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**comparative term paper on the financial performance of companies within the same sector for two different years.**

This paper is regarding analysis of financial performance of two different companies within the same sectors. Financial analysis aids to evaluate the financial health of a firm. Accounting ratios are intended for a number of years which demonstrates the changes in a firm. In order to analyse the financial performance of the companies, the accounting ratios are used. The financial statements are used from the published Annual Reports of the companies for the time period of 2016&2018. The final result of the paper in accordance of the financial performance of both companies will show which years each companies had poor performances within the years of 2016&2018.

In this present study, an attempt has been made to evaluate the financial performance of two companies of each sector.

Following Ratios are used for this paper;

1. Short term solvency and liquidity ratios

* Current ratio
* Quick assets/Acid-test ratio
* Receivables collection period
* Payables payment period
* Inventory turnover period
* Receivables turnover
* Payables turnover
* Inventory turnover

1. Efficiency/profitability ratios

* Return on capital employed
* Gross profit percentage
* Net profit percentage

1. Investors/shareholders ratios

* Earnings per share (EPS)
* Price earnings ratios (P/E ratio)
* Earnings yield
* Net assets per share (NAPS)
* Dividend per share
* Dividend pay-out ratio
* Dividend yield
* Dividend cover

1. Long term solvency & stability ratios

* Gearing ratio

**DATA ANALYSIS**

**HEALTH CARE SECTOR**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **RATIOS** | **FIDSON HEALTHCARE**  **(2018)** | **MAY & BAKER NIGERIA**  **(2018)** |
| 1. Current ratio   This ratio has shown that May & Baker has more ability to meet its short term financial obligations than Fidson healthcare. | 7,575,483=0.72:1  10,535,885 | 3,306,328=1.60:1  3,107,810 |
| 1. Acid test ratio   This shows that May & Baker is abler to meet its short term financial obligations more than Fidson healthcare. | 7,575,483-2,875,133=0.44:1  10,535,885 | 3,306,328-1,463,949=0.59:1  3,107,810 |
| 1. Receivables collection period   This shows that Fidson healthcare is likely to receive its receivables in a longer period than May & Baker. | 3,803,982**×**365 days  16,229,903  =85.5 days | 1,482,954**×**365 days  8,249,947  =65.6 days |
| 1. Payables payment period   This shows that Fidson healthcare has more time on its hands to be able to settle its creditors than May & Baker. | 3,682,712**×**365 days  9,910,219  =135.6 days | 1,400,616×365 days  5,241,910  =97.5 days |
| 1. Inventory turnover period   This computation shows that the inventories in Fidson healthcare takes more time before being able to meet its short term financial obligations. | 2,875,133**×**365 days  9,910,219  =105.8 days | 1,463,949**×**365 days  5,241,910  =101.9 days |
| 1. Receivables turnover   This shows that the trade receivables in May & Baker takes more number of times to turn over during the period. | 16,229,903=4.26 times  3,803,982 | 8,249,947=5.56 times  1,482,954 |
| 1. Payables turnover   This shows that the trade payables in May & Baker takes more number of times to turn over during the period. | 9,910,219=2.96 times  3,682,712 | 5,241,910=3.7 times  1,400,616 |
| 1. Inventory turnover   This ratio shows that may & baker had more physical turnover of trading inventories during the period. | 9,910,219=3.44 times  2,875,133 | 5,241,910=3.58 times  1,463,949 |
| 1. ROCE   This ratio shows that may & baker had more efficiency that Fidson healthcare during the year. | 2,047,789=0.21  9,947,440 | 1,189,504=0.24  5,027,756 |
| 1. Gross profit margin   This shows that both the companies made the same amount of profit from revenue. | 6,319,684**×**100%  16,229,903  =0.4 | 3,008,037**×**100%  8,249,947  =0.4 |
| 1. Net profit margin   The ratio shows that may & baker made more net profit from its revenue during the year. | 97,447**×**100%  16,229,903  =0.01 | 617,073**×**100%  8,249,947  =0.07 |
| 1. Earnings per share   This ratio shows that fidson healthcare had lesser earnings per ordinary share in issue. | 97,447= (0.06) k  1,500,000 | 374,559=0.38k  980,000 |
| 1. Price earnings ratio   This ratio shows that may & baker’s shares had more viability for investors to invest in. | 4.95= (82.5) k  (0.06) | 2.45=6.45  0.38 |
| 1. Earnings yield   This ratio also shows that may & baker’s share yielded more earnings during the year. | (0.06) **×**100%  4.95  = (0.01) | 0.38**×**100%  2.45  =0.16 |
| 1. Net assets per share   This shows that Fidson healthcare had more net assets, attributed to each ordinary share in issue than May & Baker. | 20,483,325-13,329,544  1,500,000  =4.77k | 8,135,566-4,427,565  980,000  =3.78k |
| 1. Dividend per share   This shows that may & baker declared and proposed more dividend on every issued ordinary share. | 225,000**×**100%  1,500,000  =0.15 | 196,000**×**100%  980,000  =0.20 |
| 1. Dividend pay-out ratio   This indicates that may & baker paid higher percentage of the company’s distributable earnings to ordinary shareholders in the form of dividend. | 0.15**×**100%  (0.06)  =(2.5)k | 0.20**×**100%  0.24  =0.83 |
| 1. Dividend yield   This shows that may & baker had more return on the shareholder’s investment. | 0.15**×**100%  4.95  =0.03 | 0.20**×**100%  2.45  =0.08 |
| 1. Dividend cover   This shows that it took may & baker lesser times for its dividend to be taken care of by the distributable earnings. | (0.06) ×100%  0.15  =(0.40) | 0.25×100%  0.20  =1.25 |
| 1. Gearing ratio   This shows that Fidson healthcare had a higher degree of vulnerability to the financial risk attached to the fixed interest securities. | 9,545,266=0.57  16,699,048 | 1,288,053=0.35  3,708,011 |

