

Rule of Law in the International System and Iranian Domestic Law: Challenges

Ali. Mortazavi^{1*}, Zahra. Shakibi¹, Ghasem. Zamani²

¹ Department of International Law, ST.C., Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran.

² Associate Professor, Department of International Law, Faculty of Law and Political Science, Allameh Tabatabaei University, Tehran, Iran.

* Corresponding author email address: ali.mortazavi1240@iau.ac.ir

Received: 2025-06-07

Revised: 2025-09-28

Accepted: 2025-10-04

Initial Publish: 2025-10-06

Final Publish: 2026-01-01

EDITOR:

Cavid Qasimov

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

REVIEWER 1:

Mohammadbagher. Jafari

Department of Sociology of Culture, Istanbul, Türkiye. Email: mbjafari@kmanresce.ca

REVIEWER 2:

Mehmet Yaşar

Department of Sociology, Boğaziçi University, 34342 Bebek, Istanbul, Turkey. Email: mehmetyasardo@bogazici.edu.tr

1. Round 1

1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

The statement “The rule of law is a foundational concept in modern legal and political order” is accurate but overly general. Please situate this concept within a specific theoretical framework (e.g., Albert Venn Dicey’s formalist approach vs. Friedrich Neumann’s substantive approach) to provide conceptual anchoring from the outset.

The claim that “a uniform approach cannot be adopted for all legal systems” would benefit from a brief typology of legal systems (e.g., civil law vs. common law vs. hybrid systems) to clarify the analytical boundaries of your comparative discussion.

The sentence “Transitional-justice experience shows that the mere existence of international criminal fora does not guarantee sustained enforcement” needs concrete examples (e.g., Rwanda vs. Bosnia and Herzegovina) to illustrate the argument and make it more persuasive.

While the indicators are well stated, they are presented descriptively. Please include a table comparing at least two major existing rule-of-law indices (e.g., World Justice Project vs. World Bank governance indicators) to show how your framework aligns or diverges.

You argue that “the absence of an accessible final interpreter of the Constitution ... generated serious challenges.” This is a key claim. Include empirical evidence (e.g., case backlog statistics or contradictory judgments) to support it.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the document.

1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

The phrase “an approach rarely addressed in Persian-language literature” is too broad. Cite specific major Persian works to support this assertion and demonstrate the novelty of the study more convincingly.

The long paragraph combining United Nations General Assembly, United Nations Security Council, International Court of Justice, and international criminal justice roles risks overwhelming readers. Break this into subsections or sub-paragraphs, each with a clear subheading, to enhance structural clarity.

The section discusses principles but lacks a clear link to the four-part analytical framework introduced earlier (normative quality, institutional guarantees, transparency/procedurality, compliance/effectiveness). Explicitly map these fair-trial safeguards onto that framework to ensure conceptual coherence.

When you state “Domestic legal scholarship proposes three foundational axes”, please cite the exact authors proposing these axes to strengthen attribution and avoid the appearance of synthesis without sources.

The analytical-comparative approach is mentioned but not operationalized. Please include explicit criteria used to select domestic and international sources, and clarify how “comparability” was ensured.

The proposed reforms (e.g., “continuous consolidation”) are sound but presented normatively. Please justify them with comparative evidence from at least one jurisdiction where these reforms have demonstrably improved rule-of-law indicators.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the document.

2. Revised

Editor’s decision: Accepted.

Editor in Chief’s decision: Accepted.