

**Paper: “Evaluating Industrial Dispute Resolution Methods: A Case Study of Bangladesh”**

**Submitted: 27 May 2024**

**Accepted: 27 July 2024**

**Published: 31 July 2024**

Corresponding Author: Naznin Sultana Chaity

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2024.v20n19p230](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2024.v20n19p230)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Nirmal Kumar Betchoo  
University of Mascareignes, Mauritius

Reviewer 2: Simon Egesa  
The University of Nairobi, Kenya

Reviewer 3: Blinded

-----  
Reviewer A:

Recommendation: Revisions Required

-----

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

The title of the paper "Evaluating Industrial Dispute Resolution Methods?" 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 and the length of the abstract to be between 200- 250 words.

The abstract lacks the theory underpinning the study thus needs to be included.

A concise abstract would be better compared to the current one

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

Fix the grammatical errors

**The study METHODS are explained clearly.**

It needs to be polished

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

The clarity of the body must be checked and corrected for the minor errors.

**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 be clear thus needs improvement

**The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.**

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

N/B. The author has not cited any study from AFRICA consequently he needs to do so for global perspective.

*Please rate the TITLE of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

*Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

2

*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]

3

*Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

*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):**

This paper has great quality, The title good and needs grammatical correction.

The theories underpinning the study must come out clearly in the abstract.

The citation pattern needs to be checked and be corrected.

-----

-----  
Reviewer D:

Recommendation: Revisions Required

-----

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

I think that the name of Bangladesh must be specified here. This makes the title clearer.

**The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.**

Abstract is okay.

Evaluation at this stage is qualitative.

Conclusion is quite acceptable here.

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

No, I do NOT find grammatical mistakes.

Authors have spared enough time to keep the paper free from errors.

**The study METHODS are explained clearly.**

open-ended questionnaires were devised to acquire insights regarding dispute resolution methods concerning ADR.

The devised questionnaires were reviewed. A pilot survey has been carried out to evaluate the lucidity, reliability, and validity of the items of the questionnaires.

Pilot Survey was equally done.

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

Paper is well developed.

With regards to hypothesis, I would prefer aligning them after the methodology.

Tables are okay.

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

The study found that there is no association between the level of education and the rate of involvement in ADR.

Respondents rated higher for ADR than formal litigation process.

From the data analysis, it is also found that in comparison with the adversarial

process, workers mostly afavourable to ADR due to less service cost less time, and less clumsy.

**The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.**

references are good and suitable' more than 25.

*Please rate the TITLE of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

*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]

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]

4

**Overall Recommendation!!!**

Accepted, minor revision needed

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

Paper is okay.

Hypotheses must be put after methodology.

Abstract might have a few figures to consolidate answer,

A few errors have been corrected.

Paper can be published only after changes are made.

-----

-----

Reviewer E:

Recommendation: Accept Submission

-----

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

The title of the article is clear and effectively reflects the content of the article.

**The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.**

The abstract of the article clearly outlines the objectives, methods, and results of the study.

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

The article does not contain any grammatical errors or spelling mistakes.

**The study METHODS are explained clearly.**

The study methods are explained in a clear and detailed manner.

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

The main body of the article is clear and free from errors.

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

The conclusion is precise and well-supported by the content of the article.

**The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.**

The list of references is comprehensive, appropriate, and well-organized.

*Please rate the TITLE of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

*Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

*Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

*Please rate the METHODS of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

*Please rate the BODY of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

*Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

*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):**

-----

