.
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1 Introduction

The prior goal of companies is to strengthen their financial stability in a competitive market environment, as well as to be able to compete with their rivals and to develop a positive brand. If a company achieves this goal, its balance sheet assessment (rating) and its financial strength will improve. In addition, the indicators of the balance sheet, which include the results of the actions of each company in the pursuit of such a goal, are formulated in a certain order which is relative to each other. Financial analysts point out that in order for the balance sheet to be absolutely liquid, such correlations as PE (private equity) > BC (borrowed capital) or PE (private capital) > LTA (long-term assets) must be met. In this regard if such conditions are satisfied for a company, it is possible to make a conclusion that financial condition of this company will be stable, the rating assessment will be good, the market price will be high. If we rely on the phrase “money brings money”, it will be very difficult for companies to work on the condition of PE > BC. Or if the PE > LTA condition is met for the company’s balance sheet to be absolutely liquid, then the balancing condition CA (current asset) > BC (borrowed capital) must be appropriate as well. Thus it can be concluded that the smaller the company’s BC (borrowed capital) and LTA (long-term assets), the better the overall performance of the company. However, we see that the majority of American companies (Apple, Microsoft,
Wallmart, ExxonMobil, Verizon and other companies) operating without the above conditions have high global ratings and high market prices.

We render the above situation as follows: as a company operates in a competitive market environment, playing a strategic game with its competitors, it will need potential investors and contract business partners. This means that a company will have to generate BC (borrowed capital) accurately in relation to other indicators of the balance sheet. Herewith, in order to raise the liquidity of its cash flow, a company will have to invest the residual funds in long-term investments, expand its activities and to develop modern know-how in future together with long-term assets in relation to other indicators of the accounting balance sheet. As a result of such efforts, a company will improve its balance sheet quality (rating) and expand its financial amount.

As companies have the aim to expand their financial amount gradually from year to year, and with this amount they are willing to find out among which companies they are and to know their financial position among these companies.

2 Literature review

The problems related to the research topic, as well as its urgency have been studied in the research papers of such scholars as Birman G., Schmidt S., Van Horn D.K., Bernstein L.A., Stone D, Hatching K., Bocharov V.V., Alekseev P.D., Balabanov I.T., Kolass B., Sheremet A.D., S.I. Krilov, Bank V.R., Kostirko R.O., Shokhazamiy Sh.Sh., Alimov B.B. and others [1-27]. In their research papers they have analyzed current methods and technique of determining rating assessment of financial condition of companies. Moreover, they have expressed their views on the rating assessment. Herewith, foreign scholars have used classical methods in financial analysis. For example, Kostirko R.O has noted that the lack of a single standard method for determining the rating of companies makes it very complicated to determine the rating assessment of companies.

Sheremet A.D. emphasizes that one of the companies, which differs from various other industries and possesses efficient performance can be studied as a reference standard. This does not impose any restrictions on the use of the evaluation method because the financial performance of different business entities is studied in terms of comparison.

3 Data and methodology

At the same time, scientific studies on comprehensive analysis and rating assessment of companies’ financial situation are being carried out in global practice. However, the issues of comparative assessment of quality levels based on the methodology of rating and ranking by means of coefficients in correct and inverse proportions based on the summary indicators of the accounting balance, which represent the financial status of economic entities in a complex manner, have not been effectively solved on the basis of specific mathematical methods and criteria. In this context, due to the increasing digitization of the activities of national and international rating evaluation systems, the theoretical and methodological basis related to these issues is not sufficiently developed, the urgency and necessity of achieving their effective solution is emerging.

4 A proposed mathematical approach

The methodological approach based on the rules given above includes a set of methods (methodologies) given below:
As a result, it leads to a rating of a company with a stable financial position. If one of these relative coefficients does not change during this movement, the value of a total of 12 relative coefficients; their optimal minimum and maximum amounts are determined as follows: Six correct and six reverse ratio coefficients; maximum limit values of 6 correct and 6 reverse relative coefficients.

The second method (determining the optimal limit for the minimum and maximum amount for them is determined as follows: Six correct and six reverse ratio coefficients; maximum limit values of 6 correct and 6 reverse ratio coefficients.

The third method (determining standard quantities lying within the interval of minimum and maximum limit values of 6 correct and 6 reverse relative coefficients).

The fourth method: Determination of the optimal minimum and maximum amounts determined for these correct and reverse ratio coefficients.

One of the main goals of company owners is to increase the mobility of balance sheet items. During this movement, the value of a total of 12 relative coefficients included in it.

We reveal the content of balance sheet items. During this movement, the value of a total of 12 relative coefficients included in it.

The first method: 6 are correct and 6 are wrong relative coefficients. 12 relative coefficients; the optimal minimum and maximum amounts are determined as follows: Six correct and six reverse ratio coefficients; maximum limit values of 6 correct and 6 reverse ratio coefficients.