**CONSUMER GOODS SECTOR**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **RATIOS** | **GUINNESS NIGERIA (2018)** | **FLOUR MILLS NIG. (2018)** |
| 1. Current ratio   This ratio has shown that Guinness had more ability to meet its short term financial obligations than Flourmills. | 54,610,047=1.27:1  42,847,115 | 154,380,788=1.1:1  140,074,526 |
| 1. Acid test ratio   This indicates that Guinness had more cash and other assets that can be easily converted to cash in order to meet its current liabilities. | 54,610,047-19,032,362=0.83:1  42,847,115 | 154,380,788-71,755,238=0.59:1  140,074,526 |
| 1. Receivables collection period   This ratio indicates that Guinness had more number of days for which it won’t be able to recover its receivables unlike Flourmills which had lesser days. | 23,890,304**×**365 days  142,975,792  =60.9 days | 49,546,925**×**365 days  389,397,836  =46.4 days |
| 1. Payables payment period   This computation shows that Flourmills had lesser days to eventually pay up its creditors unlike Guinness which still had more days. | 31,175,725**×**365 days  94,350,387  =120.6 days | 40,126,542**×**365 days  337,820,842  =43.4 days |
| 1. Inventory turnover period   This ratio indicates that the inventories in Flourmill had spent a longer period in the store before it was eventually sold while the inventories in Guinness sold out days before Flourmills. | 19,032,362**×**365 days  94,350,387  =73.6 days | 71,755,238**×**365 days  337,820,842  =77.5 days |
| 1. Receivable turnover   This shows that the receivables in Flourmills took more time than that in Guinness to turn over. | 142,975,792=5.98 times  23,890,304 | 389,397,836=7.86 times  49,546,925 |
| 1. Payables turnover   This shows that the payables in Flourmills took more time than that in Guinness to turn over. | 94, 350,387=3.0 times  31,175,725 | 337,820,842=8.4 times  40,126,542 |
| 1. Inventory turnover   This indicates that the inventory in Guinness took more time to turnover than those in Flourmills. | 94,350,387=4.95 times  19,032,362 | 337,820,842=4.71 times  71,755,238 |
| 1. ROCE   This shows that Flourmills had made more profit than Guinness. | 13,386,248=0.12  110,407,853 | 29,284,977=0.16  182,530,056 |
| 1. Gross profit margin   This shows that Guinness made more gross profit from the revenue. | 48,625,405**×**100%  142,975,792  =0.34 | 51,576,994**×**100%  389,397,836  =0.13 |
| 1. Net profit margin   This shows that Guinness made more net profit from the revenue. | 6,717,605**×**100%  142,625,405  =0.05 | 9,244,729**×**100%  389,397,836  =0.02 |
| 1. Earnings per share   This ratio indicates that Flourmills had more profit after tax attributed to each ordinary share in issue. | 6,717,605=3.30  2,304,731 | 9,244,725=3.52  2,624,253 |
| 1. Price earnings ratio   This computation shows that it took more years for the earnings in Guinness to recoup shareholder’s investments. | 72.00=21.8  3.30 | 23.10=6.56  3.52 |
| 1. Earnings yield   This is showing that Flourmills had more returns on the shareholder’s investment than Guinness. | 3.30**×**100%  72.00  =0.05 | 3.52**×**100%  23.10  =0.15 |
| 1. Net assets per share   This shows that Flourmills had more net assets, attributed to each ordinary share in issue. | 87,588,174=39.99k  2,190,383 | 151,446,296=57.7k  2,624,253 |
| 1. Dividend per share   This ratio shows that Flourmills declared more dividend on each ordinary share in issue. | 963,768**×**100%  1,505,88  =0.64k | 2,624,253**×**100%  2,624,253  =1.0k |
| 1. Dividend pay-out ratio   This ratio shows that Flourmills had a higher percentage of its earnings which was paid in form of dividend to ordinary shareholders. | 0.64×100%  3.30  =0.19 | 1.0**×**100%  3.52  =0.28 |
| 1. Dividend yield   This ratio indicates that Flourmills had higher return on the shareholder’s investment than Guinness did. | 0.64**×**100%  72.00  =0.01 | 1.0×100%  23.10  =0.04 |
| 1. Dividend cover   This shows that Guinness had more earnings than Flourmills to cover its dividend. | 3.30×100%  0.64  =5.16 | 3.52**×**100%  1.0  =3.52 |
| 1. Gearing ratio   This shows that Flourmills had higher degree of vulnerability to the financial risk attached to the fixed interest securities. | 58,215,730=0.66  87,588,174 | 130,987,757=0.90  145,258,820 |

**BASIC MATERIALS SECTOR**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **RATIOS** | **BERGER PAINTS (2018)** | **NOTORE PLC (2018)** |
| 1. Current ratio   This ratio has shown that Berger paints had more ability to meet its short term financial obligations than Notore plc. | 1,646,124=1.28:1  1,285,038 | 12,624,270=0.58:1  21,732,287 |
| 1. Acid test ratio   This indicates that Berger paints had more cash and other assets that can be easily converted to cash in order to meet its current liabilities. | 1,646,124-606,712=0.81:1  1,285,038 | 12,624,270-3,226,105=0.43:1  21,732,287 |
| 1. Receivables collection period   This ratio indicates that Notore plc had more number of days for which it won’t be able to recover its receivables unlike Berger paints which had lesser days. | 190,982**×**365 days  3,377,223  =20.6 days | 6,989,776**×**365 days  26,823,881  =95 days |
| 1. Payables payment period   This computation shows that Notore plc had lesser days to eventually pay up its creditors unlike Berger paints which still had more days. | 622,491**×**365 days  1,896,862  =120 days | 3,164,007**×**365 days  17,222,082  =67 days |
| 1. Inventory turnover period   This ratio indicates that the inventories in Berger paints had spent a longer period in the store before it was eventually sold while the inventories in Notore plc sold out days before Berger paints. | 606,712**×**365 days  1,896,862  =116.7 days | 3,226,105**×**365 days  17,222,082  =68 days |
| 1. Receivables turnover   This shows that the receivables of Berger paints took more time than that of Notore plc to turn over. | 3,377,223=18 times  190,982 | 26,823,881=4 times  6,989,776 |
| 1. Payables turnover   This shows that the payables of Notore plc took more time to turn over than that in Berger paints. | 1,896,862=3 times  622,491 | 17,222,082=5 times  3,164,007 |
| 1. Inventory turnover   This indicates that the inventories in Notore plc took more time to turnover than those in Berger paints. | 1,896,862=3 times  606,712 | 17,222,082=5 times  3,226,105 |
| 1. ROCE   This shows that Berger paints had made more profit than Notore plc. | 442,299=0.14  3,250,261 | 7,324,692=0.05  131,143,154 |
| 1. Gross profit margin   This shows that Berger paints made more gross profit from the revenue. | 1,480,361**×**100%  3,377,223  =0.44 | 9,601,799**×**100%  26,823,881  =0.35 |
| 1. Net profit margin   This shows that Berger paints made more net profit from the revenue. | 320,509**×**100%  3,377,223  =0.09 | 1,907,281**×**100%  26,823,881  =0.07 |
| 1. Earnings per share   This ratio indicates that Notore plc had more profit after tax attributed to each ordinary share in issue. | 320,509=1.11k  289,823 | 1.907,281=1.18k  1,610,000 |
| 1. Price earnings ratio   This computation shows that it took more years for the earnings in Notore plc to recoup its shareholder’s investments. | 8.60=7.74k  1.11 | 62.50=53k  1.18 |
| 1. Earnings yield   This is showing that Berger paints had more returns on the shareholder’s investment than Notore plc. | 1.11**×**100%  8.60  =0.13 | 1.18**×**100%  62.50  =0.02 |
| 1. Net assets per share   This shows that Notore plc had more net assets, attributed to each ordinary share in issue. | 2,813,052=9.71k  289,823 | 48,123,262=30k  1,610,000 |

