



**Paper: “Revue systématique de l'association entre les déplacements domicile-travail et le bien-être subjectif”**

**Submitted: 20 March 2025**

**Accepted: 02 May 2025**

**Published: 31 May 2025**

Corresponding Author: Oumaima Elfarkh

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2025.v21n14p178

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Christian Djimarabeye  
Université de Yaoundé 1, Cameroun

Reviewer 2: Diboh Emmanuel  
Université Jean Lorougnon Guédé, Côte d'Ivoire

Reviewer 3: Emoud Tcholi Idrissa  
Université Abdou Moumouni de Niamey, Niger

Reviewer 4: El Madhi Youssef  
Ibn Tofail University, Faculty of Sciences, Laboratory of Biology and Health, Kenitra, Morocco

### 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: DIBOH EMMANUEL	
University/Country: UNiversité Jean Lorougnon Guédé (Daloa-Côte d'Ivoire)	
Date Manuscript Received: 23/03/2025	Date Review Report Submitted: 05/04/2025
Manuscript Title: <b>Revue systématique de l'association entre les déplacements domicile-travail et le bien-être subjectif</b> <b>Systematic review of the association between commuting and subjective well-being</b>	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0424/25	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: oui	
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: 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.

Questions	Rating Result [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article. <i>Le titre est en adéquation avec le contenu du document</i>	4
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results. <i>Le résumé est bon et presente assez bien les objectifs, la méthodologie et les resultats.</i>	4
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article. <i>Texte bien écrit avec très peu de fautes.</i>	4.5
4. The study methods are explained clearly. <i>Bonne méthodologie.</i>	4.5
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4

<i>Resultats en adequation avec la méthodologie.</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>Le premier paragraphe de la conclusion n'est pa utile car c'est une repetition. Aussi cette partie du document ne doit pas contenir de citation.</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>Les references sont recentes.</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):**

**Cette étude reflète-elle la réalité globale de l'ensemble de la planète, ou juste une partie du monde? Puisque seul l'exemple du Maroc a été visiblement cité dans l'introduction.**

**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: Dr EMOUD TCHOLI Idrissa	
University/Country: Université Abdou Moumouni de Niamey/Niger	
Date Manuscript Received: 15/04/2025	Date Review Report Submitted: 16/04/2025
Manuscript Title: Systematic review of the association between commuting and subjective well-being	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0424/25	
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]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>It faithfully reflects the purpose of the research, i.e. the systematic analysis of the link between commuting characteristics and subjective well-being</i>	
<b>2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>It provides a clear, structured summary of the article's content. The essential elements - the objective of the systematic review, the methodology (databases, inclusion criteria), and the main results - are clearly highlighted.</i>	
<b>3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>The overall style is clear and scientific, but there are a few grammatical errors.</i>	

<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>The methodology is well presented and follows the standards of systematic reviews, notably with the use of the PRISMA guide. The steps involved in selecting, evaluating and analyzing the articles included are clear and well-structured.</i>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>The results are well presented, consistent with the study objectives, with no apparent inconsistencies.</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>The conclusions are well aligned with the objectives and results of the study. They effectively summarize the main contributions of the review and underline the relevance of the subject for future research in public health and mobility.</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>The bibliographic list is comprehensive, relevant and closely related to the subject. The sources are mostly recent and from recognized publications, which reinforces the credibility of the work.</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):**

The manuscript presents a relevant and timely systematic review on the relationship between commuting characteristics and subjective well-being. The topic is well defined, and the objectives, methods, and findings are clearly presented.

I commend the use of PRISMA guidelines and the structured approach to article selection and quality appraisal. However, here are a few suggestions for improvement:

1. Language and Style: There are a few grammatical and spelling mistakes throughout the manuscript. A careful proofreading or professional language editing is recommended to improve readability.
2. Methodological Clarity: While the methods are generally clear, the description of the quality assessment tool (Kmet et al.) could be expanded for better understanding by readers unfamiliar with it.
3. Minor Enhancements:
  - a. Consider briefly discussing the limitations of the review in the conclusion.
  - b. The abstract could be slightly more concise and focused.

Overall, this is a well-conducted and insightful review that contributes meaningfully to the literature on urban mobility and mental well-being. With minor revisions, it would be suitable for publication.

