

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Whistleblower Protections in the Age of National Security: A Legal Comparative Study

Anna Müller¹, Youssef El Amrani^{2*}, Liam Patterson³

¹ Department of Political Science, Humboldt University of Berlin, Berlin, Germany

² Department of International Relations, Mohammed V University, Rabat, Morocco

³ Department of Criminal Justice, University of Sydney, Sydney, Australia

* Corresponding author email address: youssef.elamrani@um5.ac.ma

Received: 2025-03-27

Revised: 2025-04-29

Accepted: 2025-05-11

Published: 2025-10-01

EDITOR:

Ghasem Eftekhari

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

REVIEWER 1:

Yuyu Zheng

School of International Relations, University of St Andrews, St Andrews, London, United Kingdom. Email: yuyuzheng@gmail.com

REVIEWER 2:

Mustafa Kaan Tuysuz

Institute of Social Sciences, Siirt Universite, Siirt, Turkey. Email: AhmetKiliç@siirt.edu.tr

1. Round 1

1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

The statement “Primary legal materials reviewed include statutory texts...” should be followed by footnotes or appendices that clearly list the specific statutes analyzed in each jurisdiction for transparency.

The reference to legal positivism is not adequately linked to the subsequent analysis. Clarify how this legal theory directly informs your critique of national security whistleblower laws.

The sentence “International legal instruments offer limited but growing guidance...” should mention more recent international cases beyond Guja v. Moldova (2008). Include newer ECtHR cases or UN developments post-2020.

The phrase “In contrast, authoritarian regimes...” is too broad. Consider qualifying this statement with more precise language, such as “In jurisdictions with limited judicial independence...”

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the document.

1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

While whistleblowers like Snowden are referenced, the section lacks a deeper theoretical analysis of the moral vs. legal dichotomy—perhaps referencing whistleblower theories of public interest or deontological ethics would add conceptual rigor.

The sentence “Comparative studies also reveal how whistleblower protection is embedded within broader legal systems...” echoes earlier points and can be trimmed or reframed to improve flow.

The term “public interest disclosure” is used repeatedly without a clear definition or legal basis. Consider clarifying this in relation to jurisdiction-specific laws.

The analysis of Canada’s PSDPA seems overly critical without acknowledging reforms or recent case law. A more balanced approach, including empirical outcomes or independent evaluations, would strengthen credibility.

The German section cites the Hinweisgeberschutzgesetz but does not explain how this law operationalizes whistleblower rights. Including specific provisions (e.g., Section 2 on scope or Section 3 on reporting channels) would enhance legal precision.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the document.

2. Revised

Editor’s decision: Accepted.

Editor in Chief’s decision: Accepted.