

OPEN PEER REVIEW

# Legal Recognition of Non-Binary Identities: Comparative Analysis of Gender Law Reform

Lucía. Fernández<sup>1\*</sup> , Selin. Arslan<sup>2</sup> <sup>1</sup> Department of Political Science, University of Buenos Aires, Buenos Aires, Argentina<sup>2</sup> Department of International Relations, Middle East Technical University, Ankara, Turkey

\* Corresponding author email address: lucia.fernandez@uba.ar

Received: 2025-08-05

Revised: 2025-12-19

Accepted: 2025-12-27

Published: 2026-01-01

**EDITOR:**Tahereh Ebrahimifar 

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

**REVIEWER 1:**Pinar Reisoğlu 

Faculty of Social Sciences, Recep Tayyip Erdogan University, Rize, Turkey. Email: pinarreisoglu@erdogan.edu.tr

**REVIEWER 2:**Shehzad Raj 

School of Law, Universiti Geomatika Malaysia, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia. Email: shehzadraj@geomatika.edu.my

## 1. Round 1

### 1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

This is a strong commitment. Consider explicitly naming which international courts or treaty bodies will be analyzed for their impact on national reform trajectories.

It would strengthen this section to briefly outline how the 2019 Act diverges from the NALSA ruling and name specific bureaucratic requirements.

This is a powerful critique—however, consider offering a counterexample of where judicial oversight has been protective rather than exclusionary.

This point is compelling; however, the term “ideological commitments” could be better substantiated by referring to legal scholarship or judicial discourse.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the document.

### 1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

This definition could be enriched by referencing key jurisprudence (e.g., Goodwin v. UK, ECHR) to ground it within existing legal doctrine.

Please specify a few jurisdictions where this incorporation has had notable legal or social impact (e.g., Canada, Malta, or South Africa).

The article would benefit from naming at least one country influenced by Argentina’s law to validate the diffusion claim. Consider citing the name and year of the legislation enacted post-ruling to improve traceability for legal scholars.

This distinction is central to your argument. Consider elaborating briefly on how symbolic inclusion may still produce legal harm or institutional inertia.

This is a key insight—consider referencing an empirical study or demographic survey demonstrating the range of identities beyond “third gender.”

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the document.

## 2. Revised

Editor’s decision: Accepted.

Editor in Chief’s decision: Accepted.