

Executive and Preventive Criminal Policy in Protecting Food Safety

Roshanak. Saedi Monfared¹, Mohammadreza. Shadmanfar^{2*}, Mahmoud. Malmir¹

¹ Department of Criminal Law and Criminology, Isf.C., Islamic Azad University, Isfahan, Iran

² Assistant Professor, Department of Law, Faculty of Administrative Sciences and Economics, University of Isfahan, Isfahan, Iran

* Corresponding author email address: m.shadmanfar@ase.ui.ac.ir

Received: 2025-06-10

Revised: 2025-12-08

Accepted: 2025-12-16

Published: 2026-05-01

EDITOR:

Richard Dodder

Emeritus Professor of Sociology and of Statistics, Oklahoma State University Stillwater, Oklahoma, USA. Email: rdodder@hotmail.com

REVIEWER 1:

Mrinalini Puranik

National Health Mission, Ministry of Health and Family Welfare, India. Email: MriPuranik@gmail.com

REVIEWER 2:

Thanuja Kulasooriya

Department Soil Science, Faculty of Agriculture, University of Ruhuna, Mapalana, Kamburupitiya, Sri Lanka. Email: thkulasooriya@soil.ruh.ac.lk

1. Round 1

1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

Excellent contextual framing, but the paragraph would benefit from a clearer transition from global to Iranian context. Add a final sentence in this paragraph indicating why food safety is especially significant in Iran (e.g., due to demographic growth, import dependence, or legislative fragmentation).

While conceptually sound, the sentence lacks citation of a primary source defining this conceptual expansion. Include a theoretical reference from comparative criminal policy literature (e.g., Garland or Delmas-Marty) to anchor this claim academically.

The current version merges too many ideas (fault-based, strict liability, consumer protection) into one dense unit.

This paragraph contains valuable legislative detail but reads like a legal summary. Strengthen the analytical tone by linking each legal instrument to its criminal policy function (e.g., deterrence, restitution, regulation).

This procedural explanation could be condensed; excessive procedural detail (e.g., “Guardian Council review”) distracts from the article’s policy focus. Retain only points relevant to criminal policy formation.

This is a crucial argument about victims’ access to justice. Expand by clarifying which specific procedural barriers (e.g., high fees, limited awareness, delay) most undermine access in practice.

Strong empirical observation but lacks supporting data. Consider adding at least one indicative statistic (e.g., rate of unenforced judgments) or official report reference to substantiate the claim of “significant proportion” of unenforced decisions.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the document.

1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

The claim of a “clear gap” is valid, but the paragraph should specify what methodological or empirical dimension prior studies missed (e.g., “absence of integrated assessment between executive and preventive measures” or “lack of actor-network perspective”).

Add a justification of the research’s practical implications for governance (e.g., “findings can inform inter-ministerial food policy coordination”) to strengthen the motivation.

This paragraph effectively introduces civil liability but could benefit from a clearer distinction between civil infractions and administrative offenses as used in Iranian legal doctrine, to avoid terminological overlap.

This comparison to French law is insightful; however, it would improve clarity if you elaborate on how the French model legally operates (e.g., “through Fonds de Garantie”) to clarify what Iran could emulate.

Consider separating this paragraph into two—one evaluating strengths and another addressing gaps—to improve readability.

Excellent evaluative insight. However, the phrase “victim-centered” should be defined or operationalized (e.g., referring to procedural justice theory or restorative frameworks) to clarify the normative benchmark applied.

The theoretical introduction is solid, yet the discussion would be enriched by briefly mentioning key scholars (e.g., Ronald Clarke or Cornish & Clarke) to show awareness of international situational crime prevention theory.

While informative, this section could more explicitly link each measure (e.g., traceability labeling, import monitoring) to its preventive function—i.e., how exactly these measures reduce criminal opportunities or enhance deterrence.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the document.

2. Revised

Editor’s decision: Accepted.

Editor in Chief’s decision: Accepted.