### **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!***

Date Manuscript Received: 15/04/2025	Date Review Report Submitted: 20/04/2025
Manuscript Title:	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0424/25	
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.**

Questions	Rating Result [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>Oui le titre est clair et est en cohérence avec le contenu. C'est un sujet d'intérêt général, qui fait partie intégrante de notre vie quotidienne et pour notre bien-être.</i>	
<b>2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.</b>	<b>3,5</b>
<i>Le résumé est complet mais revoir un peu les mots clés car ils sont longs et reprennent presque le titre</i>	
<b>3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>4,5</b>
<i>Le niveau en grammaire est excellent bien qu'une faute d'orthographe soit apparue</i>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>La méthodologie adoptée est claire et répond bien à cette étude</i>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>Les résultats sont clairs et bien organisés</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>4</b>

<i>La conclusion est très bien présentée</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>4,5</b>
<i>La bibliographie est bien présentée et actualisée</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):**

Les auteurs ont le mérite de soulever les menaces que les déplacements domicile-travail peuvent avoir une grande influence sur le bien-être subjectif alors qu'ils font parties intégrantes de notre vie quotidienne.

**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: <b>Pr. EL MADHI Youssef.</b>	
University/Country: Ibn Tofail University, Faculty of Sciences, Laboratory of Biology and Health, Kenitra, Morocco	
Date Manuscript Received:	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: "Systematic review of the association between commuting and subjective well-being"	
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: 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]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>5/5</b>
<i>The title, "Systematic review of the association between commuting and subjective well-being," is clear, concise, and accurately reflects the content of the article. It effectively communicates the focus on the relationship between commuting characteristics and subjective well-being, making it easy for readers to understand the scope of the study.</i>	
<b>2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.</b>	<b>2/5</b>
<i>The abstract covers the objectives and methods adequately but lacks sufficient detail about the key results. Additionally, references (e.g., "conformément à Kmet et al. (2004)") are included, which is not standard practice for abstracts. To improve, the authors should provide more specific examples of the main findings and remove all references from the abstract.</i>	



