



Paper: "**Materialist Premises in Hobbes and Kropotkin for Antipodean Conclusions: The State of War and the Mutual Aid**"

Corresponding Author: Francesco Scotognella

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2020.v16n23p1

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Amarjit Singh
Kurukshetra University, India

Reviewer 2: Bruno Augusto Sampaio Fuga
Unopar, Londrina, Paraná, Brazil

Published: 31.08.2020

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.

ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Reviewer Name: Bruno Augusto Sampaio Fuga	
University/Country: Unopar / Londrina / Paraná / Brazil	
Date Manuscript Received: 23/07/2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 24/07/2020
Manuscript Title: Materialist premises in Hobbes and Kropotkin for antipodean conclusions: The state of war and the mutual aid	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i>
	[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	4
<i>Good title, with good title and good subtitle.ments</i>	

2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	5
<i>Yes. Well prepared, with methods and results of the article.</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	5
<i>I did not find any errors in the article.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
<i>Very clear.</i>	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	5
<i>I did not find any errors in the article.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>It is synthetic, but good and well designed.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>Good references and good research depth.</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> x
Accepted, minor revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Return for major revision and resubmission	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reject	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.

ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Reviewer Name: Dr. Amarjit Singh	
University/Country: Kurukshetra University, Kurukshetra, INDIA.	
Date Manuscript Received: 15 July, 2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 23 July, 2020
Manuscript Title: Materialist premises in Hobbes and Kropotkin for antipodean conclusions: The state of war and the mutual aid.	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0752/20	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: No	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article. The title of the Research Paper is clear and it is adequate to the contents of the article. The Author has well explained that both Hobbes and Kropotkin have started their argumentations from the materialist premises and Hobbes ends up with the description of the state of nature whereas Kropotkin ends up with the theory of mutual aid.	05
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and	05

results.	
The author of the Research Paper has clearly presented the objectives and research methods of the Paper in the abstract itself. The findings of the Research Paper have been well explained by the author in the abstract.	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	05
There are no grammatical errors and no spelling mistakes in this Research Paper.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	05
The author of the Research Paper has adopted proper research methodology. The introduction, theoretical presentation of Hobbes, theoretical framework of Kropotkin, philosophical perspectives of the 17 th -18 th and 19 th centuries and the conclusions of the Research Paper have been properly categorized by the author.	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	05
The author has examined the subject of the Research Paper clearly and systematically. The strength of the philosophy of Thomas Hobbes and the philosophy of Petr Kropotkin, the conception of the state of nature as has been examined in the Shatara and the experimental science approach as has been examined in the Mutual Aid : A Factor of Evolution have been adequately explained by the author. The related philosophical perceptions have also been commented upon by the author. Thus, the body of the Research Paper is clear enough and it does not contain any error.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	05
The conclusions drawn by the author are accurate and are supported by the contents of the Research Paper.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	05
The sources consulted by the author are proper and relevant. The author has consulted nearly all the available original and secondary sources. Thus, the references are comprehensive and are appropriate.	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	X
Accepted, minor revision needed	Nil
Return for major revision and resubmission	Nil
Reject	Nil

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s): **Nil**

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: