



Paper: **“Dynamic Evolution of Electric Vehicle Trade Network between China and Europe”**

Submitted: 26 February 2025

Accepted: 15 May 2025

Published: 31 May 2025

Corresponding Author: Shigang Yan

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2025.v21n13p1

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Murry Siyasiya
Blantyre International University, Malawi

Reviewer 2: Enida Pulaj
University of Vlora, Albania

Reviewer 3: Blinded

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2025

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: MURRY SIYASIYA	
University/Country: MALAWI UNIVERSITY OF BUSINESS AND APPLIED SCIENCES (MUBAS)	
Date Manuscript Received: 14-03-2025	Date Review Report Submitted: 17-03-2025
Manuscript Title: EVOLUTION OF ELECTRIC VEHICLE TRADE NETWORK BETWEEN CHINA-EUROPE	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
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:	
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.

Questions	Rating Result [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article. (NEED TO REPLACE – WITH AND SO THAT IT SHOULD READ “CHINA AND EUROPE”)	4
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results. (IMPLICATIONS HAVE NOT BEEN INDICATED IN THE ABSTRACT AND IT IS NOT CLEAR HOW THE SNA HAS BEEN UTILISED IN THE WORK)	4
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article. (Please insert your comments)	5
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3

<i>(AS INDICATED IN 2)</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3
<i>(THERE ARE NO RESULTS PER SAY, BUT CALCULATIONS/DESCRIPTIVES)</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<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	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

THERE IS NEED TO CLARIFY HOW THE SNA WAS UTILIZED AND WHAT SORT OF DATA WAS USED. OTHER MINOR ISSUES HAVE BEEN INDICATED IN THE PAPER AS COMMENTS AND EDITS.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2025

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: Enida Pulaj (Brakaj)	
University/Country: University of Vlora, Albania	
Date Manuscript Received: 14.03.2025	Date Review Report Submitted: 23.03.2024
Manuscript Title: Dynamic Evolution of Electric Vehicle Trade Network between China-Europe	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
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:	

Evaluation Criteria:

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

Questions	Rating Result [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	5
<i>The title is clear and it is adequate to the content.</i>	
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	4
<i>Suggest structuring the abstract with the following sections (introduction, methods, results and conclusions);</i>	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<i>The paper needs to be proofread because there are some grammatical errors and paragraphs that seems to be formatted.</i>	
<i>Some sentences were slightly long and could be split for improved clarity and flow.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5

<i>The methodology is explained correctly.</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	5
<i>The results are clear and supported from the used study methods..</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>The conclusions are accurate, well-structured and informative. However, some minor adjustments can be made to improve clarity, coherence, and readability. Certain ideas, such as the emphasis on "strategic partnerships," were repeated with similar phrasing. The revision makes these points more concise without losing the meaning.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>Some references need corrections.</i> <i>For example: in the text body there is: Yao et al., 2023 and at the reference section there is Yao et al., 2024.</i> <i>At the introduction section it is cited: Yu et al., 2022 and at the reference section it is written Yu et al., 2021</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):