Corresponding Author: Chorouk Drissi El Bouzaidi

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: David Amakobe
Consultant, African Wood Inc. Wilmington Delaware, USA

Reviewer 2: Blinded

Reviewer 3: Blinded

Reviewer A:
Recommendation: Revisions Required

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.
The title, "A Thematic Review of Public Performance Study in Public Transportation Services," is commendable for its clarity and directness.
The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.
The abstract clearly presents the objects, methods, and results. It explicitly states its aim to "identify the main approaches, key concepts and evaluation criteria" in public performance within public transport services. The method is clearly outlined as a "structured analysis of the literature". Furthermore, the abstract effectively highlights the key result: the introduction of "an original interpretation model, the GMDP-TC model, which provides a better understanding of the determinants of performance in the context of public transport"
There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.
The article contains noticeable grammatical errors and spelling mistakes throughout its text. These linguistic issues significantly detract from the professionalism and clarity expected in a scientific publication. For instance, informal phrases such as "Here's to say" and "That's why" are used, which are unsuitable for academic discourse. Redundant constructions like "The reason why" appear multiple times, while awkward prepositional usage is evident in phrases such as "confronted to the effects of globalization", where "confronted with" would be correct. Furthermore, clunky phrasing, as seen in "This initiation represents the first step in the construction of our literature", and excessively long, complex sentences, particularly in the "Public Management" section, impede readability and comprehension. These examples collectively highlight the need for a thorough linguistic review and editing.
The study METHODS are explained clearly.
The study methods are explained with reasonable clarity regarding the general approach. The article explicitly states it is based on a "structured analysis of the literature" and utilizes a "thematic analysis of the literature". The central research question guiding this analysis is clearly articulated. Additionally, the five major thematic areas explored, from local governance to public transportation performance, are clearly identified, outlining the scope of the review. The abstract also mentions the development of the "GMDP-TC model" as a result of this analysis.
The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.
There are numerous instances of awkward phrasing, grammatical errors, and informal language that disrupt the flow and impede comprehension. For example, sentence structures are often convoluted, and transitions between sections can feel abrupt rather than seamlessly linking ideas. The body of the paper is not clear and does contain errors.
The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.
The conclusion or summary is accurate and well-supported by the content of the article. It effectively synthesizes the five key thematic areas explored throughout the paper: local governance, public management, delegation of public services management, public performance steering, and public transportation performance.
The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

Given that the reference list is intended to be in APA style, its current presentation poses significant challenges for academic rigor. While all in-text citations appear to have a corresponding entry in the reference list, the formatting of these entries is highly inconsistent and deviates substantially from APA guidelines.

Specifically, numerous journal article entries are incomplete, frequently missing essential details such as issue numbers and comprehensive page ranges. Many entries also fail to include Digital Object Identifiers (DOIs) for journal articles where they would be readily available, which is a key component of APA retrievability. Book titles are often incorrectly capitalized, appearing in title case rather than the required sentence case. Furthermore, information regarding publishers for books and detailed identifying information for reports and grey literature is frequently omitted or inconsistently presented, making it difficult to trace the original sources.

Compounding these issues, the reference list's current structure and formatting suggest it was not generated or managed using standard academic citation software or the "Manage Sources" feature in programs like Microsoft Word. This lack of systematic management contributes to the prevalence of formatting errors and inconsistencies, which would necessitate a thorough manual reformatting to meet strict APA standards for publication.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
4

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
4

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
3

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
3

Please rate the BODY of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
3

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
4

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
2

Overall Recommendation!!!
Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):
The current manuscript requires a major revision and resubmission primarily due to critical deficiencies in its reference list. While all in-text citations are present, the references fundamentally fail to adhere to APA formatting, exhibiting widespread inconsistencies, missing crucial details like DOIs, issue numbers, and page ranges, incorrect capitalization of titles, and inadequate publisher information. This suggests a complete lack of systematic reference management, severely undermining the paper's academic credibility. Furthermore, significant linguistic errors throughout the text, and insufficient detail in the methodology section, further necessitate a comprehensive overhaul before reconsideration for publication.

