



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade</u>
Manuscript Number:	2014_BJEMT_12507
Title of the Manuscript:	LANGUAGE IN THE LABOR MARKET: EVIDENCE FROM CHINESE IMMIGRANT-OWNED ENTERPRISES IN CONGO BRAZZAVILLE
Type of the Article	

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound.

To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Compulsory REVISION comments		
Minor REVISION comments	The subject of this paper is practical and important, but it requires minor revision as Follows: (1) p.1, lines 8 & 9 ---<u>We use</u> --- and <u>investigate</u>-- -->This study uses --- and investigates... (2) p.1, lines 20 & 21 ---"Chinese <u>owned</u> enterprises"--->"Chinese immigrant-owned enterprises" (3) p.2 line 63 ---order to have__better job,--- ->order to have better job... (4) p.2, lines 67 & 68--- <u>We analyze</u> --- and <u>investigate</u> ---->This study analyzes --- and investigates (5) p.4, line 148--- Lindley (2002) <u>explores</u> --- ->Lindley (2002) explored--- (6) p.4, line 149--- <u>Findings</u> ---->The findings (7) p.4, line 153--- Kossoudji (1988) <u>suggests</u>--- ->Kossoudji (1988) suggested--- (8) p.4, line156--- Schellekens (2001) <u>shows</u> --- ->Schellekens (2001) showed--- (9) p.4, line159--- Tainer (1988) <u>argues</u> ---	OK



SDI Review Form 1.6

	→Tainer (1988) argued--- (10) p.4, line196--- (CREP) survey__which was--- →(CREP) survey which was --- (11) p.5, line203--- Ma Mung (2008) <u>identifies</u> ---→Ma Mung (2008) identified --- (12) p.5, line208--- Carling and Haugen (2004) <u>refer to</u>---→Carling and Haugen (2004) referred to --- (13) p.6, line244---<u>We estimate</u>---→This study estimates --- (14) p.6, line250---<u>We generate</u>---→This study generates --- (15) p.6, line259---<u>We examine</u>---→This study examines --- (16) p.6, line282---Chiswick and Miller (2005) <u>view</u>---→Chiswick and Miller (2005) viewed --- (17) p.7, line295---<u>We finally add</u>---→This study finally adds--- (18) p.7, line305---<u>we fitted</u> ---→This study fitted- -- (19) p.7, line307--- <u>table 1</u> ----→Table 1--- (20) p.7, line312(Table 1)--- 3= fairly <u>well</u> 4= very well---→3= fairly well ; 4--- (21) p.8, line316--- <u>Table 2</u> ----→Table 2 not seprated--- (22) p.10, line319--- <u>table 2-4</u> (Sin,000)---→Table 2-4 (Sin .000)--- (23) p.13, line424--- <u>We use</u>---→This study uses---	
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	(24) p.14, line449---96% of---→Ninety-six percent of--- (25) p.14, line455---Cheng noted the---→Cheng (year?) noted the--- (26) p.14, line484---6 - --→6.--- (27) The authors are advised to describe the research limitation in the conclusion section. Besides, the references need to be formatted and checked again in accordance with the Journal's format (I remind).	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		