



Manuscript: “Analyse Comparative Des Ports De Conakry, Abidjan Et Dakar Pour La Desserte De Bamako”

Submitted: 29 June 2020

Accepted: 26 October 2020

Published: 31 October 2020

Corresponding Author: Issakha Dia

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2020.v16n29p225](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2020.v16n29p225)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Jihad Jamī

Elmalek Essaadi, Morocco

Reviewer 2: Blinded

Reviewer 3: OGOU Atsé Willy Arnaud

Université Felix Houphouët Boigny Abidjan, Côte d’Ivoire

Reviewer 4: Blinded

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.

ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Reviewer Name:	Email:
University/Country:	
Date Manuscript Received: 28-07-2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 10-08-2020
Manuscript Title: Analyse comparative de la compétitivité des ports de Conakry, Abidjan et Dakar pour la desserte de Bamako	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0735/20	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Non	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	3
<i>L'intitulé du sujet n'est pas clairement énoncé. Il est partiellement adapté au contenu de l'article.</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	2

La méthodologie n'est pas assez explicite.	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<i>D'une manière générale des corrections sont à apporter dans l'ensemble du document notamment dans la formulation des phrases.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	2
<i>La méthode de recherche n'apparaît dans le document présenté. (dans la partie matériel et méthode).</i>	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	2
<i>L'auteur est resté assez évasif dans son analyse. Il s'est laissé aller dans des démonstrations qui ne sont pas nécessairement en relation avec le sujet traité.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<i>La conclusion est à adapté au contenu corrigé de la prochaine monture du document.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
<i>Préciser s'il s'agit d'une référence bibliographique ou d'une bibliographie. Prière également de se conformer à la norme en vigueur applicable par la revue.</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	
Return for major revision and resubmission	X
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Dans l'optique d'améliorer la qualité du document, il convient que les différentes observations faites soient prises en compte.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.

ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Date Manuscript Received: 13 juillet 2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 04 Août 2020
Manuscript Title: Analyse Comparative De La Compétitivité Des Ports De Conakry, Abidjan Et Dakar Pour La Desserte De Bamako.	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Non	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: Non	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: Oui	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	2/5
<i>Le titre est clair mais n'est pas adapté au contenu de l'article. En effet, l'auteur n'a pas réussi à montrer au lecteur, la dimension comparative de la compétitivité des différents ports. Il n'a pas cerné son objet d'étude.</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	2/5

<i>Le résumé est totalement à revoir, car il est trop long et ne présente pas clairement la démarche méthodologique utilisée pour traiter l'objet. Néanmoins, les résultats y sont bien présentés.</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4/5
<i>L'article a l'avantage d'être relativement bien écrit. Et cela est au mérite de l'auteur.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	2/5
<i>Les méthodes utilisées ne sont pas explicitement présentées en lien avec l'objet. Il y a un manque relatif de rigueur méthodologique.</i>	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	1/5
<i>Le corps du document doit être revisité et réorganisé, car tel que présenté, il ne traite pas de l'objet d'étude.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	
<i>La conclusion ne rappelle pas la démarche théorique et méthodologique. De plus, les résultats présentés ne sont pas liés à l'objet.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	
<i>Les références bibliographiques sont nombreuses (4 pages), n'ont pas servi à cerner l'objet. On pourrait penser que l'auteur a fait du remplissage.</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	
Return for major revision and resubmission	X
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

L'auteur devra faire apparaître clairement dans son travail la Comparaison entre la Compétitivité des différents ports avec données précises à l'appui.
Il devra également mettre plus de rigueur dans la démarche en indiquant le nombre d'enquêtés, l'échantillonnage choisit, la méthode de recherche choisie, et faire une meilleure présentation de son champs d'étude, en lien avec l'objet.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.
ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Reviewer Name: <i>JAMĭ Jihad</i>	Email:
University/Country: Abdelmalek Essaadi / Morocco	
Date Manuscript Received: 1st July 2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 6th July 2020
Manuscript Title: Analyse Comparative De La Compétitivité Des Ports De Conakry, Abidjan Et Dakar Pour La Desserte De Bamako	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes/No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes/No	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes/No	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <i>The title corresponds with the content of the paper</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	5

<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <i>The content of the abstract is clearly presented and gives the study, the method and the result</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <i>There aren't grammatical errors. The author has written very good manuscript</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <i>The methods are clearly explained</i>	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <i>I didn't find errors in the body of the paper</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <i>The conclusion accurate and is supported by the content</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <i>The author presented a good reference related to the paper</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	X
Accepted, minor revision needed	
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

No comments

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.

ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Date Manuscript Received: 29/07/2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 07/08/2020
Manuscript Title: Analyse Comparative De La Compétitivité Des Ports De Conakry, Abidjan Et Dakar Pour La Desserte De Bamako	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 35/07/2020	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: /No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	2
<i>L'analyse de la compétitivité entre les ports étudiés a été très peu mise en exergue. Le contenu de l'article comporte trop de généralité. Les cartes et certaines illustrations sont à revoir.</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3,5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
<i>L'auteur doit certaines informations notamment le choix des personnes interrogées la technique utilisée et le nombre de personnes sollicitées dans chaque port.</i>	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	
Return for major revision and resubmission	X
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Une nouvelle instruction est nécessaire. Vous trouverez dans le document les observations pour améliorer la qualité du travail.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: