



EUROPEAN SCIENTIFIC JOURNAL
by European Scientific Institute



Paper: “Impact de la dynamique des exportations sur la qualité des infrastructures de transport en Afrique subsaharienne”

Submitted: 20 May 2025

Accepted: 29 January 2026

Published: 31 January 2026

Corresponding Author: Abdarahmane Tall

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2026.v22n1p138

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Aicha El Alaoui
Sultan My Slimane University, Morocco

Reviewer 2: Blinded

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2026

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: Aicha EL ALAOUI	
University/Country: Faculty of Economics and Management, USMS-BM Morocco	
Date Manuscript Received: January 13 2026	Date Review Report Submitted: January 17 2026
Manuscript Title: Impact de la dynamique des exportations sur la qualité des infrastructures de transport en Afrique subsaharienne	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0940/26	
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]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	4
<i>The title is precise, descriptive, and perfectly encapsulates the study's focus. It clearly states the key variables (export dynamics, transport infrastructure quality), the geographical context (sub-Saharan Africa), and implies a causal relationship under investigation ("impact of"). It is both informative and appropriate for the journal's scope.</i>	
2. The abstract presents objectives, methods, and results.	4
<i>The abstract is exceptionally well-structured. It succinctly states the objective (to examine the impact of export dynamics on transport infrastructure quality), clearly outlines the methodology (dynamic panel ARDL model for 32 SSA countries, 2009-2019, with FMOLS/DOLS robustness checks), and summarizes the key findings (positive impact of</i>	

<i>exports and GDP growth in short/long run; positive long-run role of institutions; robustness confirmed). It effectively highlights the main contribution regarding the complementary role of trade and governance.</i>	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<i>The manuscript is generally well-written in both French and English. A few minor typographical/formatting inconsistencies were noted. There are no major grammatical errors that impede understanding, but a thorough proofreading is recommended before publication to polish the text. It needs a minor grammatical revision</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>The methodological section is a major strength of the paper. It provides clear and logical progression: justification for the dynamic panel ARDL model, derivation of the equations, a robust discussion on the choice of the PMG estimator (including comparison with MG and pooled estimators), description of data sources, and detailed reporting of preliminary tests (descriptive stats, CIPS unit root tests, Pedroni and Westerlund cointegration tests). The explanation is technically sound and accessible for readers familiar with panel econometrics.</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	5
<i>The results are presented with exceptional clarity. Tables 4 and 5 are well-organized, allowing for easy comparison across the three infrastructure types (ports, roads, airports) and between short-run and long-run estimates. The interpretation in the text directly links the coefficients to the research questions, explaining the economic significance and statistical confidence. The inclusion of the error correction term (ECM) and its interpretation adds depth. The robustness checks using FMOLS and DOLS (Table 5) are convincingly integrated, showing consistent results and enhancing the credibility of the findings. No computational or interpretive errors are apparent.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>The conclusion accurately and concisely restates the study's aim, core methodology, and principal findings. It correctly emphasizes the dual positive role of export growth and institutional quality (political stability, corruption control). The policy implications are directly and logically derived from the results, advocating for simultaneous investment in transport infrastructure and institutional strengthening. There is no overstatement or deviation from what the analysis has demonstrably shown.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	2-3
<i>The reference list is extensive, relevant, and up-to-date. It effectively covers the theoretical foundations (e.g., New Trade Theory, New Economic Geography, endogenous growth), key empirical studies on infrastructure and trade, and specific econometric literature (ARDL, PMG, cointegration tests). The inclusion of major institutional reports (World Bank, UNCTAD, AfDB) strengthens the contextual background.</i> <i>Overall, the referencing is very good, but there are several missing citations in the text and one potential minor formatting inconsistency. The majority of citations are correctly matched. These are references that appear in the bibliography but are not mentioned anywhere in the manuscript body. They should either be cited or removed: Arbués, P., Baños, J. F., & Mayor, M. (2015); Aritua, B. (2019); Chiang, M. H., & Kao, C. (2002); Donaldson, D. (2018); Marcet, A., & Nicolini, J. P. (2003)...</i>	

These are also some authors/Works cited in the text that are NOT in the Reference List: Pérez et Wilson (2012) – Cited on page 7 ("Perez et Wilson (2012), s'appuyant sur l'indice de performance logistique..."). Only Pérez & Wilson (2010) is in the list. Rahman et al. (2021) – Cited on page 11 ("Récemment, Rahman et al. (2021) ... ont également confirmé..."). Robinson (2008) – Cited on page 7 ("... pour inciter et soutenir les comportements économiques positifs (Robinson, 2008 ; Tebellini, 2007)."). Tebellini (2007) is listed as Tabellini (2007), but Robinson (2008) is missing. Cho (2014) – Cited on page 2 ("... (Bruinsma et al., 1989 ; Schwab, 2018 ; Cho, 2014)."). CEA (2016) – Cited on page 5 ("Selon la CEA (2016), plus de 90% des échanges..."). Likely "UNECA" (United Nations Economic Commission for Africa).

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):

- Pour les sources des tableaux et figures: ajoutez 's' a la fin de 'Auteur'