

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Arts & Social Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJASS_91189
Title of the Manuscript:	An Ethical Review of Experimental philosophy on Robin Hood Activities:A Comparative Analysis
Type of the Article	Short 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.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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	In their discretion, this article is a "short research articles", but does not conform the journal model. I suggest adapting the criteria because this confusion make the reviewer's job difficult. For example, number of the words, number of the references and way to quote, number of the figures and others. To review citations especially those in quotation marks, as they require a page number. Better describe the methodology and cite the authors who guide the execution of the research.	
Minor REVISION comments	The questionnaire had 25 questions (open-ended) and took about 10 minutes per participant I'm complete. - I don't know if I agree with this statement, 25 open questions spend more time.	
Optional/General comments	It did a great job, but it could bring a more focused conclusion to what was discussed and emphasize the benefits of the study. I suggest reviewing and synthesizing because it seems to me to have lost focus on the real reason for the research.	

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Rosane Malvestiti
Department, University & Country	Federal University of Santa Catarina, Brazil