

**Paper: “Optimisation d’un réseau de transport durable : le pré et le post acheminement des marchandises import-export du Mali”**

**Submitted: 30 September 2024**

**Accepted: 04 November 2024**

**Published: 30 November 2024**

Corresponding Author: Lassina Togola

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2024.v20n31p124](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2024.v20n31p124)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Imad Ait Lhassan  
Université Abdelmalek Essaadi, Maroc

Reviewer 2: Blinded

### 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: Imad Ait Lhassan  |   |
| University/Country: Université Abdelmalek Essaadi - Maroc  |   |
| Date Manuscript Received: <b>05-10-2024</b>  | Date Review Report Submitted: <b>12-10-2024</b> |
| Manuscript Title: <b>Optimisation d'un réseau de transport durable : le pré et le post acheminement des marchandises import-export du Mali</b> |   |
| ESJ Manuscript Number: <b>1038/24</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: <b>Yes</b>                              |   |
| 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.

| <i>Questions</i>  | <i>Rating Result</i><br>[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>The title is clear and aligns well with the content of the article, accurately reflecting its focus and ensuring relevance to the topics discussed.</i>  |  |
| <b>2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.</b>  | <b>5</b>                                       |
| <i>The abstract effectively presents the objectives, methods, and results, providing a concise and comprehensive overview of the article's key components.</i>  |  |
| <b>3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>   | <b>3</b>                                       |
| <i>There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article, such as incorrect verb tenses and misplaced punctuation marks. For example :<br/>Page 4 : des documents administratives -&gt; des documents administratifs</i> |  |

|  |          |
|--|----------|
| <i>Page 11 : le secteur industrielle -&gt; le secteur industriel</i>   |          |
| <b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>   | <b>1</b> |
| <i>The absence of a dedicated section on the research methodology is noticeable. A more detailed explanation of the methods and tools that will be used in the results section would help enhance the clarity and rigor of the study.</i>  |          |
| <b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>   | <b>5</b> |
| <i>The results are clear and free from errors, but further elaboration on the analysis or interpretation of these findings could enhance the overall understanding and depth of the study.</i>   |          |
| <b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>  | <b>4</b> |
| <i>The conclusions or summary are accurate and well-supported by the content of the article, effectively reflecting the findings and ensuring alignment with the study's objectives and results. However, a more in-depth discussion could further strengthen the link between the conclusions and the evidence presented.</i> |          |
| <b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>  | <b>5</b> |
| <i>The references are comprehensive and appropriate, and the authors have adhered to the APA format, ensuring consistency and proper citation throughout the article.</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):**

*Please consider my remarks to enhance the quality of the article. You have done a good job, and I wish you continued success in your work.*

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