**CONSUMER SERVICES**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **RATIOS** | **MED-VIEW AIRLINE (2018)** | **TRANSCORP HOTELS (2018)** |
| 1. Current ratio   This ratio has shown that Transcorp hotels had more ability to meet its short term financial obligations than Med-view. | 2,314,839=0.11  20,454,680 | 5,722,247=0.29  19,627,117 |
| 1. Acid test ratio   This indicates that Transcorp hotels had more cash and other assets that can be easily converted to cash in order to meet its current liabilities. | 2,206,289=0.10  20,454,680 | 5,195,396=0.26  19,627,117 |
| 1. Receivables collection period   This ratio indicates that Med-view had more number of days for which it won’t be able to recover its receivables unlike Transcorp hotels which had lesser days. | 2,347,982**×**365 days  9,562,197  =89 days | 2,051,882**×**365 days  16,475,720  =45 days |
| 1. Payables payment period   This computation shows that Med-view had lesser days to eventually pay up its creditors unlike Transcorp hotels which still had more days. | 18,845,517**×**365 days  12,538,709  =548 days | 7,804,949**×**365 days  4,233,787  =672 days |
| 1. Inventory turnover period   This ratio indicates that the inventories Transcorp hotels had spent a longer period in the store before it was eventually sold while the inventories in Med-view sold out days before Transcorp. | 108,550**×**365 days  12,538,709  =3 days | 526,851**×**365 days  4,233,787  =45 days |
| 1. Receivables turnover   This shows that the receivables of Transcorp hotels took more time than that of Med-view to turn over. | 9,562,197=4 times  2,347,982 | 16,475,720=8 times  2,051,882 |
| 1. Payables turnover   This shows that the payables of Med-view took more time than that of Transcorp hotels to turn over. | 12,538,709=0.7 times  18,845,517 | 4,233,787=0.5 times  7,804,949 |
| 1. Inventory turnover   This indicates that the inventories in Med-view took more time to turnover than those in Transcorp hotels. | 12,538,709=115 times  108,550 | 4,233,787=8 times  526,851 |
| 1. ROCE   This shows that Med-view had made more profit than Transcorp hotels. | 12,538,709=4.6  2,712,762 | 5,176,008=0.06  89,158,573 |
| 1. Gross profit margin   This shows that Transcorp hotels made more gross profit from the revenue. | 2,976,513**×**100%  9,562,197  =0.31 | 12,241,933**×**100%  16,475,720  =0.74 |
| 1. Net profit margin   This shows that Med-view made more net profit from the revenue. | 10,357,133**×**100%  9,562,197  =1.08 | 3,876,300**×**100%  16,475,720  =0.24 |
| 1. Earnings per share   This ratio indicates that Med-view had more profit after tax attributed to each ordinary share in issue. | 10,357,133=1.06k  9,750,650 | 3,876,300=0.51k  7,600,404 |
| 1. Price earnings ratio   This computation shows that it took more years for the earnings in Transcorp hotels to recoup shareholder’s investments. | 2.05=1.93  1.06 | 6.10=11.9  0.51 |
| 1. Earnings yield   This is showing that Med-view had more returns on the shareholder’s investment than Transcorp hotels. | 1.06**×**100%  2.05  =0.52 | 0.51**×**100%  6.10  =0.08 |
| 1. Net asset per share   This shows that Transcorp hotels had more net assets, attributed to each ordinary share in issue. | 3,263,703=0.33k  9,750,650 | 57,637,528=7.58k  7,600,404 |
| 1. Dividend per share   This ratio shows that Transcorp hotels declared more dividend on each ordinary share in issue. | 292,519**×**100%  9,750,650  =0.03 | 1,140,061**×**100%  7,600,404  =0.15 |
| 1. Dividend pay-out ratio   This ratio shows that Transcorp hotels had a higher percentage of its earnings which was paid in form of dividend to ordinary shareholders. | 0.03**×**100%  1.06  =0.03 | 0.15**×**100%  0.51  =0.29 |
| 1. Dividend yield   This ratio indicates that Transcorp hotels had higher return on the shareholder’s investment than Med-view did. | 0.03**×**100%  2.05  =0.01 | 0.15**×**100%  6.10  =0.02 |
| 1. Dividend cover   This shows that Med-view had more earnings than Transcorp to cover its dividend. | 1.06**×**100%  0.03  =35.3 | 0.51**×**100%  0.15  =3.4 |
| 1. Gearing ratio   This shows that Transcorp hotels had higher degree of vulnerability to the financial risk attached to the fixed interest securities. | 1,614,915=0.49  3,263,703 | 28,942,569=0.50  57,637,528 |

**INDUSTRIALS SECTOR**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **RATIOS** | **LAFARGE AFRICA (2018)** | **CUTIX (2018)** |
| 1. Current ratio   This ratio has shown that Cutix had more ability to meet its short term financial obligations than Lafarge. | 59,629,654=0.34  173,870,677 | 1,957,976=1.44  1,359,513 |
| 1. Acid test ratio   This indicates that Cutix had more cash and other assets that can be easily converted to cash in order to meet its current liabilities. | 30,708,187=0.17  173,870,677 | 640,018=0.47  1,359,513 |
| 1. Receivables collection period   This ratio indicates that Cutix had more number of days for which it won’t be able to recover its receivables unlike Lafarge which had lesser days. | 11,167,705**×**365 days  187,043,475  =21.7 days | 525,058**×**365 days  5,057,375  =37.8 days |
| 1. Payables payment period   This computation shows that Cutix had lesser days to eventually pay up its creditors unlike Lafarge which still had more days. | 49,921,178**×**365 days  123,009,569  =148 days | 499,300**×**365 days  3,536,685  =51.5 days |
| 1. Inventory turnover period   This ratio indicates that the inventories in Cutix had spent a longer period in the store before it was eventually sold while the inventories in Lafarge sold out days before Cutix. | 28,921,467**×**365 days  123,009,569  =85.8 days | 1,317,958**×**365 days  3,536,685  =136 days |
| 1. Receivables turnover   This shows that the receivables of Lafarge took more time than that of Cutix to turn over. | 187,043,475=16.7 times  11,167,705 | 5,057,375=9.6 times  525,058 |
| 1. Payables turnover   This shows that the payables of Cutix took more time than that of Lafarge to turn over. | 123,009,569=2.5 times  49,621,178 | 3,536,685=7 times  499,300 |
| 1. Inventory turnover   This indicates that the inventory in Lafarge took more time to turnover than those in Cutix. | 187,043,475=6.5 times  28,921,467 | 3,536,685=2.7 times  1,317,958 |
| 1. ROCE   This shows that Cutix had made more profit than Lafarge. | 37,486,642=0.09  403,821,619 | 799,070=0.54  1,476,749 |
| 1. Gross profit margin   This shows that Lafarge made more gross profit from the revenue. | 64,033,906**×**100%  187,043,619  =0.34 | 1,520,689**×**100%  5,057,374  =0.30 |
| 1. Net profit margin   This shows that Cutix made more net profit from the revenue. | 4,141,764**×**100%  187,043,475  =0.02 | 440,295**×**100%  5,057,374  =0.09 |
| 1. Earnings per share   This ratio indicates that Cutix had more profit after tax attributed to each ordinary share in issue. | 4,141,764=0.48k  8,673,429 | 440,295=0.50k  880,661 |
| 1. Price earnings ratio   This computation shows that it took more years for the earnings in Lafarge to recoup shareholder’s investments. | 12.45=25.9  0.48 | 1.64=3.28  0.50 |
| 1. Earnings yield   This is showing that Cutix had more returns on the shareholder’s investment than Lafarge. | 0.48**×**100%  12.45  =0.04 | 0.50**×**100%  1.64  =0.30 |
| 1. Net asset per share   This shows that Lafarge had more net assets, attributed to each ordinary share in issue. | 255,743,725=29.5k  8,673,429 | 849,292=0.96k  880,661 |
| 1. Gearing ratio   This shows that Lafarge had higher degree of vulnerability to the financial risk attached to the fixed interest securities. | 256,762,031=1.00  255,743,725 | 637,491=0.49  1,299,292 |

