

OPEN PEER REVIEW

The Importance of Jury Performance in Political and Press Trials

Saeb. Ghaffari Heshejin¹, Mehdi. Shabannia Mansour^{1*}, Javad. Mirghasemi¹

¹ Department of Public Law, Central Tehran Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran.

* Corresponding author email address: Mehdi.shabannia@gmail.com

Received: 2025-01-09	Revised: 2025-04-02	Accepted: 2025-04-09	Published: 2025-07-01
EDITOR: Ghasem Eftekhari Associate Professor, Department of Political Science, University of Tehran, Tehran, Iran. Email: eftekhari@ut.ac.ir			
REVIEWER 1: Yusuf Mohamed Department of Architecture and City Design, King Fahd University of Petroleum and Minerals, Dhahran, SaudiArabia. Email: yusufmohamed@kfupm.edu.sa			
REVIEWER 2: Kaushalya Koralage Assistant Lecturer in Sociology at University of Colombo, Colombo, Sri Lanka. Email: koralage@iouc.cmb.ac.lk			

1. Round 1

1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

This is an important justification, but the theoretical link is underdeveloped. Strengthen by connecting public freedoms to broader constitutional law theories (e.g., Dahl’s democratic pluralism, Rawls’s justice as fairness). This would help bridge comparative law and political theory.

Some citations are dated (e.g., McDaniel, 2018; Sefat, 2016). Consider adding the most recent comparative jury studies (2022–2024) to show up-to-date scholarship, especially regarding digital trials and media influence.

Methodological rigor could be improved by detailing selection criteria for sources (e.g., time span, inclusion/exclusion criteria, databases searched). Clarify how you ensured representativeness and reliability.

While commendable, the ethical section could mention how potential bias in legal texts was mitigated (e.g., triangulation, consulting multiple jurisdictions).

Excellent contrasting view; however, elaborate why Scandinavian experience may not transfer to Iran (political culture, judicial independence, public participation tradition).

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the document.

1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

You mention “some legal systems” but do not specify which. Please identify at least three jurisdictions with citations to add precision — e.g., U.S., UK, France — and briefly explain how their jury powers differ.

The constitutional analysis is strong but incomplete. Consider adding the exact text of Article 168 and citing key Iranian legal scholars to strengthen the legal interpretation.

The questions are valid but long. Break them into clear, numbered research questions (e.g., RQ1, RQ2, RQ3). This improves clarity and aligns with best practices in comparative legal studies.

The theoretical framework is rich but scattered. Please explicitly map each theory to your research variables (jury independence → participatory democracy; oversight → separation of powers; trust → procedural justice). This will create conceptual coherence.

Support with specific case law or statistics (e.g., acquittal rates, appeals outcomes). This would make the findings more empirical and persuasive.

This section is excellent but could benefit from a table summarizing differences across jurisdictions (columns: Country, Binding nature of verdict, Selection method, Political trials’ independence). It would enhance readability.

Add a clear statement of how your findings advance existing knowledge — e.g., whether your comparative analysis fills a gap in Iranian legal reform discourse or contributes a new typology of jury independence.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the document.

2. Revised

Editor’s decision: Accepted.

Editor in Chief’s decision: Accepted.