Paper: **"Effects of Collective Bargaining on Industrial Disputes Management"**

Corresponding Author: Simon Egesa

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Enriko Ceko
Wisdom University, Albania

Reviewer 2: Niyibizi François Xavier
Department of Management and Development studies, Institut Polytechnique de
Byumba (IPB)

Reviewer 3: El Gharbaoui Mohammed
ENCG Kenitra, Ibn Tofail University, Morocco

Reviewer 4: Yeboah Evans
Nanjing University of Science and Technology, China

Reviewer C:
Recommendation: Revisions Required

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

The title of the paper "EFFECT OF COLLECTIVE BARGAINING ON INDUSTRIAL DISPUTES MANAGEMENT " is clear and is adequate to the content of the article.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

The abstract properly summaries the paper. However, it would be good if the authors could reduce the length of the abstract to be under 250 words.

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

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

See comments below under conclusion.

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

Take your time to read through the paper and ensure minor grammatical errors are fixed including punctuations.

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

It was a great pleasure to have the opportunity to review the paper. Undoubtedly, the author(s) have done a good job. However, here are a few observations/suggestions:
1. It is not very clear what type of paper or research is being conducted. Is it a conceptual paper, literature review (systematic or integrative) or an empirical paper?
2. You may consider including a methodology section to clarify this. Also provide some justification why you chose the given research approach.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

The reference is well put together. There are few references that need to be rewritten properly.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

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

4

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

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

3

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

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

3

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

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

2

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):

Reviewer D:
Recommendation: Revisions Required

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

The title is not clear. Authors should clarify if the issue is related worldwide or to a specific country/region. It seems to be Kenya but is not clear.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

The abstract doesn't reflects methdology and methods used to perform the research.

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

The article generally is free from grammatical errors, just some issues with the words unitarism and organisations, which might change the "s" to "z".

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

The study methods are not explaines clearly.

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

The body of the paper is clear of grammatical errors, and the logic of the article is clear, but there is not any data, figures, or information processing to achieve the conclusions and recommendations, so the main issue with this paper is its fully theoretical approach, which directs this article more on journalism rather than to scientific research.

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

The conclusion/summary is not accurate and not supported by data, figures, or information, rather than from theoretical declarations of other authors, which are listed in several pieces of the paper, which authors wrongly deviate to some unclear chapters, which are parallel chapters with Literature review.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

The list of references is not accurate, since on this issue there are a lot of scientific publications and academic books, especially those of Pearson Education and McGraw Hill, published in 2020, 2021, and 2022, which authors should use, especially on the issue of industrial disputes and organizational behavior and human resources management.

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]

2

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]

3

Overall Recommendation!!!

Return for major revision and resubmission

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Improve methodology, employing data, figures, and information as per the
country/region for which the article is written.
Employ a statistical procedure with data, figures, and information gathered to show
the logic of conclusions and recommendations drawn.
All material used before the Literature review should be listed in the Literature
review.
In the introduction, there is no need to make citations. write the introduction in your
words.
The chapter on methodology, data gathering, and data processing is missing.
The chapter on study limitations is missing.
The chapter on what this paper brings new to academia is missing.

Reviewer F:
Recommendation: See Comments

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

The article is clear and it is adequate to the contents of the articles

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

The research objectives and methods are missing in the abstract

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

Few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes were encountered

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

Study methods were not explained clearly

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

The body is clear and does not contain errors

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

The summary is clear and linked with comments. However the author was required to recommend according to the findings.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

The reference is comprehensive and appropriate

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]

2

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]

2

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 author is urged to include the following in this paper:
1. Research objectives
2. Research methods
3. Recommend according to the research findings
4. Reduce the number of the research theories.
5. Compiled the proposed subsections
6. The research should recognize the presence of the research theories

----

Reviewer I:

Recommendation: Revisions Required

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

Yes, but I propose to be more specific: .

EFFECT OF COLLECTIVE BARGAINING ON INDUSTRIAL DISPUTES
MANAGEMENT : insights and recommendations

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

Yes, but the method is not included,
The way you should answer the question of how can you demonstrate that there is the
effect of collective bargaining on industrial disputes?!
Literature review can not lead you to make recommendations / try to convince with a
case study

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

No, correct!

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

Not really!
I recommend to try to choose the right direction to present the theory!
Kenya experience case (my proposal) along with literature review

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

Correct
I also recommend to insert some charts or graphs to make your manuscript more
attractive to read

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

Yes, perfect

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

Yss! If you choose to make the DOI, you may think to use it for all your references

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]

5

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]

5

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

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

4

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Nice work! Just may be you may consider to be more consistent! Try to cut some paragraph, to be short! Insert some charts and graphs.

Reviewer J:
Recommendation: Accept Submission

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

The Tittle is clear and adequate but a little broad.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

The abstract is presented with the objectives and results but not the methods. However, the abstract is a bit longer. A concise abstract would be better.

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

There are some grammatical errors and spelling mistakes that need to be corrected. There are some hard-to-read texts.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

The methods are not explained clearly.
It needs to be improved.

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

The body is clear but contains errors that must be checked and corrected.

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

The conclusion is good because it supports the content of the study. However, the authors need to improve it.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

The references are good and appropriate, but the referencing style needs to be checked well.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

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

5

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]

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]

4

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

This review paper has great quality, but the length of the paper is a bit long. The title is a little broad. Although it is a review paper, it could have been concise with much information and data support. The keywords need to be separated by a comma. The keywords are few, and the words are much longer. However, the end of the introduction must have the paper's objective. The in-text citation needs to follow one pattern, and I suggest you pay attention to them well.