

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_92409
Title of the Manuscript:	MICHAEL SANDEL'S CONCEPTION OF COMMUNITY
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalajess.com/index.php/AJESS/editorial-policy>)

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Compulsory REVISION comments	The article discusses a very current, actual and interesting topic at the same time. When we talk about community, in general, we automatically think of people who share interests, beliefs or norms of common life. In the same manner, the communitarianism is a political current that emerged as a reaction to the individualistic perspective of liberalism. Starting from this thinking manner, the communitarians are followers of capitalism and the capitalist state, with the amendment that the state must not be the capitalist itself, but only act so that the market obeys the needs of society and not the other way around.	
Minor REVISION comments	I believe that the title chosen by the author(s) does not sufficiently reflect the content of the article. The author(s) practically make a thorough analysis of Sandel's philosophy regarding the community and the principle of communitarianism developed as a result of this philosophy, but, on the other hand, the subject goes even further, often making substantial connections between Sandel's conception and that of other authors in the field (such as Rawls, J.) In other words, I think that another title would be more appropriate, in which there is also this "detail" of the comparison between the theories. The Conclusions box is missing. Perhaps the author(s) included this aspect into the paper's background and forgot to differentiate it. The References box is too short. I understand the author(s) consider this paper as an original one, and after the titles from this section, which are very old, I believe the author(s) has right. Still, I suggest having at least 15 titles.	
Optional/General comments	Would be great if the author(s) will try to make a more deep analysis on the subject described in the paper for further and looking for more carefully at the paper's structure.	

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Popoviciu Gabriela-Argentina
Department, University & Country	University of Oradea, Romania