

Peer Review

Review of: "Hard problems in the philosophy of mind"

Marco Masi¹

1. Independent researcher

I didn't go through the entire article but, precisely for this reason, I would like to observe something.

The first question that came to my mind is where this article / essay / review is supposed to be published? Because, problematic is the fact that it is longer than 50.000 words, when most journals are limited to 9-12.000 words.

In connection to that, it doesn't become clear enough, neither from the abstract nor from the introduction, what novel insights, or new theoretical framework, the paper is going to discuss. Critiques to physicalism are many, in what sense does this work distinguish itself from other assessments? Or is this a review paper? If so, that should be stated clearly from the very beginning. If it is not, one should, at least superficially, outline in the abstract + introduction what the central thesis is. Only at the very end of the introduction one gets a glimpse from the point where it is stated "Considering the data in particular, the only direct way of investigating the mind is by introspection." I would place that paragraph at the very top (rephrasing it appropriately to the introductory context). Because, otherwise, I'm afraid most readers will not be willing to go through such a long article.

Thus, my suggestion is to furnish this overview from the very first paragraphs and shorten the article. Because, besides from the editorial limitations, I believe that, except for reviews, shorter articles have much more chances to be read.

Declarations

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.