

OPEN PEER REVIEW

The Evolution of Document Forgery in Iran and Its Impact on the Validity of Transactions in Light of the Link Between Private and Criminal Law

Sirous. Bigdeli¹, Samira Sadat. Dowlatabadi^{1*}

¹ Department of Law, Sab.C, Islamic Azad University, Sabzevar, Iran

* Corresponding author email address: samira.dowlatabadi@iau.ir

Received: 2025-08-05

Revised: 2025-12-24

Accepted: 2025-12-31

Initial Publish: 2026-01-02

Final Publish: 2026-12-01

EDITOR:

Tahereh Ebrahimifar

Head of Sociology Department, Faculty of Arts, Helwan University, Cairo, Egypt. Email: Tah.Ebrahimifar@iauctb.ac.ir

REVIEWER 1:

Mehmet Çevik

Department of Social Sciences, Ankara University, Türkiye. Email: mehmetÇevik@asbu.edu.tr

REVIEWER 2:

Fatimah Sahdan

Faculty of Social and Political Sciences (FISIP) Diponegoro University, Yogyakarta, Indonesia. Email: fatimahsahdan@rocketmail.com

1. Round 1

1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

In paragraph 1, the phrase “occupies a distinctive position between the domains of criminal law and private law” is central but remains descriptive. Define explicitly what “intersection” entails in doctrinal or functional terms (e.g., overlapping sanctions, procedural conflicts).

In paragraph 2 (“The central issue in this research concerns how the evolution...”), clearly identify the specific research gap—prior Iranian or comparative studies that failed to examine the civil consequences of forgery.

The paragraph beginning “From the perspective of Imamiyyah jurisprudence...” cites key principles but lacks precise references to classical sources (e.g., al-Makasib, Shara’i‘ al-Islam). Adding these strengthens scholarly credibility.

In 3.1. The Offense of Forgery Before the 1979 Islamic Revolution, the discussion conflates the 1925 Code and its later amendments. Distinguish legislative milestones (e.g., 1932 amendment, 1973 reforms) to present a clearer chronology.

In 3.2. The Offense of Forgery After the 1979 Islamic Revolution, the paragraph “Compared with the pre-Revolution period...” asserts moral transformation but does not examine how specific penal articles changed (e.g., Ta‘zirat 1996, Articles 523–542). Include article numbers to substantiate the claim.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the document.

1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

The three objectives listed toward the end of the Introduction (“to analyze... to explain... to examine...”) are comprehensive but would be strengthened by linking each to an expected outcome or research question, improving logical flow.

In the Concept of Forgery section, the definition “the alteration of truth in a writing...” appears verbatim from Aghaeinia (2014). Clarify whether this is a quotation or a paraphrase; include quotation marks if directly cited to maintain academic integrity.

Paragraph 1 and paragraph 2 under Types of Forgery both describe material and content-based forgery. Consolidate them to avoid repetition and use sub-headings or a comparative table for clarity.

The section 3.3. Analysis of Developments... references a “shift from uncompromising severity toward a more mixed regime.” Strengthen this by comparing sentencing ranges or procedural reforms across periods to provide measurable indicators.

Paragraph 1 of 4.1. The Material and Mental Elements of Forgery could benefit from a short comparative remark on how “intent to defraud” aligns with international standards (e.g., French Code Pénal, German StGB §267), enriching the analytical-comparative scope.

In 4.2., the claim “Forgery acquires criminal significance not merely due to the alteration of truth...” would be more persuasive if illustrated by Iranian Supreme Court rulings where potential (not actual) harm sufficed for conviction.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the document.

2. Revised

Editor's decision: Accepted.

Editor in Chief's decision: Accepted.