

Peer Review

Review of: "Human Recognition-Behavioural Adaptation System Analyzed via Structuralism and Systems Theory"

Pieter de Vries¹

1. Experimental Psychology, University of Groningen, Netherlands

Review of

Yutaka Masuda

Human Recognition-Behavioural-Adaptation System Analyzed via Structuralism and Systems Theory

The goal of the paper is to present a general theoretical framework for a broad range of human psychological phenomena. In the development of the framework, analogies with homeostasis as defined in biology play a fundamental role. The framework is used to analyse and classify mental disorders, their diagnosis, and therapies in terms of adaptation, also in the social domain.

The proposed framework is based on approaches of systems theory and structuralism. Although the framework may offer useful insights into human psychological functioning, several main points prevent a reader from gaining a good understanding of what is presented.

1. The introduction fails. The followed approaches of structuralism and systems theory are elaborated only in the discussion, whereas this is necessary in the introduction of the paper.
2. In the main sections, the definition of the proposed framework is unclear. What is missing is a systematic development of the framework given its premises. The presented figures in relation to the framework look promising from an explanatory point of view. However, too much is left to the reader to be filled in.
3. The application of the framework to the analysis of the selected psychological phenomena is not described at all or only in a very implicit way.

Adjustment of these points may lead to a more transparent conclusion of the paper.

Some minor points of criticism are:

1. What does the qualification 'recognition-behavioural' mean in relation to the notions of 'self' and 'world'?
2. Relevant previous work is almost never cited when key notions are introduced, including sources from Hinduism.
3. The qualification 'stubbornly' in relation to the 'human intelligence using modelling codes' needs further explanation.
4. The tense of the discourse is not consistent.
5. Names of scientific approaches, models, or methods should not be capitalised unless they are proper names, in contrast with elements from religious sources.
6. Unnecessary new words are introduced, like 'analogue' and 'algorithm', and 'distinguishment'.
7. What is meant by 'induce' in the phrase 'a first principle is induced'?

I hope my comments may contribute to an improvement of this paper.

Pieter de Vries

Retired from the University of Groningen, Department of Experimental Psychology

The Netherlands.

Declarations

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.