

Paper: **“Effets de la Politique Fiscale Sur la Croissance Économique du Mali”**

Submitted: 15 January 2023

Accepted: 18 May 2023

Published: 31 May 2023

Corresponding Author: Abdoulaye Maïga

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2023.v19n13p128](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2023.v19n13p128)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Oyélèyè Abdel Djèlilou Yessoufou

Laboratoire d'Analyses et de Recherches sur les Dynamiques Economiques et Sociales de l'université de Parakou, Benin

Reviewer 2: Blinded

Reviewer Z:
Recommendation: Accept Submission

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

The title is clear but it is better to increase the study period

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

The summary is not very clear because the methodology is very brief. Also the results are not clearly defined, it is not necessary to give recommendations in the abstract

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

The article is well written without grammatical mistakes but some spelling mistakes to correct which can be due to keyboard

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

The methodology is well explained but lacks some clarity. Ideally, it would be useful to present the sample that constitutes the basis and to give a history of the variables used over the study period

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

The content of the article is good and the results are well presented

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

the summary should be improved and the effect of the reasons on the economic growth should be clearly shown and not just the result

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

The reference list is complete and appropriate because a reference management software was used

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

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]

4

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, no revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

the document is well written but the summary needs to be revised, the interpretation of the descriptive statistics and econometric tests needs to be revised because it is the analysis of the results that are more telling. If possible, try to separate the results part from the discussion so that the scientific contribution of the study can be clearly understood..

Reviewer [:
Recommendation: Resubmit for Review

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

The title is clear and adequate to the content of the article.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

The abstract presents clearly the objects, methods and results.

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

No. This paper has not been rigourously written.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

The study methods are not explained clearly. I don't see the usefulness of equation 1. The dependent variable is named taux de produit intérieur brut réel. This is not a variable that represent the economic growth (taux de croissance). Besides we don't see how the long run parameters are obtained. The alpha parameters are not the long run parameters. These parameters are obtained when the variation (first difference) of the variables are equal to zero. Table 1 is not well presented.

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

The body of the paper contains error. Why in table 3 the dependent variable is in the correlation matrix? Why the variables taux brut de scolarisation and impôt sur le revenu are in the explanatory variables. These two variable are highly correlated (0,893). The stationnarity test(table 4) is not clear. The authors don't show the optimal lags. Also since there can be structural breaks in the data these results may be

misleading. I suggest to add a stationnarity test with structural breaks(the Andrew and Zivot test). The bound test has been done only with the F test. What about the t-test?. These two tests are available in the E-views software. The error correction term of the error correction model is too high(greater that one in absolute value). The correlation test and the heterscedasticity tests don't present the lags.

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

The conclusion is appropriate.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

The list of reference is appropriate. By the authors should pay attention to style of presentation.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

2

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

2

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

2

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

1

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

1

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!!!

Return for major revision and resubmission

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):