Reviewer B:
Recommendation: Resubmit for Review

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.
I would suggest this title:
A Review of Public Performance Research in Public Transportation Services
It should give more emphasis to the research aspects.
The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.
The abstract clearly outlines the scope of the work and makes a valuable contribution by framing it as a thematic review that culminates in an original model, the GMDP-TC. This gives the reader a sense of purpose and novelty. However, the delivery could be smoother. While comprehensive, the list of five thematic areas reads more like a table of contents than a flowing synthesis. Presenting them more integrated would help convey the interconnections between them and maintain narrative momentum.
There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.
I suggest reviewing the English to improve the paper. Sometimes there is repetition of terms that could be avoided. Greater richness of exposition and argumentation would improve the paper.
For example, in the subsection "I. Local governance of public services
Our thematic literature review is initiated by the theme of governance of public services. This initiation represents the first step in building our literature." Initiated/Initiation.
The study METHODS are explained clearly.
It is well explained in its simplicity, but I would suggest enriching the methodological part with further literature and practical operational suggestions, such as the construction of specific indicators.
The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.
The body of the paper is clear, but I think it's too basic. I would suggest a more in-depth scientific analysis, drawing on a much more extensive, and above all, recent and rigorous bibliography.

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.
The conclusions can be improved by trying to better highlight the methodological contribution, the limitations of the chosen approach, and prospective indications for research development.
The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.
The bibliography needs to be updated and expanded as the analysis progresses.
Please rate the TITLE of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
4

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
4

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
3

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
3

Please rate the BODY of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
3

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
3

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
2

Overall Recommendation!!!
Return for major revision and resubmission

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Reviewer C:
Recommendation: Revisions Required

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

The title, "A Thematic Review of Public Performance Study in Public Transportation Services," is clear, concise, and accurately reflects the content of the article. It effectively communicates the paper's focus on a literature review within the specific domains of public performance and transportation.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

The abstract is well-structured and successfully summarizes the core components of the study. It clearly outlines the paper's objective (a thematic review), the method (structured literature analysis across five themes), and the primary results, including the introduction of the novel GMDP-TC interpretation model.

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

The article is generally readable, but it contains several grammatical errors and awkward phrasings that detract from its overall quality. Issues include incorrect preposition usage (e.g., "confronted to" instead of "confronted with"), unconventional sentence structures (e.g., "The reason why it has enabled us to..."), and wordy constructions. A thorough proofreading and copy-editing pass is highly recommended to improve clarity and professionalism. This may create a hurdle for many readers if not addressed.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

The methodology is explained with sufficient clarity for a review paper. The authors identify their approach as a "thematic literature review" and logically structure the analysis around five distinct but interconnected themes. The progression from broad concepts like governance to the specific focus on public transport performance is logical and systematically executed.

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

The body of the paper is clear and logically organized. The five thematic sections effectively build upon one another, creating a coherent narrative that guides the reader from the macro-level theoretical foundations to the micro-level application. The content within each section is relevant and well-supported by academic citations. Apart from the grammatical issues, the body of the paper appears to be free of significant errors.

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

The conclusion is accurate and directly supported by the content presented in the manuscript. It effectively synthesizes the key findings from the thematic review and correctly reiterates the identified gap in the literature. The reintroduction of the proposed GMDP-TC model as a solution to this gap provides a strong, logical endpoint for the paper.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

The list of references is comprehensive and appropriate for the scope of this thematic review. It includes foundational and contemporary sources from a range of academic publications. The inclusion of both English and French literature is suitable given the authors' context and the international nature of the research field. The sources are relevant and effectively ground the paper's analysis in established academic discourse.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

5

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

5

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):
The article is generally readable, but it contains several grammatical errors and awkward phrasings that detract from its overall quality. Issues include incorrect preposition usage (e.g., "confronted to" instead of "confronted with"), unconventional sentence structures (e.g., "The reason why it has enabled us to..."), and wordy constructions. A thorough proofreading and copy-editing pass is highly recommended to improve clarity and professionalism. This may create a hurdle for many readers if not addressed. The body of the paper is clear and logically organized. The five thematic sections effectively build upon one another, creating a coherent narrative that guides the reader from the macro-level theoretical foundations to the micro-level application. The content within each section is relevant and well-supported by academic citations. Apart from the grammatical issues, the body of the paper appears to be free of significant errors.