ISSLP
Interdisciplinary Studies in Society, Law and Politics

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Monitoring Mechanisms to Ensure the Effectiveness of Negotiation Strategies with Non-Muslim States in International Law: A Case Study of Proposed Frameworks of the Organisation of Islamic Cooperation and Their Comparison with International Oversight Models

Maedeh Modarresi Asem[1], Abbas Samavati[1*], Tahereh Sadat Naimi[2]

[1] Department of Jurisprudence and Fundamentals of Islamic Law, YI.C., Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran
[2] Department of Jurisprudence and Law, Isf.C., Islamic Azad University, Isfahan, Iran

*** Corresponding author email address**: abbas.samavati@iau.ac.ir

Received: 2026-01-01 **Revised:** 2026-05-24 **Accepted:** 2026-06-01 **Initial Publish:** 2026-06-17 **Final Publish:** 2026-09-01

EDITOR:
Tahereh Ebrahimifar
Head of Sociology Department, Faculty of Arts, Helwan University,Cairo, Egypt. Email: Tah.Ebrahimifar@iauctb.ac.ir
REVIEWER 1:
Nabeel Bani-Hani
Faculty of Education Specialization, Wasit University, Wasit, Iraq. Email: nabeelhani@uowasit.edu.iq
REVIEWER 2:
Mehmet Çevik
Department of Social Sciences, Ankara University, Türkiye. Email: mehmetÇevik@asbu.edu.tr

1. Round 1

1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

In the paragraph starting “The central issue of this study is the examination of the hypothesis that the efficiency of negotiation strategies depends…”, the hypothesis is stated in a highly general form but lacks falsifiability criteria. The sentence “the efficiency of negotiation strategies depends upon the existence of transparent, impartial, and effective oversight mechanisms” should be reformulated into measurable variables or at least linked to evaluative indicators (e.g., compliance rates, dispute recurrence, treaty durability).

In the methodological statement “To answer this question, the study employs a comparative-analytical research method”, the manuscript does not sufficiently specify the analytical procedure. It is unclear how comparison is conducted (case selection criteria, variables, or structured comparison design). This paragraph should explicitly clarify whether the approach is doctrinal comparison, institutional comparison, or functional comparison.

In the paragraph stating “The focal point of this research is the analysis of the role of international judicial and quasi-judicial bodies…”, the concept of “Islamic International Court of Justice” is introduced without prior doctrinal grounding. The manuscript should clarify whether this is a normative proposal, a theoretical construct, or derived from existing OIC resolutions, and cite the legal feasibility within the OIC Charter framework.

In section 1.4, the sentence “states predominantly use negotiation strategies that reflect a zero-sum logic” oversimplifies realism. Contemporary realism includes nuanced variants (neorealism, defensive realism) that should be acknowledged to avoid theoretical reductionism.

In section 1.5, the statement "liberalism offers a future-oriented and cooperation-centered perspective" is accurate but lacks critical engagement. The manuscript should address critiques of liberalism, particularly regarding asymmetrical interdependence and institutional bias.

In section 1.6, the sentence "constructivism… places concepts such as identity, norm, and discourse at the center" is theoretically sound, but the manuscript does not demonstrate how constructivism is operationalized in the empirical or comparative sections, creating a gap between theory and application.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the document.

1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

In the paragraph "The study then undertakes a comparative analysis of oversight mechanisms in influential international organizations…", the comparison between the European Union and the OIC is conceptually asymmetrical. The sentence "European Union as a symbol of an integrated legal order… and the Organisation of Islamic Cooperation as a representative of the Islamic world" compares a supranational legal order with an intergovernmental organization, which requires explicit justification of comparability.

In section 1.1, the definition "the term 'oversight mechanisms' refers to a set of institutionalized structures and protocols…" is conceptually adequate but lacks engagement with existing doctrinal literature. The paragraph would benefit from referencing established typologies of oversight (ex ante vs ex post, judicial vs political oversight) to enhance theoretical rigor.

In the sentence "The nature of such negotiations is inherently complex because it is rooted in a tense history…", the claim about "tense history" is overly generalized. The manuscript should specify which historical trajectories (e.g., colonial legacies, Cold War alignments) are being referenced and how they concretely affect negotiation dynamics.

In the paragraph referencing "Treaty of Hudaybiyyah… as a symbol of peaceful engagement", the historical analogy is invoked without methodological justification. The manuscript should clarify whether this is used as a normative precedent, a constructivist narrative, or a legal analogy, as its current use risks being rhetorical rather than analytical.

In section 1.2, the sentence "Public international law… functions both as a guide for conduct during negotiations and as a creator of a common legal language" is theoretically valid but insufficiently substantiated. It would benefit from engagement with doctrinal debates on fragmentation of international law and competing normative regimes.

The paragraph discussing "the Nicaragua v. United States case in 1986" introduces a strong doctrinal example, but its connection to negotiation oversight mechanisms is implicit rather than explicit. The manuscript should clarify how judicial precedent translates into oversight of negotiation processes.

In section 1.3, the claim "international institutions optimize diplomatic interactions by reducing negotiation and transaction costs" reflects institutionalist theory but is presented as an empirical fact. The manuscript should explicitly attribute this to specific theoretical sources (e.g., Keohane) or clarify its analytical status.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the document.

2. Revised

Editor's decision: Accepted.
Editor in Chief's decision: Accepted.