**OIL & GAS SECTOR**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **RATIOS** | **CONOIL (2018)** | **MRS OIL NIG. (2018)** |
| 1. Current ratio   This ratio has shown that Conoil had more ability to meet its short term financial obligations than MRS. | 54,908,451=1.32  41,641,699 | 36,715,742=1.14  32,233,134 |
| 1. Acid test ratio   This indicates that Conoil had more cash and other assets that can be easily converted to cash in order to meet its current liabilities. | 45.766,852=1.09  41,641,699 | 32,242,453=1.00  32,233,134 |
| 1. Receivables collection period   This ratio indicates that MRS had more number of days for which it won’t be able to recover its receivables unlike Conoil which had lesser days. | 30,295,096**×**365 days  122,213,014  =90 days | 25,238,284**×**365 days  89,552,819  =102 days |
| 1. Payables payment period   This computation shows that MRS had lesser days to eventually pay up its creditors unlike Conoil which still had more days. | 35,065,872**×**365 days  109,442,111  =116 days | 18,089,739**×**365 days  85,256,239  =77 days |
| 1. Inventory turnover period   This ratio indicates that the inventories in Conoil had spent a longer period in the store before it was eventually sold while the inventories in MRS sold out days before Conoil. | 9,141,599**×**365 days  109,442,111  =30 days | 4,473,289**×**365 days  85,256,239  =19 days |
| 1. Receivables turnover   This shows that the receivables of Conoil took more time than that of MRS to turn over. | 122,213,014=4.0 times  30,295,096 | 89,552,819=3.5 times  25,238,284 |
| 1. Payables turnover   This shows that the payables of MRS took more time than that of Conoil to turn over. | 109,442,111=3.1 times  35,065,872 | 85,256,239=4.7 times  18,089,739 |
| 1. Inventory turnover   This indicates that the inventories in MRS took more time to turnover than those in Conoil. | 109,442,111=11.9 times  9,141,599 | 85,256,239=19.1 times  4,473,289 |
| 1. ROCE   This shows that Conoil had made more profit than MRS. | 2,566,765=0.13  19,255,547 | 1,483,933=0.07  22,050,068 |
| 1. Gross profit margin   This shows that Conoil made more gross profit from the revenue. | 12,770,902**×**100%  122,213,014  =0.10 | 4,296,580**×**100%  89,552,819  =0.05 |
| 1. Net profit margin   This shows that both the companies made the same net profit from the revenue. | 1,796,042**×**100%  122,213,014  =0.01 | 1,264,941**×**100%  89,552,819  =0.01 |
| 1. Earnings per share   This ratio indicates that MRS had more profit after tax attributed to each ordinary share in issue. | 1,796,042=2.59k  693,952,117 | 1,264,941=4.15k  304,786,406 |
| 1. Price earnings ratio   This computation shows that it took more years for the earnings in Conoil to recoup shareholder’s investments. | 23.25=8.97  2.59 | 25.70=6.19  4.15 |
| 1. Earnings yield   This is showing that MRS had more returns on the shareholder’s investment than Conoil. | 2.59**×**100%  23.25  =0.11 | 4.15**×**100%  25.70  =0.16 |
| 1. Net asset per share   This shows that MRS had more net assets, attributed to each ordinary share in issue. | 18,301,074=0.026  693,952,117 | 20,720,698=0.067  304,786,406 |
| 1. Dividend per share   This ratio shows that Conoil declared more dividend on each ordinary share in issue. | 1,387,904**×**100%  693,952,117  =2 | 0**×**100%  304,786,406  =0 |
| 1. Dividend pay-out ratio   This ratio shows that Conoil had a higher percentage of its earnings which was paid in form of dividend to ordinary shareholders. | 2**×**100%  2.59  =0.77 | 0**×**100%  4.15  =0 |
| 1. Dividend yield   This ratio indicates that Conoil had higher return on the shareholder’s investment than MRS did. | 2**×**100%  23.25  =0.09 | 0**×**100%  25.70  =0 |
| 1. Dividend cover   This shows that Conoil had more earnings than MRS to cover its dividend. | 2.59**×**100%  2  =1.3 | 0**×**100%  4.15  =0 |
| 1. Gearing ratio   This shows that MRS had higher degree of vulnerability to the financial risk attached to the fixed interest securities. | 4,766,240=0.26  18,301,074 | 9,232,835=0.45  20,720,698 |

**TELECOMMUNICATION & TECHNOLOGY SECTOR**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **RATIOS** | **E-TRANZACT INT. (2018)** | **CHAMS (2018)** |
| 1. Current ratio   This ratio has shown that E-tranzact had more ability to meet its short term financial obligations than Chams. | 4,105,003=0.73  5,630,715 | 607,801=0.41  1,478,060 |
| 1. Acid test ratio   This indicates that E-tranzact had more cash and other assets that can be easily converted to cash in order to meet its current liabilities. | 3,703,955=0.66  5,630,715 | 540,153=0.36  1,478,060 |
| 1. Receivables collection period   This ratio indicates that Chams had more number of days for which it won’t be able to recover its receivables unlike E-tranzact which had lesser days. | 1,075,193**×**365 days  18,621,653  =31 days | 510,446**×**365 days  584,392  =318 days |
| 1. Payables payment period   This computation shows that E-tranzact had lesser days to eventually pay up its creditors unlike Chams which still had more days. | 5,564,590**×**365 days  16,997,019  =119 days | 1,246,204**×**365 days  346,230  =1,313 days |
| 1. Inventory turnover period   This ratio indicates that the inventories in Chams had spent a longer period in the store before it was eventually sold while the inventories in E-tranzact sold out days before Chams. | 401,048**×**365 days  16,997,019  =8 days | 67,648**×**365 days  346,230  =71 days |
| 1. Receivables turnover   This shows that the receivables of E-tranzact took more time than that in Chams to turn over. | 18,621,653=17 times  1,075,193 | 584,392=1 time  510,446 |
| 1. Payables turnover   This shows that the payables of E-tranzact took more time than that in Chams to turn over. | 16,997,019=3 times  5,564,590 | 346,230=0.3 times  1,246,204 |
| 1. Inventory turnover   This indicates that the inventories in E-tranzact took more time to turnover than those in Chams. | 16,997,019=42 times  401,048 | 346,230=5 times  67,648 |
| 1. ROCE   This shows that E-tranzact had made more profit than Chams. | 3,587,447=10.6k  336,684 | 266,038=0.07k  3,727,899 |
| 1. Gross profit margin   This shows that Chams made more gross profit from the revenue. | 1,624,634**×**100%  18,621,653  =0.09 | 238,162**×**100%  584,392  =0.41 |
| 1. Net profit margin   This shows that Chams made more net profit from the revenue. | 3,136,413**×**100%  18,621,653  =0.16 | 269,440**×**100%  584,392  =0.46 |
| 1. Earnings per share   This ratio indicates that E-tranzact had more profit after tax attributed to each ordinary share in issue. | 3,136,413=0.75  4,200,000 | 385,769=0.08  4,696,060 |
| 1. Price earnings ratio   This computation shows that it took more years for the earnings in E-tranzact to recoup shareholder’s investments. | 3.95=5.26  0.75 | 0.20=4.5  0.08 |
| 1. Earnings yield   This is showing that E-tranzact had more returns on the shareholder’s investment than Chams. | 0.75**×**100%  3.95  =0.18 | 0.08**×**100%  0.20  =0.4 |
| 1. Net assets per share   This shows that Chams had more net assets attributed to each ordinary share in issue. | 159,667=0.04  4,200,000 | 3,727,899=0.8  4,696,060 |

**FINANCIALS SECTOR**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **RATIOS** | **GUARANTY TRUST BANK(2018)** | **UNITED BANK FOR AFRICA (2018)** |
| 1. ROCE   This shows that GTB had made more profit than UBA. | 190,209,286=0.37  511,842,259 | 55,350=0.15  364,598 |
| 1. Earnings per share   This ratio indicates that GTB had more profit after tax attributed to each ordinary share in issue. | 166,919,765=5.67  29,431,179 | 41,047**×**1000  34,199,421  =1.20 |
| 1. Price earnings ratio   This computation shows that it took more years for the earnings in UBA to recoup shareholder’s investments. | 34.45=6.07  5.67 | 7.70=6.41  1.20 |
| 1. Earnings yield   This is showing that GTB had more returns on the shareholder’s investment than UBA. | 5.67**×**100%  34.45  =0.16 | 1.20**×**100%  7.70  =0.15 |
| 1. Net assets per share   This shows that GTB had more net assets attributed to each ordinary share in issue. | 511,842,259=17.4  29,431,179 | 364,598=0.01  34,199,421 |
| 1. Dividend per share   This ratio shows that GTB declared more dividend on each ordinary share in issue. | 79,464,184=2.70  29431,179 | 29,070**×**1000  34,199,421  =0.85 |
| 1. Dividend pay-out ratio   This ratio shows that UBA had a higher percentage of its earnings which was paid in form of dividend to ordinary shareholders. | 2.70**×**100%  5.67  =0.47 | 0.85**×**100%  1.20  =0.71 |
| 1. Dividend yield   This ratio indicates that UBA had higher return on the shareholder’s investment than GTB did. | 2.70**×**100%  34.45  =0.08 | 0.85**×**100%  7.70  =0.11 |
| 1. Dividend cover   This shows that GTB had more earnings than UBA to cover its dividend. | 5.67**×**100%  2.70  =2.1 | 1.20**×**100%  0.85  =1.4 |

