

Feasibility of Third-Party Intervention in Dispute Resolution through Arbitration under Iranian Law: With Reference to International Instruments and Practices

Seyed Amir. Mirdehghan Ashkezari¹, Mohammadreza. Fallah^{2*}, Ghazaleh. Kabirabadi³

¹ Department of Law, Y.C., Islamic Azad University, Yazd, Iran

² Associate Professor, Department of Law, Shahed University, Tehran, Iran

³ Assistant Professor, Department of Law, Y.C., Islamic Azad University, Yazd, Iran

* Corresponding author email address: fallah@shahed.ac.ir

Received: 2025-04-01	Revised: 2025-06-30	Accepted: 2025-09-01	Published: 2025-09-07
EDITOR: Cavid Qasimov ^{id} Prof, Faculty of Letters Department of History, Van Yuzuncu Yıl University, Van, Türkiye. Email: cavidqasimov@yyu.edu.tr			
REVIEWER 1: Shehzad Raj ^{id} School of Law, Universiti Geomatika Malaysia, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia. Email: shehzadraj@geomatika.edu.my			
REVIEWER 2: Mohammadbagher. Jafari ^{id} Department of Sociology of Culture, Istanbul, Türkiye. Email: mbjafari@kmanresce.ca			

1. Round 1

1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

This paragraph could benefit from concrete statistics or recent empirical references (e.g., number of arbitration cases in Iran vs ICC/LCIA). Without data, the justification for increased reliance on arbitration appears anecdotal.

This is a strong research question. However, you should also frame sub-questions (e.g., doctrinal, comparative, procedural) to give the reader a clearer roadmap.

The explanation of Article 26 is clear, but you should quote the article's exact wording in a footnote. This will allow readers unfamiliar with the text to follow without consulting external sources.

The critique is sound but underdeveloped. Suggest why transposing civil procedure norms into arbitration is problematic—perhaps due to differences in sovereignty and private contract foundations.

While you summarize ICC Article 7 correctly, you omit discussion of the time limitation (before tribunal constitution). Including this adds precision.

This suggestion is strong but should be expanded. How might these guidelines ensure consistency with international best practices while respecting Iranian legal traditions? A short example clause would add practical value.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the document.

1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

The aim is stated, but no explicit “research objectives” or “methodology” section is provided. Consider briefly explaining the method (doctrinal legal analysis, comparative study) in the introduction for clarity.

This part summarizes definitions but lacks citations from Iranian doctrinal sources (e.g., Shams, Jafari-Langroudi). Explicitly cite local scholars to strengthen the grounding in domestic law.

The explanation is correct but could be more precise. Clarify that ICC Article 7 (2021) allows joinder under strict consent requirements, while UNCITRAL (2013) is more flexible. Without such nuance, the comparison risks oversimplification.

This principle is mentioned without reference to its constitutional or human-rights basis. Consider linking it to Article 34 of the Iranian Constitution (right to access justice) or international fair-trial standards.

The explanation is concise but should clarify that LCIA requires the tribunal to consider whether joinder is “necessary” and “appropriate.” Adding this would align your analysis with authoritative commentary.

This point is important, but you should highlight that the Act is over 25 years old (1997), which underscores its outdatedness in relation to modern commercial realities.

The proposal is well-argued, but it could be strengthened by referencing successful reforms in comparable jurisdictions (e.g., Turkey’s 2001 International Arbitration Law or Egypt’s arbitration reforms).

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the document.

2. Revised

Editor’s decision: Accepted.

Editor in Chief’s decision: Accepted.