

Peer Review

Review of: "On the Hard Problem: Revisited, Re-Evaluated, Recast"

Toshiyuki Nakajima¹

1. Ehime University, Japan

This article addresses the controversial issue of the hard problem (HP) of consciousness by reviewing significant perspectives, including “There is HP,” “There is no HP,” and an intermediate stance. While this review approach is valuable for providing an overview of the debate, the current version does not successfully propose a promising perspective toward a potential solution.

I suggest the following revisions to improve the readability and effectiveness of the paper:

(1) Introduction

The first two paragraphs may serve as the introduction, while the subsequent paragraphs may not. In the introduction, the authors should present the background of the issue and explain its significance for philosophy and science. Does this issue pose serious challenges to scientific inquiry? If so, how?

I recommend structuring the latter part as a separate section that outlines the framework and key topics discussed in the following sections. The descriptions in the third paragraph onward are unclear and difficult to understand without reading the cited references. Additionally, Figure 1 lacks standalone explanatory power and is hard to interpret.

(2) Section 2

This section provides valuable insights into the issue by summarizing key perspectives in three tables. However, I note several minor issues:

- The phrase “Explanatory gap” might be better expressed as “*There is a hard problem.*”
- *Causal and property dualism* should be clearly defined.
- Karl Popper in Section 2.3: Did he explicitly deny the existence of the hard problem? It is unclear why he is included here.
- Section 2.4: The term “*Middle ground*” is vague and needs clarification.

(3) Relationship Between Sections 3 and 4 and the Explanatory Gap in Section 2

It is unclear how Sections 3 and 4 relate to the explanatory gaps discussed in Section 2. Turing's computational approach appears to address the *easy* problem of consciousness, making it unclear how his argument connects to the perspectives on the hard problem outlined in Section 2.

(4) Section 5

I suggest that the authors clearly articulate their conclusive message based on the discussions in the previous sections. This would help disentangle the complexity of the controversy and provide a clearer resolution.

Declarations

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.