

Peer Review

Review of: "The Discontinuity of the Virtual Toward the Non-Living and the Living"

Tiago Almeida¹

1. Departamento de Formação e Investigação em Educação e Desenvolvimento, Instituto Politécnico de Lisboa, Portugal

Review of "The Discontinuity of the Virtual Toward the Non-Living and the Living" by Ana Bazac

Overall Assessment

The paper presents a philosophical exploration of the concepts of the virtual, the non-living, and the living, aiming to examine their discontinuities and continuities. The author situates the discussion within a broad ontological and epistemological framework, engaging with classical and contemporary philosophy, as well as reflections on artificial intelligence (AI). The writing is erudite and dense, incorporating historical philosophical references and complex theoretical constructs.

While the paper is ambitious and thought-provoking, it has some weaknesses in terms of structure, clarity, and argumentative focus. Below, I outline both its strengths and areas for improvement.

Strengths

Philosophical Depth and Engagement

- The paper provides a rich historical and conceptual analysis, engaging with philosophers such as Aristotle, Kant, Heidegger, Peirce, and others.
- The discussion of the dialectic between continuity and discontinuity is well-developed and resonates with broader ontological debates.

Interdisciplinary Approach

- The author effectively bridges philosophy with artificial intelligence and cognitive science, discussing the implications of AI in relation to human rationality and moral responsibility.

Engaging Writing Style

- The introduction humorously acknowledges the paper's complexity, which makes the dense subject matter more engaging.
- The discussion is intellectually stimulating, particularly in its exploration of how AI and virtual reality challenge traditional ontological categories.

Areas for Improvement

Structural Clarity and Organization

- The paper lacks a clear and progressive structure. It would benefit from more systematic organization with well-defined sections.
 - The transitions between discussions of consciousness, reality, discontinuity, AI, and virtuality are often abrupt, making it difficult for the reader to follow the argument.
1. Conceptual Foundations (Living, Non-Living, Virtual)
 2. The Nature of Discontinuity
 3. AI and Virtuality as a New Ontological Category
 4. Ethical and Philosophical Implications

Clarification of Key Concepts

- The definitions of core concepts (e.g., virtual, non-living, living, discontinuity) are sometimes buried within complex discussions.
- There is a tension between using historical philosophical definitions and proposing new interpretations, which at times causes ambiguity.

Argumentative Focus

- The paper is more exploratory than argumentative, making it difficult to discern a central thesis.
- It shifts between describing historical philosophical positions and offering new claims about the virtual, AI, and discontinuity without always clearly distinguishing between exposition and original contribution.

Engagement with Contemporary Debates on AI

- The discussion of AI is insightful but could benefit from engagement with contemporary AI ethics and philosophy literature (e.g., debates on AI consciousness, moral status, and agency).
- The claim that AI lacks true consciousness and moral reasoning is defensible, but alternative perspectives (e.g., functionalist or panpsychist views) could be acknowledged.

Redundancy and Overcomplexity

- Some sections are unnecessarily long and reiterate points made earlier, which affects readability.
- The argument could be streamlined by reducing excessive theoretical exposition and focusing on the key claims.

Conclusion and Recommendation

This paper is a valuable contribution to the philosophical discussion on the nature of virtuality and its relation to the living and non-living. However, it would benefit significantly from a clearer structure, more explicit argumentation, and engagement with contemporary AI debates. With revisions addressing these points, the paper could be a strong philosophical analysis of how the virtual reshapes our ontological and ethical frameworks.

Recommendation for Qeios: *Revise and Resubmit with Major Revisions.*

Declarations

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.