OPEN PEER REVIEW



Comparative Analysis of Supervisory Institutions in Iran and France in Addressing Crimes Related to Food, Beverages, and Hygiene

Ashkan. Rohani Janbeh Saraei 10, Fatemeh. Anahid 20, Mohammad Reza. Nazarinejad Kiashi 30

- ¹ PhD student, Department of Law, Ardabil Branch, Islamic Azad University, Ardabil, Iran
- ² Assistant Professor, Department of Law, Ardabil Branch, Islamic Azad University, Ardabil, Iran
- ³ Assistant Professor, Department of Law, Gilan Branch, Islamic Azad University, Gilan, Iran

* Corresponding author email address: Anahidftm@yahoo.com

EDITOR:

Tahereh Ebrahimifar

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

REVIEWER 1:

Sandeep Kotwal

Knowledge ManagementDivision, National Health Systems Resource Centre, Ministry of Health and Family Welfare, New Delhi, India. Email: sandkotwal@gmail.com

REVIEWER 2:

Kaushalya Koralage

Assistant Lecturer in Sociology at University of Colombo, Colombo, Sri Lanka. Email: koralage@iouc.cmb.ac.lk

1. Round 1

1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

The section defines food and beverages extensively but may be unnecessarily detailed (e.g., biochemical elements of food composition). Since this is a law and policy paper, condensing scientific definitions and focusing more on legal categorization would improve relevance.

The sentence "The term 'cosmetics' originates from the word 'adornment'..." reads more like a dictionary entry than an academic definition. Please connect this etymology to its regulatory significance (e.g., how EU and Iranian law classify cosmetics).

The text states "...insufficient resources and unclear regulations remain key challenges, necessitating legal revisions..." but does not propose what kind of legal revisions. Suggest including examples of potential amendments or models from other jurisdictions.

The section discusses overlapping authority but does not analyze why overlaps persist (political, legal, or institutional reasons). Adding a critical explanation would strengthen the analysis.

The explanation is clear, but the text does not reflect on the potential conflicts of jurisdiction between Revolutionary and General Courts. I recommend including discussion on how overlapping jurisdictions may affect enforcement consistency.

The statement "...regulatory bodies can act swiftly to prevent the sale of hazardous products" is accurate, but it would be beneficial to contrast this with the Iranian process, where product seizure requires more complex legal procedures.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the document.

1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

The technical description "Quaternary ammonium chlorides are among the cationic detergents..." is more suited to a medical journal. Consider summarizing in legal-analytical terms, focusing on regulatory implications rather than chemical mechanisms.

The explanation of majority and minority legal opinions is insightful, but the references are outdated (1988–1995). It would strengthen the paper to connect these debates to current enforcement challenges (e.g., recent court rulings or administrative reports).

The description of inspection stages ("Receiving complaints and reports... conducting inspections...") is informative but descriptive. Please critically assess whether these processes are effective in practice, supported by case data or statistics.

The sentence "Guilds resisted innovation, which hindered industrial progress." is historically interesting but lacks citation. Please provide a reference to support this claim or limit it to a contextual remark.

The paper notes "ANSES employs advanced scientific methods and modern technology..." but does not specify examples (e.g., genomics, AI-based monitoring). Including concrete examples would enhance the credibility of this point.

The collaboration with ANSES and DGCCRF is emphasized, but there is no mention of European Commission oversight or Court of Justice of the EU rulings, which are crucial in shaping French public health law. Including this would complete the comparative perspective.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the document.

2. Revised

Editor's decision: Accepted.

Editor in Chief's decision: Accepted.

