ISSLP

OPEN PEER REVIEW

The Convergence of Law and Politics for Enhancing Government Policy-Making Processes

Hamed. Jabraeeli[1*], Roghaie. Gholizadeh[2]

[1] MA, Department of Public Law, Ta.C., Islamic Azad University, Tabriz, Iran
[2] MA, Department of Private Law, Ta.C., Islamic Azad University, Tabriz, Iran

*** Corresponding author email address**: Jjaaxd54@gmail.com

Received: 2026-02-09 **Revised:** 2026-06-23 **Accepted:** 2026-07-01 **Published:** 2026-11-01

EDITOR:
Eman Shenouda
Associate Professor, Department of Psychology, Isfahan (Khorasgan) Branch, Islamic Azad University, Isfahan, Iran. Email: ens01@fayoum.edu.eg
REVIEWER 1:
Mohammadbagher. Jafari
Department of Sociology of Culture, Istanbul, Türkiye. Email: mbjafari@kmanresce.ca
REVIEWER 2:
Asghar Jafari
Associate Professor, Department of Psychology, Kashan University, Iran. Email: as_jafari@sbu.ac.ir

1. Round 1

1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

In the first paragraph of the Introduction, the sentence “When these two realms operate in isolation, several pathologies may emerge” introduces important claims about policy failure, but these claims are not sufficiently supported by examples or empirical illustrations. The authors should strengthen this paragraph by briefly referring to concrete policy domains, such as public health regulation, environmental governance, digital governance, or administrative rulemaking, where the separation of legal and political reasoning has produced identifiable institutional problems.

In the second paragraph of the Introduction, the phrase “The concept of convergence, understood as the active integration of legal reasoning, procedural safeguards, and rights-based approaches into the core of political policy-making, offers a promising remedy” is central to the article, but the concept of convergence requires deeper theoretical elaboration. The authors should distinguish convergence from related concepts such as coordination, integration, interdependence, legalization, juridification, and institutional hybridity. This distinction is necessary to establish the article’s conceptual originality.

In the paragraph beginning “Political scientists have developed many theories regarding how public policy is made,” the discussion of Policy Feedback Theory is useful but under-cited and somewhat simplified. The authors should more clearly explain the theory’s core mechanisms, including resource effects, interpretive effects, constituency formation, and institutional reinforcement. This would make the discussion more scientifically robust and prevent the theory from being reduced merely to public reaction to policy.

In the paragraph beginning “Policy Feedback Theory requires a public that is engaged with the laws and policies created by government,” the authors correctly identify citizen engagement as an important component, but the analysis should also address unequal participation. The sentence “Citizens must be genuinely engaged with government, and government must also be

willing to listen to the citizens of the nation" assumes a relatively open and responsive political system. The authors should consider power asymmetries, unequal access to participation, lobbying influence, technocratic exclusion, and administrative barriers.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the document.

1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

In the second paragraph of the Introduction, the examples "constitutional impact statements," "independent regulatory oversight bodies," and "public participation mechanisms" are valuable, but they are listed rather than analytically developed. The authors should explain how each mechanism specifically contributes to the convergence of law and politics. For example, constitutional impact statements may enhance legal compatibility, while public participation may strengthen democratic legitimacy and procedural justice.

In the third paragraph of the Introduction, the sentence "This introduction sets the stage by arguing that the convergence of law and politics is not merely a theoretical aspiration but a practical necessity for improving state policy-making in the twenty-first century" clearly states the manuscript's orientation, but the article would benefit from a sharper research problem. The authors should explicitly state the gap in existing scholarship and clarify whether the study is conceptual, doctrinal, comparative, theoretical, or policy-analytical.

In the third paragraph of the Introduction, the sentence "The subsequent sections examine the theoretical foundations of this convergence, identify its institutional enablers, and discuss potential challenges" promises a structure that is not fully reflected in the body of the article. The current main section focuses heavily on United States administrative law and public policy theories, while institutional enablers and potential challenges are not systematically organized. The authors should align the article's actual structure with the roadmap announced in the Introduction.

In the first paragraph under "Creation of Public Policy Theories in Law and Political Science," the sentence "In both law and politics, scholars and practitioners must seek answers to the major public questions facing the nation" should be revised for precision and scope. The expression "the nation" suggests a specific national context, but the article's title and abstract imply a broader governance framework. The authors should clarify whether the article is primarily about the United States, democratic systems generally, or government policy-making across legal-political systems.

In the first paragraph under "Creation of Public Policy Theories in Law and Political Science," the reference to Otto von Bismarck and the "sausage" metaphor is rhetorically engaging but currently informal in tone. The authors should either integrate the metaphor more critically into the analytical framework or reduce its prominence. In a scientific article, metaphors should support conceptual clarity rather than substitute for theoretical explanation.

In the paragraph beginning "What, then, does this mean for the fields as a whole?" the argument for cross-disciplinary exchange is important, but it remains normative rather than analytical. The authors should specify what forms of interdisciplinary communication are being proposed. For instance, the article could distinguish between interdisciplinary research, joint institutional training, legal review in policy design, policy analysis in legal education, and collaborative regulatory drafting.

In the paragraph beginning "What are public policy theories, and why are they necessary?" the definition of public policy theories is somewhat circular and should be refined. The sentence "Public policy theories address decisions made by governmental authority, including the commonly recognized rules that structure public service" does not adequately capture the explanatory function of public policy theory. The authors should define public policy theories as analytical frameworks that explain policy formation, implementation, change, institutional behavior, actor coalitions, and feedback effects.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the document.

2. Revised

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