

## 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:	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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<b>The author exposes his own opinion in the beginning. Even if not, he should provide argument against the circularity suspicion, i.e. he uses so-called experimental philosophy as a means to extract that same solution or view, according to his terms, intuition.</b>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	(i) Robin Hood is a myth, a subject that belongs to the fictional world. Under modern circumstances, his behavior would at once be considered as infringing legal regulations. So he would not be able to advance his intentions. (ii) These intentions, among other things, collaborate with the core of Marxism. The author, however, does not even mention. (iii) see next field, concerning ethical issues.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	The language/grammar should be reviewed. There are many faults and, as it seems, linguistic blotches, inaccuracies.	

### 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:	Sander Wilkens
Department, University & Country	University of Trier, Germany