**HEALTHCARE SECTOR**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **RATIOS** | **FIDSON HEALTHCARE**  **(2016)** | **MAY&BAKER NIG.**  **(2016)** |
| 1. Current ratio   This ratio has shown that May & baker had more ability to meet its short term financial obligations than Fidson. | 3,958,702=0.60  6,642,906 | 4,335,283=1.39  3,107,513 |
| 1. Acid test ratio   This indicates that May & baker had more cash and other assets that can be easily converted to cash in order to meet its current liabilities. | 2,873,167=0.43  6,642,906 | 2,651,525=0.85  3,107,513 |
| 1. Receivables collection period   This ratio indicates that Fidson had more number of days for which it won’t be able to recover its receivables unlike May & baker which had lesser days. | 2,420,941**×**365 days  7,665,029  =115.4 days | 726,248**×**365 days  8,304,215  =31.9 days |
| 1. Payables payment period   This computation shows that May & baker had lesser days to eventually pay up its creditors unlike Fidson which still had more days. | 4,229,119**×**365 days  3,599,666  =428.8 days | 1,860,899**×**365 days  5,857,420  =115.9 days |
| 1. Inventory turnover period   This ratio indicates that the inventories in Fidson had spent a longer period in the store before it was eventually sold while the inventories in May & baker sold out days before Fidson. | 1,085,535**×**365 days  3,599,666  =110 days | 1,683,758**×**365 days  5,857,420  =104.9 days |
| 1. Receivables turnover   This shows that the receivables of May & baker took more time than that of Fidson to turn over. | 7,665,029=3.2 times  2,420,941 | 8,304,215=11.4 times  726,248 |
| 1. Payables turnover   This shows that the payables of May & baker took more time than that of Fidson to turn over. | 3,559,666=0.84 times  4,229,119 | 5,857,420=3.15 times  1,860,899 |
| 1. Inventory turnover   This indicates that the inventories in May & baker took more time to turnover than those in Fidson. | 3,559,666=3.28 times  1,085,535 | 5,857,420=3.47 times  1,683,758 |
| 1. ROCE   This shows that May & baker had made more profit than Fidson. | 1,090,314=0.11  10,024,029 | 808,984=0.15  5,521,378 |
| 1. Gross profit margin   This shows that Fidson made more gross profit from the revenue. | 4,055,363**×**100%  7,655,029  =0.53 | 2,446,795**×**100%  8,304,215  =0.29 |
| 1. Net profit margin   This shows that May & baker made more net profit from the revenue. | 316,762**×**100%  7,655,029  =0.04 | 48,712**×**100%  8,304,215  =0.05 |
| 1. Earnings per share   This ratio indicates that Fidson had more profit after tax attributed to each ordinary share in issue. | 316,762=0.21  1,500,000 | 48,712=0.05  980,000 |
| 1. Price earnings ratio   This computation shows that it took more years for the earnings in May & baker to recoup shareholder’s investments. | 1.28=6.09k  0.21 | 0.94=18.8k  0.05 |
| 1. Earnings yield   This is showing that Fidson had more returns on the shareholder’s investment than May & baker. | 0.21**×**100%  1.28  =0.16k | 0.05**×**100%  0.94  =0.05k |
| 1. Net asset per share   This shows that Fidson had more net assets attributed to each ordinary share in issue. | 6,593,266=4.4k  1,500,000 | 3,050,571=3.1k  980,000 |
| 1. Dividend per share   This ratio shows that May & baker declared more dividend on each ordinary share in issue. | 75,000**×**100%  1,500,000  =0.05k | 58,800**×**100%  980,000  =0.06k |
| 1. Dividend pay-out ratio   This ratio shows that Fidson had a higher percentage of its earnings which was paid in form of dividend to ordinary shareholders. | 0.05**×**100%  0.21  =0.24k | 0.06**×**100%  0.05  =0.12k |
| 1. Dividend yield   This ratio indicates that May & baker had higher return on the shareholder’s investment than Fidson did. | 0.05**×**100%  1.28  =0.04 | 0.06**×**100%  0.94  =0.06 |
| 1. Dividend cover   This shows that Fidson had more earnings than May & baker to cover its dividend. | 0.21**×**100%  0.05  =4.2k | 0.05**×**100%  0.06  =0.83k |
| 1. Gearing ratio   This shows that May & baker had higher degree of vulnerability to the financial risk attached to the fixed interest securities. | 7,775,068=0.54k  14,368,334 | 2,025,000=0.68k  3,011,685 |

**CONSUMER GOODS SECTOR**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **RATIOS** | **GUINESS NIG. (2016)** | **FLOUR MILLS OF NIG. (2016)** |
| 1. Current ratio   This ratio has shown that Flourmills had more ability to meet its short term financial obligations than Guinness. | 47,869,835=0.71  67,109,622 | 137,613,069=1.20  114,508,685 |
| 1. Acid test ratio   This indicates that Flourmills had more cash and other assets that can be easily converted to cash in order to meet its current liabilities. | 34,848,587=0.52  67,109,622 | 100,355,386=0.88  114,508,685 |
| 1. Receivables collection period   This ratio indicates that Flourmills had more number of days for which it won’t be able to recover its receivables unlike Guinness which had lesser days. | 26,509,663**×**365 days  101,973,030  =94.8 days | 66,504,239**×**365 days  247,876,504  =97.9 days |
| 1. Payables payment period   This computation shows that Flourmills had lesser days to eventually pay up its creditors unlike Guinness which still had more days. | 37,529,981**×**365 days  60,162,617  =227.7 days | 29,046,061**×**365 days  223,664,917  =47.4 days |
| 1. Inventory turnover period   This ratio indicates that the inventories in Guinness had spent a longer period in the store before it was eventually sold while the inventories in Flourmills sold out days before Guinness. | 13,021,248**×**365 days  60,162,617  =78.99 days | 37,257,683**×**365 days  223,664,917  =60.8 days |
| 1. Receivables turnover   This shows that the receivables of Guinness took more time than that in Flourmills to turn over. | 101,973,030=3.8 times  26,509,663 | 247,876,504=3.7 times  66,504,239 |
| 1. Payables turnover   This shows that the payables of Flourmills took more time than that in Guinness to turn over. | 60,162,617=1.6 times  37,529,981 | 223,664,917=7.7 times  29,046,061 |
| 1. Inventory turnover   This indicates that the inventories in Flourmills took more time to turnover than those in Guinness. | 60,162,617=4.6 times  13,021,248 | 223,664,917=6.0 times  37,257,683 |
| 1. ROCE   This shows that Guinness had made more profit than Flourmills. | 4,415,623=0.11  41,660,605 | 4,300,173=0.04  118,787,922 |
| 1. Gross profit margin   This shows that Guinness made more gross profit from the revenue. | 41,810,413**×**100%  101,973,030  =0.41 | 24,211,587**×**100%  247,876,504  =0.10 |
| 1. Net profit margin   This shows that Flourmills made more net profit from the revenue. | 2,015,886**×**100%  101,973,030  =0.02 | 10,425,786**×**100%  247,876,504  =0.04 |
| 1. Earnings per share   This ratio indicates that Flourmills had more profit after tax attributed to each ordinary share in issue. | 2,015,886=1.34  1,505,888 | 10,425,786=3.9  2,624,253 |
| 1. Price earnings ratio   This computation shows that it took more years for the earnings in Guinness to recoup shareholder’s investments. | 83.05=61.9  1.34 | 1.30=0.3  3.97 |
| 1. Earnings yield   This is showing that Flourmills had more returns on the shareholder’s investment than Guinness. | 1.34**×**100%  83.05  =0.02 | 3.97**×**100%  1.30  =3.05 |
| 1. Net assets per share   This shows that Flourmills had more net assets, attributed to each ordinary share in issue. | 41,660,605=27.7  1,505,888 | 100,244,139=38.2  2,624,253 |
| 1. Dividend per share   This ratio shows that Guinness declared more dividend on each ordinary share in issue. | 245,000,000**×**100%  1,505,888  =162.7 | 1,936,869**×**100%  2,624,253  =0.74 |
| 1. Dividend pay-out ratio   This ratio shows that Guinness had a higher percentage of its earnings which was paid in form of dividend to ordinary shareholders. | 162.7**×**100%  1.34  =121.4 | 0.74**×**100%  3.97  =0.18 |
| 1. Dividend yield   This ratio indicates that Guinness had higher return on the shareholder’s investment than Flourmills did. | 162.7**×**100%  83.05  =1.95 | 0.74**×**100%  1.30  =0.56 |
| 1. Dividend cover   This shows that Flourmills had more earnings than Guinness to cover its dividend. | 1.34**×**100%  162.7  =0.08 | 3.97**×**100%  0.74  =5.4 |
| 1. Gearing ratio   This shows that Guinness had higher degree of vulnerability to the financial risk attached to the fixed interest securities. | 89,487,315=2.14  41,660,605 | 60,241,178=0.60  100,244,139 |

