

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Interaction of Domestic and International Criminal Jurisdictions: A Comparative Study with Emphasis on the International Criminal Court

Mohammad Ali. Khozeimeh¹, Majid. Shayganfard^{1*}, Hamidreza. Mirzajani¹

¹ Department of Criminal Law and Criminology, Ma.C., Islamic Azad University, Mashhad, Iran

* Corresponding author email address: drshayganfard@mshdiau.ac.ir

Received: 2025-04-03	Revised: 2025-05-25	Accepted: 2025-06-02	Published: 2025-12-03
EDITOR: Eman Shenouda ^{id} Associate Professor, Department of Psychology, Isfahan (Khorasgan) Branch, Islamic Azad University, Isfahan, Iran. Email: ens01@fayoum.edu.eg			
REVIEWER 1: Jeremiah Thuku Thuku ^{id} Department of Literary and Communication Studies, Laikipia University, Nyahururu, Kenya. Email: jerethukuthuku@gmail.com			
REVIEWER 2: Shehzad Raj ^{id} School of Law, Universiti Geomatika Malaysia, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia. Email: shehzadraj@geomatika.edu.my			

1. Round 1

1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

The opening paragraph should include a clearly articulated research question or objective. Currently, it provides background context without delineating a focused problem statement.

While this is a good definition, it should be cited appropriately with doctrinal sources. Also, the difference between universal jurisdiction and extraterritorial jurisdiction is not clearly demarcated.

The legal implications of sovereignty violation are stated, but there is no citation of relevant international law (e.g., UN Charter Article 2(4), or ICJ rulings). Please support this with legal precedents.

The description lacks detail on how universal jurisdiction was applied by Spain and how UK courts dealt with immunity. Consider citing the House of Lords ruling and its significance in international criminal law.

The connection between national laws and ICC jurisdiction is implied but not sufficiently unpacked. Provide specific examples of how domestic legislation aligns—or fails to align—with the Rome Statute.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the document.

1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

This is a sweeping generalization. Please support this claim with at least two scholarly references or qualify it by citing a leading legal source or scholar.

This statement should include references to illustrate which legal systems responded most notably, and how. Consider adding examples of domestic legal reforms driven by the Rome Statute.

While informative, the paragraph would benefit from clearer linkage to your main argument. Consider briefly stating how this source supports the principle of complementarity or your argument about jurisdiction overlap.

Many references are listed with brief summaries but no integration into the article's argument. Consider synthesizing how these references support, contradict, or complicate your thesis.

This case is not widely known and lacks citation or specific legal outcomes. Please provide a source and clarify how it illustrates jurisdictional conflict.

Please differentiate between treaties with universal jurisdiction effects (e.g., Rome Statute) and those that are more narrowly applied (e.g., regional conventions). Otherwise, the analysis remains too general.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the document.

2. Revised

Editor's decision: Accepted.

Editor in Chief's decision: Accepted.