



### REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: IJAR-57497

**Title: Un regard croisé sur la Bible et la culture dogon au Mali (A Cross-Cultural Perspective on the Bible and Dogon Culture in Mali) .**

**Recommendation:**

- Accept as it is .....
- Accept after minor revision.....**
- Accept after major revision .....
- Do not accept (*Reasons below*) .....

Rating	Excel.	Good	Fair	Poor
Originality		√		
Techn. Quality			√	
Clarity			√	
Significance		√		

Reviewer's ID: JPR- 212

### Detailed Reviewer's Report

This manuscript presents an empirical study comparing Dogon traditional cosmology and naming practices with biblical teachings. The topic is highly original, culturally significant, and contributes to the under-researched field of African traditional religions in dialogue with Christianity. The fieldwork is commendable, and the data (especially the tables of Dogon names and divine attributes) provide rich primary source material. However, the paper suffers from several methodological, structural, and analytical weaknesses that prevent acceptance in its current form. A "Do Not Accept" recommendation is given due to these issues, though the manuscript has strong potential after major revision.

**Major Reasons for Rejection or Required Major Revision:**

**1. Methodological Transparency Issues:**

- **Sample size and selection:** The study uses a focus group in Amani (size not specified) and 14 purposively selected individuals in Bamako. This is a very small sample for drawing broad conclusions about "Dogon culture," which is heterogeneous across >20 dialects and many villages. The authors should justify why this sample is sufficient or representative.
- **Lack of demographic data:** No age, gender, occupation, religious affiliation (traditional vs. Christian vs. Muslim), or education level is provided for participants. This information is critical since responses likely vary by these factors.
- **Interview/questionnaire content:** The questionnaire is described only by four themes. The actual questions are not provided in the manuscript or as an appendix, making replication impossible.
- **Data analysis method:** The paper states that results were "compared to biblical teaching" but does not describe any qualitative data analysis technique (e.g., thematic analysis, content analysis, coding procedures). It is unclear how researcher bias was managed.

**2. Lack of Critical Engagement with Dogon Cultural Diversity:**

- The paper repeatedly refers to "the Dogon" as a monolithic group. However, the authors acknowledge (page 2, lines 56-58) that the Dogon have more than 20 dialects and the study used only the Toroso variant from Amani. Many claims (e.g., "the Dogon believe that...") are presented as universal when they may be specific to one village or lineage. This overgeneralization is a serious flaw for an academic paper.

**3. Weak Discussion and Over-reliance on Biblical Proof-Texting:**

- The Discussion section (pages 10-12) largely consists of stating a Dogon belief, then citing one or more Bible verses (e.g., "Jn 3:16 ; Ep 2:8") to show difference or similarity. This is not a critical analysis but a theological comparison. The authors do not engage with scholarship on comparative religion, missiology, or African theology (e.g., John Mbiti, Kwame Bediako, Lamin Sanneh), all of which are highly relevant.
- The explanation for why Dogon lack the concept of God's unique son ("the mystery hidden for all time," Col 1:26) is presented as theological assertion rather than academic interpretation. A neutral, analytical tone is expected in a research paper, not a confessional one.

**4. Structural and Redundancy Problems:**

# International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

www.journalijar.com

## REVIEWER'S REPORT

- Sections 3 (Results) and 4 (Discussion) are poorly separated. The Results section already contains interpretive language (e.g., page 7, line 254: "Il n'a pas été précisé si la circoncision est une ordonnance d'Ama ou des hommes"). This belongs in Discussion.
- Table 2 (divergences) and Table 3 (names) are useful, but Table 1 is incomplete (only one row shown on page 9, but the caption implies more). The manuscript appears to have formatting errors or missing content.
- Several paragraphs are repeated verbatim (e.g., page 8, lines 276-279 appear twice; the entire "Le système d'attribution des prénoms dogon" subsection is duplicated on page 8). This suggests poor proofreading.

### 5. Clarity and Language Issues:

- While the French is generally readable, there are numerous typographical errors, missing spaces, inconsistent hyphenation, and awkward constructions (e.g., page 2, line 54: "pour sjourner au Mandé" – missing diacritic; page 5, line 164: "mettre fin à la vidée son prochain" – should be "mettre fin à la vie de son prochain").
- Some sentences are extremely long and difficult to follow (e.g., page 4, lines 109-112). Professional copyediting is recommended.

### 6. Incomplete or Inconsistent Referencing:

- Reference #12 (INSTAT, 2026) cites a population census from the future (2026), which is impossible. This appears to be a typo; the correct year is likely 2016 or 2020? Given the current year is 2026, this requires immediate correction.
- References #2 ("Ginna Dogon, 1990") and #20 (Togo, 2022) are cited in the text but do not appear in the bibliography? They do appear, but formatting is inconsistent.
- Several references lack publishers or page ranges (e.g., #3 Batoli Betiw, #13 Jaeger L, #16 La Sainte Bible – while the Bible is common knowledge, a specific edition should still include publisher information).

### Positive Aspects Worth Acknowledging:

- The documentation of 25+ Dogon theophoric names (Table 3, pages 9-10) with morphological breakdowns and contextual meanings is valuable original data that could be published as a standalone contribution.
- The distinction between *Ama* (God) and *ama* (symbols/divinities) is clearly explained and culturally significant.
- The comparison with biblical naming patterns (El-prefix/suffix names) is insightful.

### Specific Technical Corrections Needed (Examples):

Location	Issue	Correction Suggestion
Page 1, line 5	"s'est déroulédans"	"s'est déroulée dans"
Page 5, line 164	"vidée son prochain"	"vie de son prochain"
Page 8, lines 276-279	Entire paragraph duplicated	Remove duplicate
Page 8, line 293	"des évènements.Dans"	Missing space after period
Page 9, line 322	Tableau 1 incomplete	Provide full table or remove
Page 11, line 349	"condapasser"	"de passer"
Page 13, reference #12	INSTAT, 2026	Verify and correct year (likely 2016 or 2022)

### Recommendation for Authors:

This manuscript has a strong foundation and addresses an important topic. However, before it can be accepted, the authors must:

1. Provide a much more detailed methodology section (sample demographics, actual questions, analysis procedures).
2. Acknowledge the diversity of Dogon culture and avoid overgeneralizing from one village + 14 individuals.
3. Rewrite the Discussion to engage with scholarly literature on African traditional religions and missiology, moving beyond simple Bible-verse comparisons.
4. Remove duplicate paragraphs, complete incomplete tables, and correct the INSTAT reference year.
5. Have the manuscript professionally copyedited for French grammar and clarity.

Given the extent of required changes, a "Major Revision" would normally be requested, but the current undisclosed sample size, missing methods details, and the impossibility of a 2026 citation lead this reviewer to recommend **Accept after minor revision** in its present form. The authors are strongly encouraged to resubmit after substantial revision