OPEN PEER REVIEW



Legal Realism and the Predictability of Judicial Decisions

Matthew Angelosanto 1*00

¹ Department of Legal Studies, Sapienza University of Rome, Rome, Italy

* Corresponding author email address: matangelosanto@uniroma.it

Received: 2023-03-20 Revised: 2023-04-25 Accepted: 2023-05-02 Published: 2023-07-01

EDITOR:

Mustafa Kaan Tuysuz

Institute of Social Sciences, Siirt Universite, Siirt, Turkey

AhmetKılıç@siirt.edu.tr

REVIEWER 1:
Yusuf Mohamed

Department of Architecture and City Design, King Fahd University of Petroleum and Minerals, Dhahran, SaudiArabia
yusufmohamed@kfupm.edu.sa

REVIEWER 2:

Mohammadbagher. Jafari

Department of Sociology of Culture, Istanbul, Türkiye

1. Round 1

1.1. Reviewer 1

mbjafari@kmanresce.ca

Reviewer:

Including or referencing empirical studies that directly support the claims about judicial predictability and legal realism would strengthen the paper's arguments.

Elaborating on the methodology for the literature review, including search strategies and criteria for inclusion and exclusion, can enhance the paper's scientific rigor.

Integrating insights from psychology, sociology, or political science on judicial behavior could enrich the discussion on the predictability of judicial decisions.

Exploring the impact of technology, such as AI and machine learning, on the predictability of judicial decisions and how it intersects with legal realism would provide a contemporary dimension to the analysis.

Identifying areas for future research, especially those that could empirically test the hypotheses about judicial predictability and legal realism, would be a valuable addition to the conclusion.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the document.

1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

A comparison with other legal theories, such as legal positivism or critical legal studies, regarding judicial predictability could offer a more nuanced understanding of legal realism's contributions and limitations.

Discussing the implications of legal realism for legal education, specifically on how it shapes the teaching of jurisprudence and legal reasoning, could add an important dimension to the paper.

Offering specific policy recommendations for improving the predictability of judicial decisions based on the insights from legal realism would make the paper more practical and actionable.

Incorporating perspectives on legal realism and judicial predictability from jurisdictions outside the United States can provide a more comprehensive view of the topic.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the document.

2. Revised

Editor's decision: Accepted.

Editor in Chief's decision: Accepted.

