|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | |
| Book Name: | **WORKPLACE INEQUALITY AND DISCRIMINATION ON INDIVIDUAL DEVELOPMENT AND ORGANISATIONAL PERFORMANCE, IN SELECTED HOTELS IN DURBAN METROPOLITAN CITY, SOUTH AFRICA** |
| Manuscript Number: | **Ms\_BPR\_** **3649** |
| Title of the Manuscript: | **WORKPLACE INEQUALITY AND DISCRIMINATION ON INDIVIDUAL DEVELOPMENT AND ORGANISATIONAL PERFORMANCE, IN SELECTED HOTELS IN DURBAN METROPOLITAN CITY, SOUTH AFRICA** |
| Type of the Article | **Complete Book** |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| PART 1: Review Comments | | |
| Compulsory REVISION comments | Reviewer’s comment | Author’s Feedback *(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)* |
| **Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.** | This manuscript is important for the scientific community as it provides valuable insights into the pervasive issues of workplace inequality and discrimination in the South African hospitality industry, which remain underexplored in this specific context. The study's use of qualitative methods and rich participant narratives offers a nuanced understanding of how these challenges affect individual development and organizational performance. I appreciate the manuscript's practical implications, as it highlights actionable recommendations for HR managers, trade unions, and policymakers to address systemic discrimination. However, the discussion could benefit from broader comparative analyses with similar industries in other regions to provide a more global perspective. |  |
| **Is the title of the article suitable?**  **(If not please suggest an alternative title)** | The title is clear and reflects the central themes of the study; however, it could be refined to be more concise and engaging. A suggested alternative title is:  "The Impact of Workplace Inequality and Discrimination on Employee Development and Organizational Performance: A Case Study of Durban's Hospitality Sector, South Africa"  This version maintains clarity while emphasizing the focus on the hospitality sector and the study's regional context. |  |
| Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here. | The abstract provides a good overview of the study, including its objectives, methods, and findings. However, there is room for improvement in terms of clarity and conciseness. Here are some suggestions for revision:  Additions:  **Highlight the key practical outcomes**: Mention specific recommendations or strategies that could address inequality and discrimination. For instance, briefly state how organizations can implement diversity management or training programs.  **Quantify the impact**: If available, include quantitative data or specific examples from the findings to make the conclusions more impactful.  **Mention study limitations**: Briefly acknowledge any significant limitations, such as the focus on only two hotels or reliance on qualitative data.  Deletions:  **Overly detailed methodological descriptions**: While the mention of NVivo software and transcription accuracy is useful, this level of detail is unnecessary in the abstract and can be summarized.  **Repeated emphasis**: Phrases like "workplace inequality and discrimination" are repeated several times. Use synonyms or streamline the language for better readability.  Suggested Revised Abstract:  This research examines the impact of workplace inequality and discrimination on individual development and organizational performance within the hospitality sector in Durban, South Africa. Using a qualitative approach, the study explores employees' lived experiences through interviews, observations, and thematic analysis with NVivo software. Findings reveal four major themes—recruitment practices, emotional responses, workplace discrimination, and inequality—underscoring the persistence of systemic racism and exploitation, particularly affecting Black employees, women, and foreign workers. The study highlights the negative repercussions on employee motivation, productivity, and organizational performance. Practical recommendations include strengthening diversity management, enforcing anti-discrimination policies, and enhancing training programs to foster inclusivity. These findings contribute valuable insights for HR managers, trade unions, and policymakers to address workplace disparities in the South African hotel industry.  This revision makes the abstract more concise and focused while retaining its essential elements. |  |
| **Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?** | The structure and subsections of the manuscript are largely appropriate, but there is always room for refinement to enhance readability and coherence. |  |
| **Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.** | This manuscript demonstrates scientific robustness and technical soundness through its well-defined research objectives, grounded in a pertinent and timely issue within the hospitality sector. The methodological rigor is evident in the use of qualitative tools such as NVivo, combined with thematic analysis, ensuring a systematic approach to data collection and interpretation. The manuscript's theoretical foundation, built on concepts of inequality and discrimination, aligns with the study's context and enhances its scholarly value. Furthermore, the findings are logically presented and substantiated, providing a clear link between the research problem and the conclusions, which contributes to the study's validity and relevance. |  |
| **Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.**  **-** | The references cited in the manuscript appear to be sufficient and cover a broad range of relevant studies, indicating a comprehensive literature review. Many of the sources are recent, reflecting the current state of research in the field. However, to enhance the depth and relevance of the study, consider including additional references that specifically address recent advancements in discrimination studies, workplace inequality in the hospitality industry, or methodological frameworks for qualitative analysis. Adding such references can further contextualize the findings within recent academic discourse. |  |
| Minor REVISION commentsIs the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | The language of the manuscript is generally clear and appropriate for scholarly communication. The ideas are conveyed effectively, and the terminology aligns with academic standards. However, there are occasional grammatical inconsistencies and sentences that could be rephrased for improved clarity and flow. For example:   1. Simplify overly complex sentences to avoid confusion. 2. Improve transitions between sections to enhance readability. 3. Ensure consistent use of tenses and avoid redundancy in phrasing.   A thorough proofreading or light editing by a professional could refine the language further and elevate the overall quality of the manuscript. |  |
| Optional/General comments | The manuscript provides valuable insights and makes a meaningful contribution to its field. The topic is well-chosen and aligns with current research trends, addressing a relevant gap in the literature. While the study design and methodology are robust, a more detailed explanation of certain analytical choices could enhance the manuscript’s transparency.  Additionally, improving the flow between sections and ensuring consistency in formatting would strengthen the presentation. Minor revisions to the language and clarity of some sentences will further improve the overall readability and impact of the work. The authors are encouraged to address these points to maximize the manuscript’s scholarly value.  The manuscript demonstrates a solid scientific approach, is generally well-structured, and provides meaningful insights into the topic. However, some improvements could be made in terms of clarity, the inclusion of more recent references, and addressing minor revisions in language and formatting. After addressing these aspects, the manuscript could be considered for acceptance. |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **PART 2:** | | |
|  | **Reviewer’s comment** | **Author’s comment *(if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)*** |
| **Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?** | ***(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*** |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Reviewer Details:** | |
| **Name:** | **Nadiia Bocharova** |
| **Department, University & Country** | **Kharkiv National Automobile and Highway University, Ukraine** |