



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJEMT_19486
Title of the Manuscript:	The Evolution of the Chinese Administrative Examination & Approval System: Reasonable or Unreasonable?
Type of the Article	Original Research 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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	(i) The objectives of the paper are not clearly stated. This must be addressed by rewriting the Introduction section of the paper. (ii) The literature Review should be reorganised with the major concept of Administrative Examination and Approval System analysed adequately. From the argument of the paper, one can guess that the dependent variable is Economic/Social Development. But this has not been given adequate attention especially in the literature review. (iii) The methodology of the paper has not been properly discussed. This leaves one to wonder how much use news reportage is to a research on Evolution of administrative and Approval System.	Thanks for these important revision suggestions. I've rewritten the Introduction section to state the objective of the paper, i.e. to judge the rationality of CAEAS and its reform in the perspective of reviewing the history of CAEAS. The literature review is reorganized to illustrate the unique of Chinese Administrative Examination and Approval System. It also presents the research progress of CAEAS reform in China, including the suggestions and views. In fact, economic/social development is regarded as the condition and the result of CAEAS reform, not the independent variable or dependent variable. I've explained the research method and data resources. All those revision are marked in yellow.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	The language of the Paper needs to be refined. The author must adopt better language in the presentation of his/her argument.	I've tried my best to refine the language.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The topic of the paper is an interesting one. The author have in his/her reach, a great deal of data which could make the paper of a useful value.	Thanks.