**BASIC MATERIALS SECTOR**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **RATIOS** | **BERGER PAINTS (2016)** | **NOTORE CHEM IND. (2016)** |
| 1. Current ratio   This ratio has shown that Berger paints had more ability to meet its short term financial obligations than Notore. | 1,560,693=1.19  1,306,347 | 6,224,605=0.11  57,780,638 |
| 1. Acid test ratio   This indicates that Berger paints had more cash and other assets that can be easily converted to cash in order to meet its current liabilities. | 991,218=0.76  1,306,347 | 3,520,765=0.06  57,780,638 |
| 1. Receivables collection period   This ratio indicates that Berger paints had more number of days for which it won’t be able to recover its receivables unlike Notore which had lesser days. | 381,029**×**365 days  2,602,824  =53.4 days | 3,273,020**×**365 days  25,201,505  =47.4 days |
| 1. Payables payment period   This computation shows that Berger paints had lesser days to eventually pay up its creditors unlike Notore which still had more days. | 679,151**×**365 days  1,491,193  =166.2 days | 18,803,868**×**365 days  18,375,119  =373.5 days |
| 1. Inventory turnover period   This ratio indicates that the inventories in Berger paints had spent a longer period in the store before it was eventually sold while the inventories in Notore sold out days before Berger paints. | 569,475**×**365 days  1,491,193  =139.3 days | 2,703,840**×**365 days  18,375,119  =53.7 days |
| 1. Receivables turnover   This shows that the receivables of Notore took more time than that of Berger paints to turn over. | 2,602,824=6.8 times  381,029 | 25,201,505=7.6 times  3,273,020 |
| 1. Payables turnover   This shows that the payables of Berger paints took more time than that of Notore to turn over. | 1,491,193=2.2 times  679,151 | 18,375,119=0.97  18,803,868 |
| 1. Inventory turnover   This indicates that the inventories in Notore took more time to turnover than those in Berger paints. | 1,491,193=2.6 times  569,475 | 18,375,119=6.7 times  2,703,840 |
| 1. ROCE   This shows that Berger paints had made more profit than Notore. | 278,317=0.09  2,795,918 | 2,406,455=0.03  95,582,939 |
| 1. Gross profit margin   This shows that Berger paints made more gross profit from the revenue. | 1,111,631**×**100%  2,602,824  =4.3 | 6,826,386**×**100%  25,201,505  =0.27 |
| 1. Net profit margin   This shows that Notore made more net profit from the revenue. | 224,007**×**100%  2,602,824  =0.09 | 12,018,149**×**100%  25,201,505  =0.47 |
| 1. Earnings per share   This ratio indicates that Notore had more profit after tax attributed to each ordinary share in issue. | 224,007=0.77  289,823 | 12,018,149=7.45  1,612,066 |
| 1. Price earnings ratio   This computation shows that it took the same amount of years for the earnings of both the companies to recoup its shareholder’s investments. | 6.40=8.3  0.77 | 62.5=8.3  7.46 |
| 1. Earnings yield   This is showing that both companies had the same returns on the shareholder’s investment. | 0.77**×**100%  6.40  =0.12 | 7.46**×**100%  62.5  =0.12 |
| 1. Net asset per share   This shows that Notore had more net assets, attributed to each ordinary share in issue. | 2,604,181=8.9  289,823 | 41,214,522=25.6  1,612,066 |
| 1. Gearing ratio   This shows that Notore had higher degree of vulnerability to the financial risk attached to the fixed interest securities. | 1,011,135=0.38  2,604,181 | 69,698,214=1.69  41,214,522 |

**CONSUMER SERVICES**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **RATIOS** | **MED-VIEW AIRLINE (2016)** | **TRANCORP HOTELS(2016)** |
| 1. Current ratio   This ratio has shown that Transcorp hotels had more ability to meet its short term financial obligations than Med-view. | 3,753,271=0.4  8,686,425 | 11,706,906=0.9  13,306,033 |
| 1. Acid test ratio   This indicates that Transcorp hotels had more cash and other assets that can be easily converted to cash in order to meet its current liabilities. | 3,737,339=0.4  8,686,425 | 11,023,291=0.8  13,306,033 |
| 1. Receivables collection period   This ratio indicates that Transcorp hotels had more number of days for which it won’t be able to recover its receivables unlike Med-view which had lesser days. | 3,074,820**×**365 days  25,962,545  =43 days | 9,265,317**×**365 days  14,559,553  =232 days |
| 1. Payables payment period   This computation shows that Med-view had lesser days to eventually pay up its creditors unlike Transcorp hotels which still had more days. | 7,488,641**×**365 days  21,895,300  =124.8 days | 5,764,926**×**365 days  3,625,369  =580 days |
| 1. Inventory turnover period   This ratio indicates that the inventories in Med-view had spent a longer period in the store before it was eventually sold while the inventories in Transcorp hotels sold out days before Med-view. | 15,932**×**365 days  21,895,300  =265.5 days | 683,615**×**365 days  3,625,369  =68.8 days |
| 1. Receivables turnover   This shows that the receivables of Med-view took more time than that of Transcorp hotels to turn over. | 25,962,545=8.4 times  3,074,820 | 14,559,553=1.57 times  9,265,317 |
| 1. Payables turnover   This shows that the payables of Med-view took more time than that of Transcorp hotels to turn over. | 21,895,300=2.9 times  7,488,641 | 3,625,369=0.6 times  5,764,926 |
| 1. Inventory turnover   This indicates that the inventories in Med-view took more time to turnover than those in Transcorp hotels. | 21,895,300=1374 times  15,932 | 3,625,369=5 times  683,615 |
| 1. ROCE   This shows that Transcorp hotels had made more profit than Med-view. | 288,057=0.04  6,746,911 | 4,636,291=0.06  74,983,317 |
| 1. Gross profit margin   This shows that Transcorp hotels made more gross profit from the revenue. | 4,067,245**×**100%  25,962,545  =0.16 | 10,934,184**×**100%  14,559,553  =0.75 |
| 1. Net profit margin   This shows that Transcorp hotels made more net profit from the revenue. | 772,851**×**100%  25,962,545  =0.03 | 3,733,593**×**100%  14,559,553  =0.3 |
| 1. Earnings per share   This ratio indicates that Transcorp hotels had more profit after tax attributed to each ordinary share in issue. | 772,851=0.079  9,750,649 | 3,733,593=0.49  7,600,000 |
| 1. Price earnings ratio   This computation shows that it took more years for the earnings in Transcorp hotels to recoup shareholder’s investments. | 0=0  0.079 | 4.98=10.2  0.49 |
| 1. Earnings yield   This is showing that Transcorp hotels had more returns on the shareholder’s investment than Med-view. | 0.079**×**100%  0  =0 | 0.49**×**100%  4.98  =0.09 |
| 1. Net asset per share   This shows that Transcorp htotels had more net assets, attributed to each ordinary share in issue. | 6,424,478=0.65  9,750,649 | 53,252,671=7.00  7,600,000 |

