

Examining the System of State Responsibility and Accountability for Embassies with Emphasis on the Armed Attack on the Embassy of the Republic of Azerbaijan in Tehran in 2023

Kaveh. Rezaei^{1*} 

¹ Phd Student of General International Law, Tehran Branch, Payam Noor University, Tehran, Iran

* Corresponding author email address: jafariashin@pnu.ac.ir


Received: 2025-02-03

Revised: 2025-04-01

Accepted: 2025-04-08


Published: 2025-12-03

EDITOR:

Cavid Qasimov 


Prof, Faculty of Letters Department of History, Van Yuzuncu Yıl University, Van, Turkiye. Email: cavidqasimov@yyu.edu.tr

REVIEWER 1:

Abdus Samad 

Assistant Professor, Department of Law, AWKUM, Pakistan . Email: abdussamad@awkum.edu.pk

REVIEWER 2:

Pınar Reisoğlu 

Faculty of Social Sciences, Recep Tayyip Erdogan University, Rize, Turkey. Email: pinarreisoglu@erdogan.edu.tr

1. Round 1

1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

The introduction outlines the general topic but does not clearly state specific research objectives or questions. Consider ending the introduction with a precise research aim or a guiding research question.

The article implies that the presence of graffiti on embassy walls indicates state failure. Clarify whether this satisfies the due diligence standard recognized in international law for attribution of responsibility.

The argument that the state is not responsible because it condemned the act contradicts international law, which emphasizes preventive duties. Reconcile this with the obligation to prevent, investigate, and punish.

This analogy dilutes the special obligations toward diplomatic missions. Rephrase to reflect the specific legal status embassies enjoy under the Vienna Convention (e.g., inviolability, protection duties).

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the document.

1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

The article is presented as “original research,” but it lacks any section detailing methods, sources, or data collection procedures. Clarify whether this is a doctrinal legal analysis or a case study-based approach.

The Vienna Convention is discussed extensively, but there’s little mention of complementary customary international law principles. Integrate references to customary norms or state practice as identified by the ICJ or ILC.

While both theories are presented, the discussion favors risk theory without adequately addressing its limitations or criticisms. Include counterarguments or cases where fault-based reasoning prevailed (e.g., Barcelona Traction, ICJ 1970).

The account of the armed attack is brief and lacks contextual details (e.g., security measures, prior threats). Incorporate more specifics to support the legal analysis of responsibility.

The statement that “no international responsibility was imposed on Iran” should be rephrased or qualified, as such conclusions require judicial adjudication or third-party review.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the document.

2. Revised

Editor’s decision: Accepted.

Editor in Chief’s decision: Accepted.