




# Possible Legal Protections for Paintings Used in Architecture


Masoomah. Mobarakian<sup>1</sup> , Morteza. Shahbazinia<sup>2\*</sup> , Sattar. Zarkalam<sup>3</sup> 

<sup>1</sup> PhD student in private law, Department of Law, Central Tehran Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran

<sup>2</sup> Associate Professor, Faculty of Law, Tarbiat Modares University, Tehran, Iran

<sup>3</sup> Associate Professor, Department of Law, Shahed University, Tehran, Iran

\* Corresponding author email address: shahbazinia@gmail.com

Received: 2023-08-25	Revised: 2023-09-16	Accepted: 2023-09-26	Published: 2023-10-01
<b>EDITOR:</b> Richard Dodder  Emeritus Professor of Sociology and of Statistics, Oklahoma State University Stillwater, Oklahoma, USA. Email: rdodder@hotmail.com			
<b>REVIEWER 1:</b> Mehmet Yaşar  Department of Sociology, Boğaziçi University, 34342 Bebek, Istanbul, Turkey. Email: mehmetyasardo@bogazici.edu.tr			
<b>REVIEWER 2:</b> Patrika Handique  Patent Information Centre, Intellectual Property Facilitation Centre, Chhattisgarh Council of Science & Technology, Raipur, Chhattisgarh, India. Email: Patriandique@gmail.com			

## 1. Round 1

### 1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

The sentence "Iranian law does not explicitly address the value of artistic works or their irrelevance to originality" lacks clarity. Please elaborate on how the "value" of artistic works is assessed and how it connects to the concept of originality in the Iranian legal context.

You mention that "no one may use or exploit [an architectural work] without the permission of the creator". Please clarify how this is enforced in practice, especially given the noted limitations of Iran's enforcement mechanisms.

The sentence "execution is not a mandatory requirement for copyright protection" would benefit from elaboration on the differences in how this principle is applied in common law versus civil law jurisdictions.

The discussion on "automatic protection without formalities" is crucial. Please add a brief analysis of how this principle has been interpreted by Iranian courts, or whether any judicial gaps exist.

The list of paintings eligible for protection (e.g., murals, decorative elements) is insightful. Please clarify whether Iranian law differentiates between these forms in terms of registration, enforcement, or protection scope.

The definition of "originality" is broad. It would strengthen the argument to include how originality is interpreted in judicial practice, especially in art-related disputes.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the document.

## 1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

The term "architectural atmosphere" is central to the discussion of copying in architectural works. It would strengthen the argument to include a legal definition or precedent where this concept has been applied in intellectual property disputes.

In the sentence "Neither personal nor general styles are protected under copyright law...", please cite international or Iranian legal precedents to substantiate this point, especially as it contrasts with earlier assertions on stylistic copying.

The claim "The legal protection of paintings used in architecture is being examined systematically for the first time" is strong. Please justify this statement with a comparative review of previous research or legal literature in Iran or internationally.

The statement "The rights of creators of building plans, designs, and structures have been formally recognized" would benefit from specific legal citations, particularly from Iranian legislation and any relevant judicial interpretations.

The reference to "Article 21 of the Law on the Protection of Authors..." should be clarified—specifically, whether the optional nature of registration has caused enforcement or ownership ambiguities in court practice.

The statement "authorship is presumed to belong to the person whose name appears on the work..." could benefit from a comparative analysis with Iranian law—does such a presumption exist, and is it rebuttable?

The statement "architectural paintings incorporating nanomaterials or light-sensitive pigments may be eligible for patent registration" is compelling. Please provide an example or cite a precedent or patent registry entry demonstrating this claim.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the document.

## 2. Revised

Editor's decision: Accepted.

Editor in Chief's decision: Accepted.