

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Research Journal of Arts &amp; Social Sciences</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJASS_91189
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>An Ethical Review of Experimental philosophy on Robin Hood Activities:A Comparative Analysis</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Short Research Article</b>

### 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.journalarjass.com/index.php/ARJASS/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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>This article is well written and proposes an interesting subject, even if, to be honest, it is not new. So it doesn't seem particularly original.</p> <p>At a close look, it is a "literary" mode with which to discuss utilitarianism.</p> <p>There are, however, some observations which I hope will be useful to the author and some suggestions which he/she should take into account.</p> <p>First, the Author should update the bibliography, especially in relation to experimental philosophy.</p> <p>Second, he/she should better define which of the many approaches of experimental philosophy currently available, he/she intends to do precisely for the thesis advocated in the essay.</p> <p>Moreover, he/she should at least clarify, in Robin Hood's discussion of Utilitarianism, the difference between Act and Rule Utilitarianism.</p> <p>There is no critical treatment of the results which have been presented. A philosophical text cannot be a merely descriptive text. The relationship between "experimental philosophy" and "common sense ethics" should also be examined: the latter expression should be clarified and it should be clarified in what sense a method of experimental philosophy, proposed to a broad audience with a common sense ethics, has led to the results of the investigation described in this article. This report needs to be studied in greater depth, but it is taken for granted in the text.</p> <p>Finally, the conclusions are not conclusions: the author does not tell the reader what objectives he has achieved, what went well in the research, what problems still exist, what else could be investigated, etc. The conclusions are, on the contrary, a very short and general summary of what has been written. I suggest rewriting them.</p>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	In general, the article is interesting, even if it requires some important additions or clarifications, both in the method and with regard to the proposed contents.	

### **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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	<b>Lorena Forni</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of Milano, Italy</b>