

Peer Review

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

Ximena González-Grandón¹

1. Education, Ibero American University, Mexico City, Mexico

The paper is engaging and has the potential to make a valuable contribution to the literature. It examines the debate surrounding the hard problem of consciousness, presenting a range of perspectives from its outright rejection to its possible reconciliation through a more fundamental framework. The author aims to map these viewpoints while advocating for a position grounded in classical science, distinguishing it from alternative explanations such as quantum consciousness or information-based theories.

Overall, this is a worthwhile and relevant contribution to consciousness studies. However, certain developments should be considered, particularly the phenomenological analysis of the hard problem of consciousness, which involves intersubjectivity. At the very least, the paper could briefly summarize the contemporary debate on intersubjectivity and emphasize the importance of the living body in shaping our experience and understanding of otherness. Additionally, it would be beneficial to incorporate key phenomenological concepts such as self, other, time, space, and body. Is there room in the discussion for intercorporeality or bodily awareness in a non-reductive way?

Furthermore, engaging with contemporary phenomenological developments beyond Merleau-Ponty is essential. Approaches such as second-person methodologies (e.g., Varela's neurophenomenology, Natalie Depraz's cardio phenomenology), as well as broader disciplinary fields like enactive cognitive science, ecological psychology, and 4E cognition, have significantly shaped current debates. Addressing these perspectives would not only enrich the discussion but also move beyond the conceptual refinements of the philosophy of mind to foster dialogue with other fields.

Finally, while the article provides a thorough and descriptive overview, the author's central argument becomes somewhat diluted amidst the extensive descriptions. I suggest making the core proposal

more explicit and deepening the analysis, as some sections feel like a mere catalog of perspectives rather than a cohesive argument.

Declarations

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.