

**Paper: “Le Tramway de Québec comme Catalyseur de la Durabilité des Transports Publics et de la Résilience face aux Changements Climatiques : Une revue critique”**

**Submitted: 24 June 2024**

**Accepted: 17 July 2024**

**Published: 31 July 2024**

Corresponding Author: Kossivi Fabrice Dossa

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2024.v20n20p80

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Emmanuel Ekitela  
Technical University of Mombasa, Kenya

Reviewer 2: Ousmane Kansaye  
Abdou Moumouni University, Niger

### **ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2024**

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. The copyrights of the report are on the publisher and the data can be used for research purposes.

*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>Emmanuel Ekitela</b>	
University/Country: <b>Technical University of Mombasa</b>	
Date Manuscript Received: <b>27<sup>th</sup> June, 2024</b>	Date Review Report Submitted: <b>28<sup>th</sup> June, 2024</b>
Manuscript Title: <b><i>The Quebec City Tramway: A Catalyst for Public Transportation Sustainability and Climate Change Resilience?</i></b>	
ESJ Manuscript Number: <b>18264</b>	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: <b>Yes</b>	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: <b>Yes</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.**

<b>Questions</b>	<b>Rating Result</b> [Poor] <b>1-5</b> [Excellent]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>The title is well presented in a well-developed narrative, The title words are within the range of maximum of 15 words in in a scientific paper.</i>	
<b>2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>The abstract should not exceed 200 words in length, written using Times New Roman 12 letters and numbers, single-spaced. The abstract must be structured to include (1) background; (2) method; (3) research results; (4) conclusion. The background consists of 2-3 sentences about the background and reasons for conducting the research with the selected title. The background ends with a</i>	

*sentence stating the research objectives. The method contains a research design, participants and sampling techniques, instruments, data analysis techniques. The results contain the main and important findings of the research data analysis. If the research is quantitative, then findings of the relationship/influence of variables, or group differences must be followed by an estimate of the size of the relationship/influence/difference, 95% confidence interval, and p-value, which are written in brackets, and at the end of the sentence, the findings are. The p-value should be reported as 3 digits after the decimal, for example,  $p = 0.027$ . For example, the interpretation of a particular relationship (OR = 5.67; 95% CI 4.44 to 9.23;  $P = 0.027$ ). The conclusion consists of 1-2 sentences of research conclusion. The conclusion section can be added to the implications of the research results*

<b>3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>2</b>
---	----------

*There were grammatical errors and spelling mistakes which needs to rectified by the author.*

<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>3</b>
--	----------

*This section contains research methods, including research design, participants, instruments, research procedures, data analysis techniques. [Justify, Times New Roman 11, spacing 1,15]:*

<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>3</b>
--	----------

*This section is divided into two parts. The first section presents the characteristics of the sample data (study population), that is, a sample of the population, in which the relationship/influence of variables / or group differences is analyzed. Description of the sample (study population) is important so that readers can interpret and apply the research findings appropriately, whether about the relationship between variables, the effect of a variable on other variables, or group differences if any.*

*The second part is the results of the analysis of the relationship/influence of variables / or group differences. The analysis results need to be accompanied by correct interpretation (interpretation). Interpretation in the form of words must not provide the same information (redundancy) as information in the form of numbers which is clearly meaningful without the need for additional words.*

*Use tables/graphs/figures that contain the interpretation of the results of the data analysis to make it easier for the reader to understand the results of the text research. Use of tables and figures should refer to APA Style 7th edition [Justify, Times New Roman 11, spacing 1,15]*

<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>4</b>
---	----------

*All figures and tables should be cited in order. For initial submission, please embed figures, tables, and their captions within the main text near where they are cited. At revision, figures should be uploaded separately, as we need separate files for production. Tables and all captions should be moved to the end of the file.)*

<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>3</b>
---	----------

*References should use a name-date format, not numbers. Enclose citations in parentheses with authors in upright text (non italics) as in: (Smith et al., 2009) or Smith et al. (2009).*

*References in supporting information must also be included in the reference list of the main paper, or in a designated section in the main paper so that they will be discovered, linked, and indexed. A separate list in the supporting information is not necessary. References are not included in word counts for excess length fees.*

*In the References section, cite the data/software described in the Availability Statement (this includes primary and processed data used for your research). For details on data/software citation as well as examples, see the data and software citation section of the Data & Software for Authors guidance.*

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

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

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

- 1. To frequently check on spelling errors.**
- 2. To highlight punctuational mistakes.**
- 3. To implement appropriate writing strategies.**

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

-----  
Reviewer B:

Recommendation: Revisions Required  
-----

**The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.**

The title is clear and perfectly matches the content of the document

**The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.**

Yes, and there is compliance with the methodology used PRISMA

**There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.**

Indeed, some grammatical errors exist but the author is invited to take care of them.

**The study METHODS are explained clearly.**

Yes

**The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.**

The content of the document is clear. However, it deserves to be worked on to avoid repetition on the importance of the project at the level of several parties. This gives a redundant appearance

**The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.**

Yes

**The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.**

Yes

*Please rate the TITLE of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

*Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

*Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

*Please rate the METHODS of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

*Please rate the BODY of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

*Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

*Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

**Overall Recommendation!!!**

Accepted, minor revision needed

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

I suggest that the authors correct the remaining errors by taking into account the few observations that I have inserted in the document

-----