<b>3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>4/5</b>
<p><i>While the article is generally well-written, there are some grammatical and spelling issues that need attention. Examples include:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Incorrect preposition usage: "Satisfaction vis-à-vis les déplacements domicile-tavail" (should be "vis-à-vis des").</i></li> <li><i>Spelling errors: "diffèrentes" → "différentes".</i></li> <li><i>Repetitive phrasing: The term "longs trajets domicile-travail" is overused without variation.</i></li> <li><i>A thorough proofreading would significantly enhance the linguistic quality.</i></li> </ul>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>5/5</b>
<p><i>The methods section is exceptionally detailed and follows the PRISMA guidelines rigorously. The selection criteria, databases used (Scopus, Google Scholar, PubMed), and the evaluation process based on Kmet et al. (2004) are all clearly outlined. This level of transparency ensures reproducibility and strengthens the credibility of the study.</i></p>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>5/5</b>
<p><i>The results are presented in a structured and comprehensible manner. Tables are used effectively to summarize key findings, and the main trends (e.g., negative effects of long commutes, benefits of active transport) are well-supported by evidence. No apparent errors were identified in the interpretation of the data.</i></p>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>2/5</b>
<p><i>The conclusion is overly long and repetitive, summarizing much of the information already discussed in the results and discussion sections rather than focusing on the key contributions and actionable recommendations. While it accurately reflects the study's findings, it lacks conciseness and fails to emphasize the unique value of the research.</i></p> <p><i>A more effective conclusion would:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Highlight the main findings briefly (e.g., negative impacts of long commutes, benefits of active transport).</i></li> <li><i>Focus on the novelty of the study (e.g., synthesizing data to provide a holistic understanding of commuting and subjective well-being).</i></li> <li><i>Provide clear, actionable recommendations for policymakers without reiterating all details.</i></li> </ol> <p><i>For example, instead of restating all results, the authors could summarize implications in a few sentences, such as:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>"This study underscores the importance of promoting active transport and improving public transport conditions to enhance commuters' well-being."</i></li> <li><i>"Urban planning policies should prioritize reducing long commutes and fostering sustainable mobility options."</i></li> </ul>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>3/5</b>
<p><i>The reference list is extensive and includes a wide range of peer-reviewed articles published between 2010 and 2023. However, there are several issues that need to be addressed to ensure compliance with APA 7th edition standards and improve the overall quality of the references:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Duplicate Entries:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Several references are listed multiple times without clear justification. For example:</i></li> </ul> </li> </ol>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Clark, B., et al. (2019) appears twice.</i></li> <li>• <i>Bergstad, C. J., et al. (2010 and 2011) likely refer to the same publication but are listed separately.</i></li> <li>• <i>Ettema, D., Friman, M., et al. (2012) is cited twice.</i></li> <li>• <i>These duplicates should be merged or removed to avoid redundancy.</i></li> </ul>
2.	<p><i>Incomplete or Incorrect References:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Some references lack essential information, such as volume numbers, page ranges, or DOIs. Examples include:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Chrisinger, B. W., et al. (2019): Missing DOI for International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health .</i></li> <li>• <i>Diener, E. (2009): Missing publisher and DOI. It should be formatted as:</i>  <i>Diener, E. (2009). The science of well-being: The collected works of Ed Diener . Springer. <a href="https://doi.org/10.1007/978-90-481-2350-6">https://doi.org/10.1007/978-90-481-2350-6</a></i></li> <li>• <i>Fordham, L., et al. (2017): If this is a conference paper, it should include the full citation format for proceedings.</i></li> <li>• <i>Guennouni, J. (2019): This reference lacks clarity about the document type. It should specify whether it is a report, brief, or other format.</i></li> <li>• <i>Nie, P., &amp; Sousa-Poza, A. (2016): Missing volume and page numbers. It should be:</i>  <i>Nie, P., &amp; Sousa-Poza, A. (2016). Commute time and subjective well-being in urban China. China Economic Review, 41 , 123–137. <a href="https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chieco.2016.03.002">https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chieco.2016.03.002</a></i></li> <li>• <i>Sirgy, M. J. (2012): Duplicate author names should be corrected, and the title formatting should follow APA guidelines.</i></li> </ul> </li> </ul>
3.	<p><i>Formatting Issues:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Titles of journal articles should be in sentence case (only the first word capitalized unless it includes proper nouns).</i></li> <li>• <i>Journal titles should be italicized and in title case (major words capitalized).</i></li> <li>• <i>DOIs should always be presented as active URLs (e.g., <a href="https://doi.org/">https://doi.org/</a>...).</i></li> </ul>
4.	<p><i>Irrelevant or Non-Pertinent References:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>While the majority of references are relevant, some may not directly contribute to the study’s objectives. These should be reviewed and potentially removed to streamline the reference list.</i></li> </ul> <p><i>Suggestions for Improvement:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Remove duplicate entries and consolidate overlapping references.</i></li> <li>• <i>Complete all missing information (volume, pages, DOIs, etc.) for incomplete references.</i></li> <li>• <i>Ensure all references adhere to APA 7th edition formatting guidelines.</i></li> <li>• <i>Verify the relevance of each reference to the study’s objectives and remove any that do not add value.</i></li> </ul>

**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):

1. Abstract:
  - The abstract should be revised to focus more on the key findings and actionable recommendations rather than including references (e.g., "conformément à Kmet et al. (2004)"). References are not standard in abstracts and detract from the clarity of the summary.
  - Add specific examples of the main results, such as the negative effects of long commutes (>80 km/day) on life satisfaction and the benefits of active transport modes.
2. Grammar and Spelling:
  - Correct spelling errors and grammatical issues throughout the manuscript:
    - "diffèrentes" → "différentes"
    - "Satisfaction vis-à-vis les déplacements" → "Satisfaction vis-à-vis des déplacements"
  - Avoid repetitive phrasing, particularly with terms like "longs trajets domicile-travail."
  - Ensure consistent use of accents and prepositions.
3. Conclusion:
  - Streamline the conclusion to focus on the study's unique contributions and practical recommendations for policymakers. Avoid restating all findings in detail.
  - Highlight actionable insights, such as promoting active transport, improving public transport conditions, and reducing long commutes.
  - Remove redundant information and ensure the conclusion is concise and impactful.
4. References:
  - Address duplicate entries (e.g., Clark, B., et al. (2019); Bergstad, C. J., et al. (2010 and 2011)).
  - Complete missing information in references (e.g., DOIs, volume numbers, page ranges).
  - Ensure all references adhere to APA 7th edition formatting guidelines (e.g., sentence case for article titles, title case for journal names, active DOI links).
  - Remove irrelevant or non-pertinent references that do not directly support the study's objectives.
5. General Improvements:
  - Conduct a thorough proofreading to eliminate minor grammatical and stylistic issues.
  - Maintain the high-quality structure and clarity demonstrated in the methods and results sections.