

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>)

Review Form 1.6

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	<p>The concept of experimental philosophy is new to me. This article highlighted and demonstrated how experimental philosophical can be conducted. Here are my comments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The title informed me that the whole article will be using philosophical method and comparative analysis to compare several experimental philosophies done by other researchers on the ethics of Robin Hood activities. 2. Abstract was not a summarisation of the whole article. It did not inform <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. The problem statement b. The objectives of the study c. The methodology used d. The findings 3. There were claims made in the introduction which were not supported by evidence. For example, the writer wrote "several philosophers have expressed their dissatisfaction with experimental philosophy" but did not name at least two philosophers who were against experimental philosophy. 4. After finished reading the introduction, I was lost to what actually the article tried to present. The introduction ended with a very brief explanation on experimental philosophy. 5. Literature review focused mainly on the judgment of whether Robin Hood's action was ethical according to the perspectives of several philosophers. But no literature on experimental philosophy was included in the literature review. It would be better and more organized if the writer divided this section into subheadings beginning with Utilitarian Philosophy, Kant's Moral Philosophy. Under each subheading, the writer can clarify the meanings of the philosophy and the judgment on Robin Hood's activities based on that philosophy. 6. Objectives of the study were not mentioned. After reading the findings then I knew the objectives of the study. The writer should explain the objectives of the study and why this study was significant. Moreover, the article failed to mention why experimental philosophy on ethics of Robin Hood's activities was conducted. 7. Research methodology should clearly explain the method of experimental philosophy according to several experts in experimental philosophy. Besides, there was no detailed explanation the instrumentation. The writer did not report the validity and reliability of the instrument used. 8. "Data Analysis" subheading should be named "Findings" because the article reported the findings of the study from quantitative data. Data analysis procedure was already mentioned in the methodology section. 9. The subheading "Findings" should be changed to "Discussion" because the writer discussed the findings of this study by comparing to the views of several philosophers. The writer should limit the discussion on two philosophers mentioned in literature review. If the writer wanted to also compare with Plato, Locke Haddin, etc., these philosophers should also be included in the literature review. 10. "Discussion and Findings" should be changed to "Conclusion". It should conclude on the significance of experimental philosophy and its challenges. However, I still am wondering, whose perspectives should be used, the philosophers or the common people? And why? 11. There were major issues in language. Some of the sentences cannot be understood. There were inconsistencies in the spelling of Robin Hood. This paper needs major language editing. 	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	This paper can be published after major revision	

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

Review Form 1.6

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Wan Mazwati Wan Yusoff
Department, University & Country	International Islamic University Malaysia, Malaysia