**INDUSTRIALS SECTOR**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **RATIOS** | **LAFARGE AFRICA (2016)** | **CUTIX (2016)** |
| 1. Current ratio   This ratio has shown that Cutix had more ability to meet its short term financial obligations than Lafarge. | 87,283,942=0.77  112,592,247 | 1,071,229=1.42  756,297 |
| 1. Acid test ratio   This indicates that Cutix had more cash and other assets that can be easily converted to cash in order to meet its current liabilities. | 64,719,114=0.57  112,592,247 | 583,270=0.77  756,297 |
| 1. Receivables collection period   This ratio indicates that Lafarge had more number of days for which it won’t be able to recover its receivables unlike Cutix which had lesser days. | 21,451,612**×**365 days  87,198,416  =89.8 days | 477,457**×**365 days  2,835,862  =61.5 days |
| 1. Payables payment period   This computation shows that Cutix had lesser days to eventually pay up its creditors unlike Lafarge which still had more days. | 40,094,240**×**365 days  64,326,776  =227.5 days | 163,378**×**365 days  2,102,510  =28.4 days |
| 1. Inventory turnover period   This ratio indicates that the inventories in Lafarge had spent a longer period in the store before it was eventually sold while the inventories in Cutix sold out days before Lafarge. | 22,564,828**×**365 days  64,326,776  =128 days | 487,959×365 days  2,102,510  =84.7 days |
| 1. Receivables turnover   This shows that the receivables of Cutix took more time than that of Lafarge to turn over. | 87,198,416=4.06 times  21,451,612 | 2,835,862=5.93 times  477,457 |
| 1. Payables turnover   This shows that the payables of Cutix took more time than that of Lafarge to turn over. | 64,326,776=1.6 times  40,094,240 | 2,102,510=12.8 times  163,378 |
| 1. Inventory turnover   This indicates that the inventories in Cutix took more time to turnover than those in Lafarge. | 64,326,776=2.9 times  22,564,828 | 2,102,510=4.3 times  487,959 |
| 1. ROCE   This shows that Lafarge had made more profit than Cutix. | 19,022,075=0.04  425,005,965 | 25,587=0.02  1,135,423 |
| 1. Gross profit margin   This shows that Lafarge made more gross profit from the revenue. | 22,871,640**×**100%  87,198,416  =0.26 | 733,353**×**100%  2,835,862  =0.25 |
| 1. Net profit margin   This shows that Lafarge made more net profit from the revenue. | 20,778,348**×**100%  87,198,416  =0.24 | 190,551**×**100%  2,835,862  =0.07 |
| 1. Earnings per share   This ratio indicates that Lafarge had more profit after tax attributed to each ordinary share in issue. | 20,778,348=3.8  5,480,734 | 190,551=0.22  880,661 |
| 1. Price earnings ratio   This computation shows that it took more years for the earnings in Lafarge to recoup shareholder’s investments. | 40.95=10.8  3.79 | 1.89=8.6  0.22 |
| 1. Earnings yield   This is showing that Cutix had more returns on the shareholder’s investment than Lafarge. | 3.79**×**100%  40.95  =0.09 | 0.22**×**100%  1.89  =0.11 |
| 1. Net assets per share.   This shows that Lafarge had more net assets, attributed to each ordinary share in issue. | 340,094,143=62.05  5,480,734 | 870,217=0.9  880,661 |
| 1. Dividend per share   This ratio shows that Lafarge declared more dividend on each ordinary share in issue. | 5,754,771**×**100%  5,480,734  =1.05 | 105,679**×**100%  880,661  =0.12 |
| 1. Dividend pay-out ratio   This ratio shows that Lafarge had a higher percentage of its earnings which was paid in form of dividend to ordinary shareholders. | 1.05**×**100%  3.79  =3.6 | 0.12**×**100%  0.22  =0.54 |
| 1. Dividend yield   This ratio indicates that Cutix had higher return on the shareholder’s investment than Lafarge did. | 1.05**×**100%  40.95  =0.03 | 0.12**×**100%  1.89  =0.06 |
| 1. Dividend cover   This shows that Lafarge had more earnings than Cutix to cover its dividend. | 3.79**×**100%  1.05  =3.6 | 0.22**×**100%  0.12  =1.8 |
| 1. Gearing ratio   This shows that Cutix had higher degree of vulnerability to the financial risk attached to the fixed interest securities. | 114,163,707=0.33  340,094,143 | 611,045=0.70  870,217 |

