

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Analysis of the Strengths and Weaknesses of Iraq’s Security Agreements with Emphasis on Institutional, Intelligence, Border, and Political–Economic Dimensions

Ahmed. Raad Hasan¹, Rahman. Najafi^{2*}, Nasrollah. Kalantari³, Ali. Alizadeh³

¹ PhD student in International Relations, Supreme National Defense University, Tehran, Iran
² Associate Professor, Faculty Member, Supreme National Defense University, Tehran, Iran
³ Assistant Professor, Faculty Member, Supreme National Defense University, Tehran, Iran

* Corresponding author email address: rnajafi1385@gmail.com

Received: 2025-07-13	Revised: 2025-11-01	Accepted: 2025-11-08	Initial Publish: 2025-11-10	Final Publish: 2026-04-01
EDITOR: Richard Dodder Emeritus Professor of Sociology and of Statistics, Oklahoma State University Stillwater, Oklahoma, USA. Email: rdodder@hotmail.com				
REVIEWER 1: Muhammad Abdul Rahman Department of Humanities, Rajaratnam School of International Studies, Nanyang Technological University, Singapore. Email: muhammadrahman@ntu.edu.sg				
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:

The sentence “The discrepancy between the official objectives of these agreements and the actual results reveals a fundamental gap...” is well stated but would benefit from referencing empirical studies or reports that document these discrepancies, to anchor the argument in previous research.

The discussion of Iraq’s geopolitical position is insightful; however, the paragraph could benefit from integrating a comparative perspective—perhaps mentioning how Iraq’s situation parallels or contrasts with similar regional actors (e.g., Lebanon or Jordan) to strengthen analytical depth.

The line “this topic... has been rarely and inadequately explored independently” should be supported by a brief citation review (1–2 sentences) naming existing works and explaining precisely what gap remains unaddressed. This would strengthen the study’s originality claim.

The observation “each country seeks to leverage security cooperation to entrench its political or economic sway in Iraq” could be supported by empirical evidence or case examples (e.g., Turkish base negotiations or Iranian border trade influence) to substantiate the claim.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the document.

1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

The research question “What are the most significant challenges and deficiencies in Iraq’s security agreements...” is relevant but should be operationalized into sub-questions corresponding to each dimension (institutional, intelligence, border, political–economic) for methodological transparency.

The authors state “This conceptual framework forms the foundation for analyzing Iraq’s security agreements...” but do not explicitly map how each theoretical pillar (legal, institutional, structural–perceptual) corresponds to the four analytical dimensions. A short table or schematic could improve conceptual clarity.

The description “the highest mean belongs to the intelligence dimension (3.51)” is purely descriptive. Include a brief inferential insight—e.g., whether differences among dimensions are statistically significant—to elevate analytical sophistication.

The phrase “these structures have facilitated information exchange and decision-making” could be supported with specific examples or citations of particular committees or agreements (e.g., the Iraq–Iran Border Security Committee) to demonstrate empirical grounding.

The authors mention “intelligence rivalries among neighbors...” but the paragraph remains descriptive. Recommend adding a theoretical linkage—perhaps using security dilemma or institutional realism concepts—to frame why these rivalries persist despite cooperation mechanisms.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the document.

2. Revised

Editor’s decision: Accepted.

Editor in Chief’s decision: Accepted.