

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

Rogelio Miranda Vilchis

**Potential competing interests:** No potential competing interests to declare.

This paper aims to identify the place of naturalistic philosophy in our intellectual endeavors. The authors place between philosophy and science. They advance the case study of the meaning of words like “phenomenon” and “life” in the work of scientists like Bohr and Feynman.

I find the idea that naturalistic philosophy lies between philosophy and science appealing. I also think that the idea that philosophers and scientists do philosophy (naturalistic philosophy) gets it right: the boundaries are vague and porous. Yet, here are some questions that can be of help:

1. What are the roles of naturalistic philosophy beyond making explicit the existential dimension? Can naturalistic philosophy be of help to science, and in which way? The authors point out that its role lies in the communication of science to the general public and in politics, but does it have any scientific-like role like the discovery of new facts? I wonder whether the concepts of naturalistic philosophy serve or not for the interpretation of scientific evidence for scientists and philosophers themselves besides the general public.
2. The authors distinguish between natural and scientific language. It would be helpful if the authors make explicit the nature of philosophical language. Is it a third category of language? Perhaps philosophical language is just a mix of scientific and natural language.
3. I find appealing the implication that natural philosophy has for teaching philosophy, but that theme is underdeveloped in the paper. A discussion of the importance of natural philosophy for teaching science and the identification of some principles or teaching strategies and how we can implement them in the classroom can be helpful.