

**Paper: “Approche Géospatiale de la Localisation des Stations-Services au Cameroun”**

**Submitted: 30 December 2023**

**Accepted: 12 March 2024**

**Published: 31 March 2024**

Corresponding Author: Gilles Tounsi

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2024.v20n8p140

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Blinded

Reviewer 2: Blinded

Reviewer 3: Issa Fofana

Université des Sciences Sociales et de gestion de Bamako, Mali

Reviewer 4: Mambou Jean Romuald

Université Denis SASSOU-N’GUESSO de Kintélé, République du Congo

# ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2023

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: Dr Issa FOFANA,	
University/Country: Mali	
Date Manuscript Received: 2 janvier 2024	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title:	
ESJ Manuscript Number: Approche <b>géospatiale de la localisation des stations-services au Cameroun</b>	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes	
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]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>C'est une question d'actualité dans de nombreuses villes africaines.</i>	

<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>Le document est bien écrit avec peu de fautes.</i>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>2</b>
<p>L'auteur doit revoir sa méthodologie. Il manque les données des entretiens qualitatives qu'est-ce que les gens ont dit de ce sujet.  Également il manque des acteurs importants qu'il faudra interroger : les habitants aux alentours des stations, les conducteurs de taxis et de motos, les gestionnaires des stations de télécommunication  Les photos doivent être commentées.</p>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>Les résultats peuvent être améliorés en ajoutant les avis des autres acteurs qui manquent.</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

**Overall Recommendation** (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Accepted, minor revision needed	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Return for major revision and resubmission	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reject	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

**Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:**



## ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2023

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: <b>MAMBOU Jean-Romuald</b>	
University/Country: <b>Université Denis SASSOU-N'GUESSO de Kintélé (République du Congo)</b>	
Date Manuscript Received: <b>19 janvier 2024</b>	Date Review Report Submitted: <b>24 février 2024</b>
Manuscript Title: <b>Approche Géospatiale de la Localisation des Stations-services au Cameroun</b>	
ESJ Manuscript Number: <b>0125/24</b>	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper:	<b>Yes/No</b>
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: <b>Yes/No</b>	
You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: <b>Yes/No</b>	

### 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]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <b><i>Oui, le titre est clair et en adéquation avec le contenu de l'article. / Yes, The title is clear in line with the content of the article.</i></b>	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <b><i>Le résumé reprend correctement la problématique et les principaux résultats.</i></b>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this</b>	<b>2</b>

<b>article.</b>	
<i>(Please insert your comments) Le document contient beaucoup un certain nombre de fautes d'orthographe et de grammaire qu'il conviendrait de corriger.</i>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments) La méthodologie est clairement explicitée.</i>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments) Les résultats sont liés à la méthodologie de travail.</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments) La conclusion conviendrait à être plus étoffée en reprenant les résultats majeurs.</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments) Les références sont adaptées à la problématique de l'étude.</i>	

**Overall Recommendation** (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	<b>X</b>
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

L'auteur doit revoir la conclusion. Il devrait également relire le texte et corrigé les nombreux coquilles qui dénaturent la qualité de l'article.

**Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:**

Le travail mené dans cette recherche est intéressant. Le sujet est d'actualité et pourra servir pour la résolution des situations similaires dans d'autres pays africains où la problématique de l'implantation des stations-services reste une préoccupation.