

Analyzing the Interaction of Legal–Political Approaches by Scholars as a Novel Strategy for Strengthening International Peace and Security (A Descriptive–Analytical Study)


Rasool. Yousefi¹ , Seyed Farshid Jafari. Pabandi^{1*} , Malek. Zolqadr¹ 

¹ Department of Political Science and International Relations, Za.c., Islamic Azad University, Zanzan, Iran

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


Received: 2025-11-12	Revised: 2026-02-03	Accepted: 2026-02-07	Initial Publish: 2026-02-09	Final Publish: 2026-07-01
----------------------	---------------------	----------------------	-----------------------------	---------------------------

EDITOR:

Cavid Qasimov¹ 


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

REVIEWER 1:

Jeremiah Thuku Thuku¹ 

Department of Literary and Communication Studies, Laikipia University, Nyahururu, Kenya. Email: jerethukuthuku@gmail.com

REVIEWER 2:

Agwu Sunday Okoro¹ 

Lecturer & Clinical Law Administrator at Baze University Abuja, Abuja, Nigeria. Email: agwuokoro@gmail.com

1. Round 1

1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

The phrase “innovative strategies, including concepts such as legal diplomacy and neoliberal institutionalism” groups together approaches with very different ontological assumptions. Please justify analytically why these are treated as part of a single interactive trend, or disaggregate them conceptually.

When asking whether one approach must be subordinated to the other, the article raises an important epistemological question. However, the manuscript does not later return explicitly to this question. Please signal clearly where and how this question is answered in subsequent sections.

The binary presentation of “primacy of power” versus “primacy of rules” is analytically clear but risks oversimplification. Consider acknowledging hybrid positions within each tradition to avoid constructing straw-man oppositions.

The sentence “international law is best understood as institutionalized politics” is conceptually dense. Please define this claim more precisely and explain how it differs from legal realism or instrumentalism.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the document.

1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

The article describes itself as “descriptive–analytical” and “library-based,” but this remains underspecified. Please add a short methodological subsection clarifying: (a) criteria for source selection, (b) analytical framework, and (c) how description transitions into analysis.

The section promises “careful attention” to intellectual traditions, yet the organizing logic is not explicit. Consider adding a brief roadmap paragraph explaining how classical, modern, and synthetic approaches are analytically connected.

The juxtaposition of Waltz and Kelsen is theoretically sound, but the discussion remains largely descriptive. Please deepen the analysis by explicitly identifying the core incompatibility between systemic anarchy and hierarchical legality.

The example of environmental governance is useful, but it appears abruptly. Please clarify why environmental regimes are an appropriate analogy for peace and security, or provide an additional security-specific example.

The claim that institutions “discipline political power” would benefit from further nuance. Please discuss the limits of institutional discipline, particularly in asymmetrical power relations.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the document.

2. Revised

Editor’s decision: Accepted.

Editor in Chief’s decision: Accepted.