OPEN PEER REVIEW

Unification of Private International Law Rules

Reza. Rahimi[1*], Nejad Ali. Almasi[2], Ebrahim. Taghizadeh[3]

[1] PhD Student, Department of Private Law, Payame Noor University, Tehran, Iran
[2] Full Professor, Department of Private Law and Islam, Faculty of Law and Political Science, University of Tehran, Tehran, Iran
[3] Professor, Department of Private Law, Payame Noor University, Tehran, Iran

*** Corresponding author email address**: reza-rahimi1970@student.pnu.ac.ir

Received: 2025-07-02	**Revised:** 2025-11-01	**Accepted:** 2025-11-08	**Published:** 2026-07-01

EDITOR:
Asghar Jafari
Associate Professor, Department of Psychology, Kashan University, Iran. Email: as_jafari@sbu.ac.ir
REVIEWER 1:
Asghar Jafari
Associate Professor, Department of Psychology, Kashan University, Iran. Email: as_jafari@sbu.ac.ir
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:

While the authors define uniform laws accurately, this section lacks conceptual distinction between “harmonization” and “unification.” It is recommended to include a brief theoretical clarification to prevent terminological ambiguity throughout the paper.

The discussion on the instruments of unification (conventions, principles, guidelines) should be supported by recent empirical examples—for instance, the 2016 UNCITRAL Model Law on Secured Transactions—to strengthen the relevance of the argument.

The historical account is accurate but purely descriptive. The authors should critically analyze how the Hague Conference’s conventions have influenced Iranian law or identify obstacles preventing Iran’s full participation.

The definition of international jurisdiction is correct but would benefit from comparative citation of major systems (EU Brussels I bis Regulation, U.S. Federal Rules §1331) to situate the concept within contemporary practice.

The discussion of historical context could be strengthened by referencing Islamic jurisprudence on tazāhum al-ahkām (conflict of norms), as the Iranian system is grounded in Sharia; this would improve the local legal relevance of the paper.

The subsection appropriately lists three causal factors but lacks hierarchical analysis. The authors should indicate which of these factors most significantly affects present-day Iranian conflict-of-laws issues and why.

The classification between direct and indirect effects is valuable, yet it requires clarification on enforceability mechanisms. The authors should specify whether “direct effect” implies self-execution or automatic incorporation under Iran’s constitutional system.

While the list of organizations is comprehensive, the paragraph would benefit from distinguishing law-making competence from policy coordination functions. For example, WTO rules harmonize through obligation rather than model law, a nuance not addressed.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the document.

1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

This paragraph makes prescriptive claims about Iran's participation in international conventions. The authors should substantiate these claims with specific treaties and the years of Iran's accession to ensure factual accuracy and transparency.

The paragraph mixes objectives with methods. It would be clearer to separate the research aims (identification, examination, proposal) from the procedural steps (literature review, doctrinal analysis) to improve methodological coherence.

The argument conflates international legal personality with participation in private international law. It is suggested to include doctrinal references distinguishing public and private subjects of international law to prevent conceptual overlap.

This section contains several assertions about "soft power" without defining the term in a legal-theoretical sense. The authors should either operationalize "soft power" within legal unification or replace it with a jurisprudentially grounded concept such as legal influence or norm diffusion.

The section is informative but overly general. The authors might reorganize it thematically (legal, political, economic, procedural obstacles) to enhance analytical clarity and reader navigation.

The explanation of opt-in limitations is insightful; however, the paper should propose specific implementation models (e.g., dualist vs monist incorporation) relevant to Iran to connect theory to domestic feasibility.

This sentence—"Conversely, the less dependent these rules are on specific national systems…"—could be expanded to explain how transnational commercial customs achieve neutrality, possibly citing examples from lex mercatoria practice.

The critique of commercial bias is persuasive but unbalanced. The authors should also discuss countervailing social or consumer-protection harmonization efforts (e.g., UN Guidelines for Consumer Protection 2016) to provide analytical symmetry.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the document.

2. Revised

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