OPEN PEER REVIEW

Comparative Analysis of International Commercial Arbitration Laws in Iran and the UNCITRAL Model Law

Behzad Mobaraki^{1*}1

¹ M.A. in Private Law, Private Law Department, Faculty of Law and Political Sciences, Science and Research Branch. Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran

* Corresponding author email address: b.mobaraki12@gmail.com

Received: 2024-07-27Revised: 2024-09-20Accepted: 2024-09-29Published: 2024-12-01EDITOR:
Eman ShenoudaEman ShenoudaE

1. Round 1

1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

In the introduction, the sentence "Arbitration has become a crucial mechanism for resolving cross-border commercial disputes..." could benefit from additional statistics or examples to substantiate the claim about arbitration's global significance.

The term "public policy exceptions" is used frequently; consider providing a more explicit definition within the context of Iranian legal frameworks early in the discussion.

The implications section should better articulate how foreign investors, local businesses, and policymakers could benefit or be impacted by the proposed harmonization measures.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the document.

1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

The paragraph starting with "Despite its significance, the adoption of the UNCITRAL Model Law is not uniform..." should explicitly highlight what specific aspects of Iran's arbitration laws remain misaligned and why prior research has not addressed them comprehensively.

The introduction lacks a clear research question or hypothesis. Consider including a statement such as: "This study aims to answer whether Iran's arbitration laws align with UNCITRAL principles and what legal reforms are necessary."

The methodology section mentions the use of primary and secondary sources, but it would be helpful to include a justification for why specific sources (e.g., Iranian Civil Procedure Code) were chosen over others.

The section starting with "The study adopts a comparative framework to analyze..." could elaborate on why the selected themes (jurisdiction, enforceability, public policy) were prioritized over others.

There is no mention of how the research ensures validity and reliability, especially given the qualitative nature of the descriptive analysis.

In the section "Comparative Analysis: Iran vs. UNCITRAL Model Law," a more structured table or sub-sections for each key theme (jurisdiction, enforcement, judicial intervention) would enhance readability and logical flow.

In the section "Challenges in Harmonization," the discussion of cultural barriers could be expanded to include practical ways arbitration centers in Iran could address them, such as through specialized Sharia-compliant arbitration frameworks.

The section addressing "Legal Harmonization" could benefit from a brief discussion of relevant legal harmonization theories or models that support the analysis.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the document.

2. Revised

Editor's decision: Accepted. Editor in Chief's decision: Accepted.

