When the Numbers Stop Making Sense

The financial statements tell a story. Analytical review is the discipline of asking whether the story is coherent, and what the incoherence reveals when it is not.

The Question Most Audit Teams Do Not Ask

Risk assessment identifies what might go wrong. Substantive procedures test whether it did. Analytical review, at planning, during execution, and at the final stage, is the discipline that asks a different question entirely:

> Does the overall financial picture make sense?

Not does each number pass its individual test. Not does the revenue recognition policy comply with Ind AS 115. Not does the impairment model use an appropriate discount rate. But does the complete financial picture- revenue, margins, cash flows, working capital, related party movements, going concern indicators, tell a coherent story about a business operating in its known economic environment?

That question is harder to answer than any individual procedure. It requires the auditor to hold the entire financial statement in mind simultaneously and ask whether the patterns are consistent, with each other, with the industry, with the prior year, with what the auditor knows about how this business actually operates.

It is also the question that most frequently reveals what individual procedures miss.

Analytical Compliance vs. Analytical Investigation

SA 520 governs analytical procedures. It requires their use at planning- to understand the entity and identify areas of risk, and at the final stage, to assess whether the financial statements are consistent with the auditor's understanding. It permits their use as substantive procedures where the auditor determines they are more effective than tests of detail.

In practice, analytical review is most frequently performed as a compliance activity rather than an investigative one. The difference determines what each produces.

> ### Analytical Compliance
>
> Ratios are calculated. Variances are identified. Management explanations are obtained. The procedures are completed and documented. Output: A documented set of ratios with management explanations attached.

> ### Analytical Investigation
>
> Unexplained patterns are treated as signals rather than variances to be explained. Signals are pursued until the explanation is independently corroborated or the implication is understood. Output: Comfort, or a finding. Never just an explanation.

> Analytical compliance produces a documented set of ratios with management explanations attached. Analytical investigation produces either comfort, because the explanation is independently verifiable, or a finding. Never just an explanation.

The Five Patterns That Most Reliably Signal Problems

Across NFRA inspection findings and documented corporate failures, five analytical patterns appear with the greatest frequency in the periods preceding material misstatement or financial distress. Each is individually explicable. Together, or in combination, they form the earliest visible signal that the financial statements may not be telling a coherent story. NFRA's Financial Reporting Quality Review Reports have consistently identified analytical review as an area where files document procedures performed rather than coherence assessed.

Patterns 1–3

1. Revenue Growing Faster Than Cash Collections

When receivable days expand significantly while revenue grows, particularly over multiple periods, the financial statements are signalling aggressive revenue recognition, customer financial stress, channel stuffing, or fictitious sales. The analytical test: plot revenue growth against cash receipts from customers in the cash flow statement across a minimum of three years. A single year's divergence is explicable. Three years of divergence is a pattern requiring investigation.

2. Profits Consistently Exceeding Operating Cash Flows

Reported profits can be manufactured through accounting choices. Cash is harder to fabricate. When operating profit and operating cash flow diverge persistently, not in one year, but across multiple periods, the divergence deserves investigation beyond ratio documentation. Working capital build proportionate to revenue growth is different from working capital build that exceeds it. Non-cash income that recurs year after year is different from a one-time item.

3. Margin Stability During Operational Disruption

When an industry is under pressure, cost inflation, demand contraction, competitive intensity, and a company reports stable or improving margins, the stability itself is a signal. It may reflect genuine competitive advantage. It may reflect accounting choices smoothing what should be visible volatility. The auditor who accepts margin stability as reassuring rather than investigating its source has missed the analytical signal.

Patterns 4–5

4. Related Party Transaction Growth Outpacing Rationale

When related party transactions grow in scale across successive periods while the disclosed commercial rationale becomes progressively less specific, the pattern signals that the scrutiny applied may not be proportionate to growing significance. The analytical test: map related party transaction volume against disclosed rationale across multiple years. A pattern of growing transactions with thinning explanation is itself an audit signal.

5. Going Concern Language That Softens as Conditions Deteriorate

When an entity's financial position is weakening, liquidity tightening, debt covenants approaching thresholds, refinancing requirements increasing, the going concern language in successive audit reports should become more specific and more prominent, not less. When going concern language softens or remains unchanged as observable financial stress increases, the audit report is communicating something inconsistent with the financial reality it describes.

The Final Analytical Review: Where the Discipline Matters Most

SA 520 requires analytical procedures at the conclusion of the audit to assess whether the financial statements as a whole are consistent with the auditor's understanding of the entity. This is the last opportunity to identify incoherence before the opinion is issued.

In practice, the final analytical review is frequently the weakest application of the discipline. By the conclusion of an audit, the engagement team is psychologically committed to conclusions reached during execution. The file is substantially complete. The opinion is drafted. The partner is focused on completion. This is precisely the moment when the discipline of asking "does the overall picture make sense?" is most valuable, and most frequently avoided.

> The auditor who completes the final analytical review by confirming that variances have been explained has performed a compliance procedure. The auditor who asks whether the explanations, taken together, tell a coherent story has performed the investigative function that the standard requires.

The Root Cause Analysis Discipline

Three Levels of Investigation

When an analytical pattern is identified, revenue diverging from cash, margins stable during disruption, going concern language softening, the investigative discipline requires pursuing the signal at three levels.

> ### The Surface Level
>
> What is the numerical pattern and how significant is it across multiple periods?

> ### The Explanation Level
>
> What does management say explains the pattern, and is that explanation consistent with all available evidence, not just the evidence management has provided?

> ### The Implication Level
>
> If management's explanation is incomplete or incorrect, what does the pattern indicate about the financial statements? What is the alternative hypothesis, and has it been genuinely evaluated rather than dismissed?

Most analytical review stops at the explanation level. The investigative discipline requires reaching the implication level, explicitly documenting the alternative hypothesis considered and the evidence that supports or refutes it. That documentation is what distinguishes a file that demonstrates genuine analytical rigour from one that records procedures performed.

The Diagnostic Question

For every engagement, before the opinion is issued, one question should be asked and documented:

> If someone who had never seen this company's financial statements before were shown this year's numbers alongside the prior two years, the revenue trajectory, the cash conversion, the margin behaviour, the working capital movements, the going concern indicators, would the overall picture make sense to them as a description of a business operating in its known environment?

If the answer is yes, the analytical review has provided comfort. If the answer is uncertain, the file should document why. If the answer is no, or if the question has not been asked, the audit is not complete.

The Three-Year Test

One year's divergence between revenue and cash, or between profit and operating cash flow, is explicable. Three years of divergence is a pattern. Analytical review that examines only the current year cannot identify patterns. Design monitoring across a minimum of three years for every significant analytical signal.

The Alternative Hypothesis

For every management explanation of a significant variance, the file should document the alternative hypothesis, what the pattern would indicate if the explanation is incomplete, and the evidence that supports or refutes that alternative. The alternative hypothesis considered and rejected is as important as the explanation accepted.

The Coherence Test

Before the opinion is issued: does the overall financial picture tell a coherent story about this business operating in its known environment? Not each individual number, the picture. Incoherence at the overall level is the signal that individual procedures have not caught. It is where the final analytical review does its most important work.

When the numbers stop making sense, that is not the end of the analytical review. It is the beginning of it.

CA Pranav Jain, FCA | Co-Founder, Anveshana Consulting Private Limited | anveshana@anveshanaconsulting.com — This article is part of Anveshana's Audit Quality Insights series.