

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Challenges of Employees’ Rights in Iranian Administrative Laws and Regulations from a Human Rights Perspective

Amir. Eslami Samrin¹, Ali Faghih. Habibi^{1*}, Mahdieh. Saneei¹

¹ Department of Public Law, ST.C., Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran

* Corresponding author email address: faghih.habibh@gmail.com

Received: 2025-08-21	Revised: 2025-10-21	Accepted: 2025-10-28	Initial Publish: 2025-11-29	Final Publish: 2026-07-01
EDITOR: Cavid Qasimov ^{id} Prof, Faculty of Letters Department of History, Van Yuzuncu Yil University, Van, Turkiy. Email: cavidqasimov@yyu.edu.tr				
REVIEWER 1: Muhammad Abdul Rahman ^{id} Department of Humanities, Rajaratnam School of International Studies, Nanyang Technological University, Singapore. Email: muhammadrahman@ntu.edu.sg				
REVIEWER 2: Zeynep Karal ^{id} Department of Computer and Instructional Technologies Education, Trabzon University, Trabzon, Türkiye. Email: zeynepkaral@trabzon.edu.tr				

1. Round 1

1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

In the Introduction, the sentence “A significant issue concerning government employees is the lack of serious determination in enforcing the law...” should be supported by specific examples or observable administrative patterns. The statement is currently too broad.

In the part addressing Political and Instrumental Use of Human Rights, the long paragraph describing governmental attitudes reads as a summary rather than an analytical evaluation. Consider breaking it into smaller parts and adding commentary.

The section Interaction Between the Islamic Republic and Human Rights Institutions includes the statement that conventions were “ratified absolutely and without any conditions.” This is definitive wording that must be qualified or clarified, as the legal implications are complex.

The same section later argues that the country “largely adheres to human-rights treaties,” which contradicts earlier descriptions of non-implementation challenges. Please reconcile these two positions for consistency.

In Weaknesses in Enforcement of the Obligation to Cooperate, the paragraph discussing the need for permanent institutional mechanisms would benefit from concrete examples of such mechanisms, either domestic or international.

In Impact of Treaties on Domestic Law, the phrase “clear difficulty the government would face in implementing them” requires elaboration. It would strengthen the argument to specify which types of laws, procedures, or institutional frameworks create these difficulties.

The section contains a repeated explanation of domestic-international legal conflicts, especially regarding the application of treaties. Condensing these explanations into a single, well-structured paragraph would avoid redundancy.

In the Human Dignity subsection, the discussion of corporal punishment lacks a balanced analysis. It describes certain practices but does not explore how administrative law specifically interacts with these punishments. Please add administrative-law context.

The section on Gender Discrimination repeats nearly identical content in two consecutive paragraphs regarding occupational segregation. One of these repetitions should be removed to maintain academic rigor.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the document.

1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

In the section Human Rights Challenge Between Iran and the West, the claim that Western human rights “contradict the foundations of Islamic law” is repeated several times across paragraphs. Consider condensing these repetitions into a single, analytically strong paragraph.

In the subsection Foundational Challenges, the first and second paragraphs repeat similar arguments about ideological differences. This redundancy weakens the flow; a more concise synthesis would improve clarity.

In the discussion of Rights and Duties, the explanation of the interdependence of rights and duties lacks concrete doctrinal examples. Readers would benefit from an illustration of how this interdependence appears in administrative or constitutional practice.

In the section on Secularism, the definition provided oversimplifies the concept by stating that “humans require no religious guidance.” A more nuanced explanation reflecting political and legal dimensions of secularism is recommended.

In the Freedom of Belief subsection, the discussion raises the issue of children’s religious rights versus parental rights but does not connect this tension to domestic administrative practices. This connection would help situate the issue within the article’s focus.

The Job Security section includes broad claims about the prevalence of temporary and informal contracts. The text should include more concrete illustrations, such as common sectors affected or examples of administrative employment practices.

In the discussion of Trade Unions and Strikes, the assertion that the right to strike is not recognized needs clearer explanation of the administrative consequences for employees. Adding examples of disciplinary outcomes would make the analysis stronger.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the document.

2. Revised

Editor’s decision: Accepted.

Editor in Chief’s decision: Accepted.