

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Settlement of Disputes in Shared Water Law with an Emphasis on Judicial Precedent

Seyyede Parisa. Jalili¹, Atefeh. Amininia^{2*}, Maryam. Afshari³¹ Department of International Law, Emirates Branch, Islamic Azad University, Dubai, United Arab Emirates² Department of International Law, Central Tehran Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran³ Department of Law, Damavand Branch, Islamic Azad University, Damavand, Iran

* Corresponding author email address: A.amininia@iauctb.ac.ir

Received: 2024-02-20

Revised: 2025-03-25

Accepted: 2025-04-13

Published: 2025-07-01

EDITOR:Cavid Qasimov^{id}

Prof, Faculty of Letters Department of History, Van Yuzuncu Yıl University, Van, Türkiye. Email: cavidqasimov@yyu.edu.tr

REVIEWER 1:Mohammadbagher. Jafari^{id}

Department of Sociology of Culture, Istanbul, Türkiye. Email: mbjafari@kmanresce.ca

REVIEWER 2:Jeremiah Thuku Thuku^{id}

Department of Literary and Communication Studies, Laikipia University, Nyahururu, Kenya. Email: jerethukuthuku@gmail.com

1. Round 1

1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

The sentence "The resolution of disputes is one of the most fundamental responsibilities..." provides a general statement. Consider narrowing the scope more quickly to shared water disputes to increase thematic relevance.

The introduction does not clearly identify a gap in current scholarship on international water dispute resolution. Please articulate what specific aspect of judicial precedent in shared water law is under-researched.

The quote attributed to Bahiraei (2023, p.137) on public legitimacy lacks a proper reference in the final list and appears ideologically charged. Consider reframing or supporting this with legal theory literature.

The explanation of Articles 4 and 5 could be clearer. It's recommended to present the legal text, followed by analytical commentary, rather than intermixing both.

The paragraph "This dispute, known as the Silala River case..." summarizes facts well but should also discuss the implications for customary international law or precedent-setting value.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the document.

1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

When citing Paragraph 3 of Article 2 of the UN Charter, it would be appropriate to include the exact language in quotation marks and offer a formal citation.

The discussion of "diplomatic or non-legal methods" and "legal methods" could be condensed. The classification is well-established and does not need detailed elaboration unless connected to water law cases.

In the discussion of conventions (e.g., Helsinki Rules 1966, Berlin Rules 2004), maintain consistent date formatting to aid clarity.

The transition from the Berlin Rules to the section "Examining the Relationship Between Borders in International Judicial Decisions" is abrupt. Consider using a transitional paragraph to maintain narrative coherence.

While these are authoritative, the manuscript should engage with secondary literature (e.g., academic analyses of the cases) to enrich the discussion.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the document.

2. Revised

Editor's decision: Accepted.

Editor in Chief's decision: Accepted.