**OIL & GAS SECTOR**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **RATIOS** | **CONOIL (2016)** | **MRS OIL NIG. (2016)** |
| 1. Current ratio   This ratio has shown that Conoil had more ability to meet its short term financial obligations than MRS. | 64,070,070=1.3  50,384,089 | 62,006,446=1.1  54,070,179 |
| 1. Acid test ratio   This indicates that Conoil had more cash and other assets that can be easily converted to cash in order to meet its current liabilities. | 58,814,474=1.17  50,384,089 | 55,002,273=1.0  54,070,179 |
| 1. Receivables collection period   This ratio indicates that MRS had more number of days for which it won’t be able to recover its receivables unlike Conoil which had lesser days. | 16,383,764**×**365 days  85,023,546  =70.3 days | 43,244,878**×**365 days  109,635,054  =143.9 days |
| 1. Payables payment period   This computation shows that MRS had lesser days to eventually pay up its creditors unlike Conoil which still had more days. | 37,358,764**×**365 days  70,882,997  =192.3 days | 32,156,838**×**365 days  100,879,939  =116.3 days |
| 1. Inventory turnover period   This ratio indicates that the inventories in Conoil had spent a longer period in the store before it was eventually sold while the inventories in MRS sold out days before Conoil. | 5,255,596**×**365 days  70,882,997  =27 days | 7,004,173**×**365 days  100,879,939  =25.3 days |
| 1. Receivables turnover   This shows that the receivables of Conoil took more time than that of MRS to turn over. | 85,023,546=5.2 times  16,383,929 | 109,635,054=2.5 times  43,244,878 |
| 1. Payables turnover   This shows that the payables of MRS took more time than that of Conoil to turn over. | 70,882,997=1.9 times  37,358,764 | 100,879,939=3.1 times  32,156,838 |
| 1. Inventory turnover   This indicates that the inventories in MRS took more time to turnover than those in Conoil. | 70,882,997=13.4 times  5,255,596 | 100,879,939=14.4 times  7,004,173 |
| 1. ROCE   This shows that Conoil had made more profit than MRS. | 2,435,472=0.13  19,449,373 | 3,289,530=0.12  27,294,636 |
| 1. Gross profit margin   This shows that Conoil made more gross profit from the revenue. | 14,140,549**×**100%  85,023,546  =0.17 | 8,755,115**×**100%  109,635,054  =0.10 |
| 1. Net profit margin   This shows that Conoil made more net profit from the revenue. | 2,837,884**×**100%  85,023,546  =0.03 | 1,465,905**×**100%  109,635,054  =0.01 |
| 1. Earnings per share   This ratio indicates that MRS had more profit after tax attributed to each ordinary share in issue. | 2,837,884=4.09  693,952 | 1,465,905=5.77  253,988 |
| 1. Price earnings ratio   This computation shows that it took more years for the earnings in Conoil to recoup shareholder’s investments. | 37.48=9.2  4.09 | 43.24=7.5  5.77 |
| 1. Earnings yield   This is showing that MRS had more returns on the shareholder’s investment than Conoil. | 4.09**×**100%  37.48  =0.11 | 5.77**×**100%  43.24  =0.13 |
| 1. Net asset per share   This shows that MRS had more net assets, attributed to each ordinary share in issue. | 18,465,681=26.6  693,952 | 22,163,841=87.3  253,988 |
| 1. Dividend per share   This ratio shows that Conoil declared more dividend on each ordinary share in issue. | 2,081,856**×**100%  693,952  =3 | 279,388**×**100%  253,988  =1.1 |
| 1. Dividend pay-out ratio   This ratio shows that Conoil had a higher percentage of its earnings which was paid in form of dividend to ordinary shareholders. | 3**×**100%  4.09  =0.7 | 1.10**×**100%  5.77  =0.2 |
| 1. Dividend yield   This ratio indicates that Conoil had higher return on the shareholder’s investment than MRS did. | 3**×**100%  37.48  =0.08 | 1.10**×**100%  43.24  =0.03 |
| 1. Dividend cover   This shows that MRS had more earnings than Conoil to cover its dividend. | 4.09**×**100%  3  =1.4 | 5.77**×**100%  1.10  =5.2 |
| 1. Gearing ratio   This shows that MRS had higher degree of vulnerability to the financial risk attached to the fixed interest securities. | 8,990,872=0.5  18,465,680 | 18,526,556=0.8  22,163,841 |

**TELECOMMS & TECHNOLOGY SECTOR**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **RATIOS** | **E-TRANZACT INT. (2016)** | **CHAMS (2016)** |
| 1. Current ratio   This ratio has shown that E-tranzact had more ability to meet its short term financial obligations than Chams. | 4,569,856=1.35  3,389,742 | 2,419,904=0.85  2,834,825 |
| 1. Acid test ratio   This indicates that E-tranzact had more cash and other assets that can be easily converted to cash in order to meet its current liabilities. | 4,360,554=1.3  3,389,742 | 2,320,242=0.82  2,834,825 |
| 1. Receivables collection period   This ratio indicates that Chams had more number of days for which it won’t be able to recover its receivables unlike E-tranzact which had lesser days. | 853,823**×**365 days  10,404,501  =29.95 days | 2,198,220**×**365 days  641,435  =1250 days |
| 1. Payables payment period   This computation shows that E-tranzact had lesser days to eventually pay up its creditors unlike Chams which still had more days. | 2,667,261**×**365 days  7,500,582  =129.8 days | 2,113,369**×**365 days  273,689  =2818 days |
| 1. Inventory turnover period   This ratio indicates that the inventories in Chams had spent a longer period in the store before it was eventually sold while the inventories in E-tranzact sold out days before Chams. | 209,302**×**365 days  7,500,582  =10 days | 99,662**×**365 days  273,689  =132.9 days |
| 1. Receivables turnover   This shows that the receivables of E-tranzact took more time than that of Chams to turn over. | 10,404,501=12 times  853,823 | 641,435=0.29 times  2,198,220 |
| 1. Payables turnover   This shows that the payables of E-tranzact took more time than that of Chams to turn over. | 7,500,582=2.8 times  2,667,261 | 273,689=0.13 times  2,113,369 |
| 1. Inventory turnover   This indicates that the inventories in E-tranzact took more time to turnover than those in Chams. | 7,500,582=35.8 times  209,302 | 273,689=2.7 times  99,662 |
| 1. ROCE   This shows that E-tranzact had made more profit than Chams. | 620,180=0.17  3,521,525 | 397,450=0.08  5,076,223 |
| 1. Gross profit margin   This shows that Chams made more gross profit from the revenue. | 2,903,919**×**100%  10,404,501  =0.28 | 367,746**×**100%  641,435  =0.57 |
| 1. Net profit margin   This shows that Chams made more net profit from the revenue. | 449,486**×**100%  10,404,501  =0.04 | 1,908,433**×**100%  4,696,060  =0.41 |
| 1. Earnings per share   This ratio indicates that Chams had more profit after tax attributed to each ordinary share in issue. | 449,486=0.11  4,200,000 | 1,908,433=0.41  4,696,060 |
| 1. Price earnings ratio   This computation shows that it took more years for the earnings in E-tranzact to recoup shareholder’s investments. | 5.00=45.45  0.11 | 0.50=1.25  0.40 |
| 1. Earnings yield   This is showing that Chams had more returns on the shareholder’s investment than E-tranzact. | 0.11**×**100%  5.00  =0.02 | 0.40**×**100%  0.50  =0.8 |
| 1. Net asset per share   This shows that Chams had more net assets, attributed to each ordinary share in issue. | 3,507,674=0.84  4,200,000 | 5,076,223=1.08  4,696,060 |

**FINANCIALS SECTOR**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **RATIOS** | **GUARANTY TRUST BANK (2016)** | **UNITED BANK FOR AFRICA (2016)** |
| 1. ROCE   This shows that GTB had made more profit than UBA. | 154,005,487=0.32  476,917,853 | 57,649=0.15  390,900 |
| 1. Earnings per share   This ratio indicates that GTB had more profit after tax attributed to each ordinary share in issue. | 126,836,792=4.31  29,431,179 | 47,541=0.0013  36,279,526 |
| 1. Price earnings ratio   This computation shows that it took more years for the earnings in GTB to recoup shareholder’s investments. | 24.70=5.7  4.31 | 4.50=3.4  1.31 |
| 1. Earnings yield   This is showing that UBA had more returns on the shareholder’s investment than GTB. | 4.31**×**100%  24.70  =0.17 | 1.31**×**100%  4.50  =0.29 |
| 1. Net assets per share   This shows that GTB had more net assets, attributed to each ordinary share in issue. | 476,917,853=16.2  29,431,179 | 390,900=0.01  36,279,526 |
| 1. Dividend per share   This ratio shows that GTB declared more dividend on each ordinary share in issue. | 52,093,179=1.76  29,431,179 | 21,768**×**1000  36,279,526  =0.60 |
| 1. Dividend pay-out ratio   This ratio shows that UBA had a higher percentage of its earnings which was paid in form of dividend to ordinary shareholders. | 1.76**×**100%  4.31  =0.41 | 0.60**×**100%  1.31  =0.46 |
| 1. Dividend yield   This ratio indicates that UBA had higher return on the shareholder’s investment than GTB did. | 1.76**×**100%  24.70  =0.07 | 0.60**×**100%  4.50  =0.13 |
| 1. Dividend cover   This shows that GTB had more earnings than UBA to cover its dividend. | 4.31**×**100%  1.76  =2.45 | 1.31**×**100%  0.60  =2.18 |