

OPEN PEER REVIEW

The Security-Oriented Effects on the Domain of Maximal Criminalization

Seyedeh Monira. Hejazi¹, Baharak. Shahed², Jamal. Beigi³, Keyvan. Heydarnejad⁴

1. Department of Criminal Law and Criminology, Ta.C., Islamic Azad University, Tabriz, Iran
2. Department of Criminal Law and Criminology, Ur.C., Islamic Azad University, Urmia, Iran
3. Department of Criminal Law and Criminology, Mar.C., Islamic Azad University, Maragheh, Iran
4. Department of Criminal Law and Criminology, Shab.C., Islamic Azad University, Shabestar, Iran

* Corresponding author email address: baharakshahed@iau.ac.ir

Received: 2025-06-01	Revised: 2025-10-12	Accepted: 2025-10-20	Initial Publish: 2025-10-20	Final Publish: 2026-04-01
EDITOR: Richard Dodder ^{id} Emeritus Professor of Sociology and of Statistics, Oklahoma State University Stillwater, Oklahoma, USA. Email: rdodder@hotmail.com				
REVIEWER 1: Jingjing Wang ^{id} Law School, Peking University (PKU), Peking, China. Email: jingwang@vip.sina.com				
REVIEWER 2: Jingjing Wang ^{id} Law School, Peking University (PKU), Peking, China. Email: jingwang@vip.sina.com				

1. Round 1

1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

The definition of securitism as “subordination of criminal rules to state sovereignty” is valuable but should distinguish between securitization (a process) and securitism (an ideological condition). A brief comparative note on terminology used in political science would add conceptual depth.

The sentence “Global experience in recent decades shows that the absolute prioritization of security has had serious consequences for civil liberties...” would benefit from at least one empirical reference or cross-national statistic to substantiate this assertion.

When stating “Emphasis will be placed on reforming legislative structures...”, indicate whether these recommendations are theoretical or derived from case analyses. The introduction should preview the article’s analytic framework more clearly.

— This assertion aligns with “penal populism” theory; explicitly using that term and referencing key authors (e.g., Pratt 2007) would strengthen theoretical framing.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the document.

1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

The citation to Kalantari (2022) should be integrated analytically: explain how Kalantari operationalizes “state interference” to ground your adaptation of the term.

“However, threats in society must be actual rather than hypothetical...” — Excellent normative point, but the criteria for distinguishing “actual” from “hypothetical” threats remain undefined. Propose measurable indicators or judicial standards.

The text paraphrases Article 2 of the Islamic Penal Code. Include the enactment year (2013) immediately in-text to reinforce legal precision.

— Provide contextual explanation of how each administration’s legal reforms concretely altered criminal statutes. Without such detail, the examples risk appearing anecdotal.

While the principle of legality is well introduced, the paragraph merges constitutional and statutory references. Separate them analytically—one discussing constitutional authority, the other legislative drafting standards.

The exposition is comprehensive but overly long. Consider summarizing jurisprudential debates in a table or condensed paragraph to improve readability and emphasize interpretive divergence among courts.

The sentence “Given the legislative ambiguity, jurisprudence diverges...” could cite representative Supreme Court cases to ground the claim of divergence in empirical judicial evidence.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the document.

2. Revised

Editor’s decision: Accepted.

Editor in Chief’s decision: Accepted.