

Review of: "In the doing of science, what is the place for naturalistic philosophy? Implications for the teaching of science"

Mjege Kinyota¹

¹ University of Dar es Salaam

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

This article is clearly written and publishable upon minor revisions. The intentions of the article are clearly stated in the first few paragraphs which make the paper interesting and easy to read. I would recommend the authors to consider the following comments in order to strengthen the article

First, the authors propose physicists Richard Feynman and Werner Heisenberg as well as Niels Bohr, and philosopher Ludwig Wittgenstein and political theorist Hannah Arendt. I must admit that their proposal is very relevant to this article and can be implicitly felt. However, the authors do not provide the reasons for their choice of these scientists and philosophers. I would suggest that the justifications for sampling them (from many others) be made explicit in one or two paragraphs.

Second, I also think the authors can link well their work with the tenets of Nature of science (NOS). For instance, the sentence "But, in many instances, there is still a disjunction between the doing of science and people whose sense of reality derives from an immediate connection with the world. And is this still not a problem that requires continual addressing from the side of naturalistic philosophy?" could be taken as an example of science as theory-laden. Further, some of the debates (e.g. wave or particle) discussed in the article can be understood in terms the tentativeness nature of science. That being said, I don't mean to change the focus of the article. I think using this lens would place the article, especially science, within the framework of the NOS. Kindly see quote and references below for guidance.

...that scientific knowledge is tentative; empirical-based; subjective (theory-laden); partly the product of human inference, imagination and creativity; and socially and culturally embedded. Two additional important aspects are the distinction between observations and inferences and the functions of, and relationships between, scientific theories and laws (Das et al., 2019, p. 394).

Das, P. M., C. Faikhamta & V. Punsuvon. 2019. Bhutanese students' views of nature of science: A case study of culturally rich country. *Research in Science Education*, 49:391–412.

Lederman, N. G., F. Abd-El-Khalick, R. L. Bell & R. S. Schwartz. 2002. Views of nature of science questionnaire: toward valid and meaningful assessment of learners' conceptions of nature of science. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, 39(6), 497–520.

Finally, the authors mention the “implications for the teaching of science” in the abstract. However, these implications are not explicitly stated in the conclusion. I understand that some educators may not be aware of the philosophical language used in this article. I was wondering if the authors can list the implications of their discussion for the teaching of science using a plain language, a language that can be understood by ordinalry science teachers.

Minor issues

There are several spacing issues (e.g. first line, second paragraph in the “introduction”. Please revise accordingly. I understand that they might source from the system itslef. Just for the authors to take note.