The second method: Determination of the optimal limit for the minimum and maximum amounts determined for these correct and reverse ratio coefficients.

The third method (determining standard quantities lying within the interval of minimum and maximum limit values of 6 correct and 6 reverse ratio coefficients).

The first method: 6 are correct and 6 are reverse ratio coefficients; maximum limit values of 6 correct and 6 reverse ratio coefficients.

Based on the company’s liabilities, the strength was determined.

The aim of simplifying the content of balance sheet items. During this movement, the value of a total of 12 relative coefficients included in it.

In order to determine the balance sheet quality assessment system (rating) of a company with a stable financial position, if one of these relative coefficients does not change during this movement, the value of a total of 12 relative coefficients included in it.

We reveal the content of balance sheet items. During this movement, the value of a total of 12 relative coefficients included in it.

In order to determine the balance sheet quality assessment system (rating) of a company with a stable financial position, if one of these relative coefficients does not change during this movement, the value of a total of 12 relative coefficients included in it.
Values of the criterion $F$ are determined as follows.

We divide the range of the calculated values into four qualitative gradations, using the standard values and minimum and maximum limits of all 12 coefficients determined above, i.e.:

$$
\begin{align*}
\text{min} F &= |0,59 - 1| + |1,7 - 1| + |1,5 - 1| + |0,67 - 1| + |0,62 - 0,5| + |1,61 - 1,25| \\
&\quad + |1,56 - 2| + |0,64 - 0,5| + |0,92 - 0,1| + |1,09 - 0,5| \\
&\quad + |1,05 - 0,5| + |0,95 - 0,13| \\
&= 5,04
\end{align*}
$$

$$
\begin{align*}
\text{max} F &= |0,59 - 0,1| + |1,7 - 10| + |1,5 - 4| + |0,67 - 0,25| + |0,62 - 0,8| + |1,61 - 2| + |1,56 - 1| + |0,64 - 1| + |0,92 - 2| + |1,09 - 10| + |1,05 - 8| + |0,95 - 2| = \\
&= 31,19
\end{align*}
$$

The quantities of the criterion $F$ are determined in four gradation intervals.

1. $0 < F < 5$ is excellent quality
2. $5 < F < 15$ is good quality
3. $15 < F < 25$ is qualified quality
4. $25 < F < \infty$ is adequate quality

The generalized conditional reference balance was as follows:

$$
\begin{align*}
C (a) &= 0,07050 \\
A (b) &= 12y \\
A (c) &= 97y
\end{align*}
$$

For said purpose, in order to divide the amount of the criterion $F$ it is possible to use the logarithmic scale, its ranking position in financial top is determined as follows.

Given the amount $y$ of a company’s balance

Using the reference values and the minimum and maximum limits of all 12 coefficients, we calculate its minimum ($\text{min} F$) and maximum ($\text{max} F$): $\text{min} F = 0,07050 \cdot 0,04 = \log_{10} y_1$, $\text{max} F = 12 \cdot 97 = \log_{10} y_2$

Using the proposed summar

$$
\kappa = \log_{10} \frac{y_1 + y_2 + y_3 + y_4}{4}
$$

The financial position of any organizational and legal company is assessed by a rating using the generalized conditional reference balance.
In reliance upon the financial amount of companies, we divide the financial amount into several levels to determine their comparable total cost. These levels are as follows:

- **Level 1** is called "A". This level includes all companies with a financial amount more than 8 (i.e. \( k > 8 \)).
- **Level 2** is called "B". This level includes all companies with a financial amount more than 7 and less than 8 (i.e. \( 7 < k \leq 8 \)).
- **Level 3** is called "С". This level includes all companies with a financial amount more than 6 and less than 7 (i.e. \( 6 < k \leq 7 \)).
- **Level 4** is called "D". This level includes all companies with a financial amount more than 5 and less than 6 (i.e. \( 5 < k \leq 6 \)).
- **Level 5** is called "E". This level includes all companies with a financial amount more than 4 and less than 5 (i.e. \( 4 < k \leq 5 \)).
- **Level 6** is called "F". This level includes all companies with a financial amount more than 3 and less than 4 (i.e. \( 3 < k \leq 4 \)).
- **Level 7** is called "G". This level includes all companies with a financial amount more than 2 and less than 3 (i.e. \( 2 < k \leq 3 \)).
- **Level 8** is called "H". This level includes all companies with a financial amount more than 1 and less than 2 (i.e. \( 1 < k \leq 2 \)).
- **Level 9** is called "I". This level includes all companies with a financial amount more than 0 and less than 1 (i.e. \( 0 < k \leq 1 \)).

