

Issuance of Passports for Married Women in the Iranian Legal System in Light of International Instruments

Sayed Marzieh. Kia¹, Bijan. Abbasi^{2*}

¹ PhD student in Public International Law, Alborz Campus, University of Tehran, Tehran, Iran

² Professor, Department of Public Law and Political Science, University of Tehran, Tehran, Iran

* Corresponding author email address: abbasi@ut.ac.ir

Received: 2025-07-13 Revised: 2025-10-16 Accepted: 2025-10-23 Initial Publish: 2025-12-15 Final Publish: 2026-04-01

EDITOR:

Ghasem Eftekhari

Associate Professor, Department of Political Science, University of Tehran, Tehran, Iran. Email: eftekhari@ut.ac.ir

REVIEWER 1:

Abdus Samad

Assistant Professor, Department of Law, AWKUM, Pakistan. Email: abdussamad@awkum.edu.pk

REVIEWER 2:

Jingjing Wang

Law School, Peking University (PKU), Peking, China. Email: jingwang@vip.sina.com

1. Round 1

1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

Consider citing the exact legal wording or quoting it in translation within parentheses to improve precision and aid readers unfamiliar with Iranian legislation. This would also enhance legal transparency and interpretive accuracy.

The transition from the constitutional to the international dimension is abrupt. Introduce a bridging sentence that contextualizes how the Iranian Constitution operationalizes international commitments, particularly regarding gender equality.

Excellent use of General Comment No. 27. However, specify which paragraphs of the Comment are most directly applicable to the Iranian context. Including paragraph numbers will show familiarity with the interpretive framework and strengthen your international law argument.

The text rightly quotes Article 15(4) of CEDAW, but since Iran has not ratified CEDAW, the discussion should explicitly mention this fact and then justify the Convention's use as a normative benchmark rather than binding law. Otherwise, the reader may question its legal relevance.

This section could be improved by inserting a short timeline table summarizing key amendments to the Passport Act from 1932 to 2017. A visual summary would clarify the historical development of the restrictions and make the argument more accessible.

The article cites Khomeini and Tusi (2008) as references here. Clarify whether these are used as jurisprudential authorities or as secondary academic sources. The distinction is important for methodological rigor in Islamic legal research.

The argument that Article 18 "lacks internal coherence" is compelling but needs empirical support. Consider referencing examples of judicial decisions or administrative cases where inconsistent interpretations have occurred to demonstrate this incoherence in practice.

This section excellently lists exceptions but would be more persuasive with legal citations to corresponding Civil Code articles or judicial precedents confirming these exemptions in Iranian law.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the document.

1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

The three research questions are well formulated, but they should be explicitly linked to the subsequent structure of the article. Adding a short sentence clarifying which section answers which question will guide the reader and improve logical coherence.

The analysis of Article 13 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights could be strengthened by referencing contemporary interpretations from UN or academic commentaries post-2015 to demonstrate ongoing relevance, not only historical context.

The argument would benefit from a brief comparative note—how have Islamic or Iranian jurists responded to Article 16's equality clause? Without this, the discussion appears descriptive rather than analytical.

The reasoning is strong but overly dense. Divide the paragraph into shorter segments to aid readability and emphasize each inconsistency separately: nationality, residency, and travel destination distinctions.

Excellent identification of ambiguity; however, the discussion could benefit from a citation to Iranian judicial circulars or Attorney General guidelines, if any, to substantiate claims about interpretive diversity among prosecutors.

The survey of juristic disagreement is informative but lacks methodological framing. Indicate how juristic opinions were selected—by historical influence, representativeness, or citation frequency—to reinforce the study's analytical credibility.

The interpretation is theologically sound but could benefit from comparison with Sunni exegesis, especially since the paper claims a "comparative" dimension. Including at least one Sunni jurist's perspective (e.g., al-Qurtubi or Ibn Kathir) would enrich the comparative analysis.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the document.

2. Revised

Editor's decision: Accepted.

Editor in Chief's decision: Accepted.