

Paper: “Perturbation des fréquentations touristiques et crises au Mali de 1990 à 2020 : insécurité et risque sanitaire Covid-19”

Submitted: 20 April 2022

Accepted: 23 June 2022

Published: 30 June 2022

Corresponding Author: Moussa dit Martin Tessougue

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2022.v18n20p141](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2022.v18n20p141)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Arsène Kadjo

Université Peleforo Gon Coulibaly de Korhogo, Côte d’Ivoire

Reviewer 2: Blinded

Reviewer 3: Blinded

Reviewer 4: Blinded

Reviewer J:

Recommendation: Revisions Required

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

Yes, the title is very clear and adequate.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

The abstract is clear and fairly complete, limited to the descriptive purposes of the article. However, it is appropriate for the first sentence to contain the specific reference to the phenomenon studied, as well as the title: 'This study observes the tourism statistics in Mali from 1990 to 2020' (also in the French summary, of course). This is because, in scientific literature, the abstract is a separate element respect to the title, and must be self-explanatory.

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

I am not a native French speaker, although I can read it easily. But the text seems clear and well written to me.

I subjected the text to two different automatic grammar checkers and found no errors. However, I cannot say anything about the writing style, except that I find it a little too verbose.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

The study methods are well explained, especially in the examination of the story & territory of Mali and then discussing the results.

However, the section "1.Methodologie" is somewhat sacrificed by the choice not to break up the description of the formulae (subsections "Flux des arrivées et nuitées" and "Taux d'occupation hôtelier et durée moyenne de séjour"). I recommend following the custom of scientific articles in the field of statistics, writing the formulae in a line of their own, and also the descriptions of their elements in a sentence unrelated to the following one (of course, pressing the RETURN key at the end of each description): e.g:

"Le traitement des flux des arrivées et nuitées, passe par l'appréciation de leur évolution annuelle de 1990 à 2020. La formule utilisée à cet effet est : [press "RETURN]

Taux d'évolution = $((P_n/P_{n-1})-1)*100$. [press "RETURN]

P_n , signifie l'effectif de l'année en cours ; P_{n-1} représente l'effectif de l'année précédente ; 1 équivaut à la constante ; *100 pour exprimer la proportion en pourcentage. [press "RETURN]

Les calculs des flux moyens..." etc.

Do the same for the formulas:

$$r = ((\ln(P_n / P_0)) / (T_2 - T_1))$$

$$P_n = P_0 (1+r)^n$$

$$TO = ((NV/NP) * 100).$$

$$DMS = (N/A).$$

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

In my opinion, the paper is clear and contains no methodological errors. However, the titles of graphs 1 and 3 are wrong, because (whatever the Excel software claims) graphs with separate bars ARE NOT histograms, but VERTICAL BARS diagrams...

This is because an histogram should describe continuous phenomena, not discrete data or (worse case) categories of a non-quantitative variable. See

<https://fr.wikipedia.org/wiki/Histogramme>

Ok, years can be considered (in a sense) a continuous quantitative variable divided into classes, as the end of one year immediately precedes the begin of the next year. But, if the aesthetics or clarity of the graph do not allow the bars to be joined, then don't call it a histogram.

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

The conclusions represent a simple summary of the many observations described in the preceding pages, so they are certainly supported by the context. Perhaps this summary is too short (as the previous descriptions were too long).

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

I think that the References list is quite comprehensive and appropriate.

However, I must point out some imperfections: first, P. Kotler et al (2016) is cited on p. 3 but not listed in the bibliography; I find "M. TOM A (2017)" on p. 5, but this author is simply called Tom Moultrie (see

<http://demographicestimation.iussp.org/fr/content/evaluation-générale-de-la-qualité-des-données-par-âge-et-sexe>), so that 'A' should be removed both in the text and in the bibliography. Again, on p. 22, the text reported by Diombera in 2021 includes the citation '(MTTA, 2020)', which, however, does not exist in this Bibliography: it should be inserted there, or removed from the text. On p. 23, I find 'Le Ministère du Tourisme du Québec, (2016, p.4)', but nothing similar exists in the Bibliography.

OMATHO, 2013 is cited in the footnotes to all tables and graphs, but this reference does not exist in the Bibliography: there is OMATHO, 2014, which reports 2013 data. Please correct the year in all the notes to tables and graphs

Finally, in the Bibliography, on p. 26 the 'Direction Nationale du Tourisme et de l'Hôtellerie (DNTH), 2019' is never mentioned in the text, and should be removed from the list; in the third line of DOUMBIA's reference there is a typo 'Hôtell24erie'; the reference "Observatoire National du Tourisme" of 2019 is called "Observatoire du Tourisme" in the text, and this inconsistency should be resolved; the two references "Office Malien du Tourisme et de l'Hôtellerie" of 2009 and 2006 are never cited in the text, and should therefore be removed.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

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

5

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

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

4

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

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

4

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

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

3

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

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

4

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

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

4

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

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

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Please, pay a bit more attention to your Reference list. But not only to it.

Reviewer M:

Recommendation: Revisions Required

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

"Perturbation de quelques indicateurs des statistiques touristiques au Mali de 1990 à 2020 par les crises : insécurité et COVID-19

Le titre est clair et précis

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

Le résumé est assez bien structuré avec une bonne présentation du contexte, de la méthodologie et des résultats

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

Les phrases sont par moment assez longues et des mots par endroits inappropriés.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

La méthodologie est assez explicite

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

Le travail est bien structuré

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

La conclusion retrace bien les différents aspects abordés tant dans les résultats que dans la discussion

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

Plusieurs auteurs cités dans le texte n'apparaissent pas dans les références bibliographiques.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

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]

4

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

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

3

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

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

3

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

revoir la longueur de certaines section du texte telles que revues dans le texte.
Synthétiser certaines parties donc et alourdir moins le texte.
Revoir les références bibliographiques avec la revue du texte. Tous les auteurs
convoqués dans le travail doivent impérativement figurer dans les références
bibliographiques.

Reviewer N:
Recommendation: Revisions Required

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

Le titre est en adéquation avec l'article. Cependant, nous suggérons aux auteurs une
reformulation du titre qui serait:

Perturbation des fréquentations touristiques et crises au Mali de 1990 à 2020:
Insécurité et risque sanitaire Covid-19

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

Absolument oui, l'abstract obéit à la marche de l'article dans lequel les auteurs ont
présenté le contexte de l'étude, l'objectif, la méthode et les résultats.
Ainsi, cela a été respecté par l' auteur.

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

Il y a quelques structures grammaticales qui dénotent sur la compréhension des idées émises par les auteurs.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

La méthode de l'article est bien menée par l'auteur. Cela permet de cerner les résultats de l'étude

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

Il en existe quelques erreurs mineures.

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

La conclusion respecte la marche scientifique. Elle se décline par l'aboutissement des résultats obtenus, à la vérification de l'hypothèse émise et enfin la perspective d'éventuelle recherche.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

La liste de la référence bibliographique est compréhensive et appropriée pour discuter les résultats par l'auteur.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

2

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

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

4

*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]

3

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

L'article soumis à nos relecture est dans l'ensemble accepte mais il subsiste quelques éléments à corriger avant sa publication.
Ainsi, l'auteur pourra avoir un avis favorable de notre part.