Creating a ranking for companies by dividing them into intermediate gradations of one unit length makes it easier for us to draw conclusions for these companies. However, since there are unlimited numbers in a single unit range, it is very unlikely that the financial amount of two or more companies will be equal to the same number. We use an overall estimate to determine robust position of companies that belong to each of these levels. This assessment is determined as follows:

\[
 n = \frac{\text{the normalized financial size of the company}}{\text{the company's financial rating}}
\]

The higher this overall assessment, the more stable the company’s financial position, as well as the higher its position in the top–strength.

Financial statements of each company, which role in financial strength is comparable, should be brought to the same financial amount (thousand, million or billion UZS or in the currency, such as the USD or the Euro).

**5 Results and discussion**

Practical application of the results, specified above, can be seen in the example of companies in the F, G and H levels of the United States.

The table(1) shows that “Alphabet” company referred to level “F” (i.e. \( 3 < k \leq 4 \)) is the highest-ranked in the financial top–strength of companies of the USA in terms of financial amount. “Microsoft” is ranked the second. “Apple”, “Walmart”, “UnitedHealth Group”, “ExxonMobil”, “Chevron” and “Verizon” are ranked the third, fourth, fifth, sixth, seventh and eighth respectively.
Table 1. Determining financial top-strength rating of American companies related to “F” level (3 < k ≤ 4) in terms of financial amount (https://www.macrotrends.net).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coefficients</th>
<th>Apple</th>
<th>Alphabet</th>
<th>Exxonmob</th>
<th>Microsoft</th>
<th>Verizon</th>
<th>Chevron</th>
<th>UnitedHealth Group</th>
<th>Walmart</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2018 year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absolute difference</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LT A/C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA/L TA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LT/PE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE/TA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LT/TL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TL/PE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE/TL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LT/TA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA/TA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE/C A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA/TL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T/L/TA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE/TL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LT/PE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rating assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial amount</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranking in terms of financial top-strength</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2. Determining financial top-strength rating of American companies related to “G” level (i.e. $2 < k \leq 3$) in terms of financial amount [https://www.macrotrends.net].

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coefficients</th>
<th>Reference quantile</th>
<th>Occidental Petroleum</th>
<th>Intel</th>
<th>Tesla</th>
<th>Pepsi</th>
<th>Coca-cola</th>
<th>Amerisource</th>
<th>Burlington</th>
<th>United Airlines</th>
<th>Holdings Inc</th>
<th>International Paper</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LTA/CA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA/LTA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTA/PE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE/CA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA/TL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TL/CA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE/TL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TL/PE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 3. Determining financial top-strength rating of American companies related to “H” level (i.e. $1 < k \leq 2$) in terms of financial amount [https://www.macrotrends.net/](https://www.macrotrends.net/)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PE/CA</th>
<th>CA/TL</th>
<th>TL/CA</th>
<th>PE/TL</th>
<th>TL/PE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating assessment</th>
<th>Financial amount</th>
<th>Overall assessment</th>
<th>Ranking in terms of financial top-strength</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is obvious from the table(3), that “Regeneron Pharmaceuticals” company referred to level “H” level (i.e. \(1 < k \leq 2\)) is the highest-ranked in the financial top-strength of American companies in terms of financial amount. “Thor Industries” company is ranked the second. “Huntsman corporation”, “SpartanNash”, “Dana”, “Spirit Aerosystems”, “JetBlue”, “Motorola Solutions” are ranked the third, fourth, fifth, sixth, seventh and eighth respectively.

### 6 Conclusion

The mathematical approach to the comprehensive analysis of the financial situation of the companies and the comparative comparative assessment and ranking of the companies, based on the comprehensive analysis of the financial situation of foreign countries, the empirical analytical–test results of the comparative comparative assessment of the financial situation and the ranking of the countries (that is, the comparative comparative rating assessment based on the comprehensive mathematical analysis of the financial situation of the countries and the mathematical approach of determining the ranking and the principles and methodology of its application were developed, and the scientific validity of this mathematical approach was empirically confirmed based on the results of a comprehensive analysis of the financial situation, financial rating and ranking of prestigious companies in foreign countries). The methodological importance of this result is that the proposed mathematical approach, the principles and methodology of its application enriched and improved the existing theoretical–methodological basis of complex financial analysis of company. In this approach, based on the rules of its scientific–methodological base, within the scope of scientific research, it is possible to form relevant scientific conclusions, develop theoretical proposals and practical
recommendations. The practical significance of companies in their strategic development plans is mainly two goals: to increase the value and financial size steadily; ensuring the quality of the accounting balance. If these two goals are met, the overall financial rating of the company will also increase. In this case, as a rule, it is important that the financial size of the companies whose financial condition is stabilizing and improving from year to year should be higher than the inflation level and the general financial rating has been confirmed to increase from year to year. Practical effect—the established rule is that companies should serve as a program in the development of strategic development plans, and the annual growth rate of the financial size should be higher than the current inflation rate.
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