

Review of: "Free Will Stands When Properly Explained and Correctly Defined and Neuroscience Shows This to Be the Case"

Ivo Coser

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The writer presents the problem clearly. Starting from the problem of free will he/she mentions important authors of Philosophy (Aristotle, Locke, Hume, Kant and Nozick. He/she also discusses the theme based on neuroscience authors. In spite of the clarity of the exposition and the importance of writers like Locke, Hume and Kant, it is necessary to mention what follows. The author scans these writers without discussing them deeply. In this way, Locke, the author who appears most often in the article, does not receive any analysis that makes his conceptions of will and freedom deeper than a mere reference to his text. The same applies to Hume or Kant. The relevant bibliography on these author' concepts is vast, however the article does not use any author who discusses such concepts. If the purpose of the article was to bring the theme to discussion, it should have used writers who discussed it in Locke, Hume and Kant, and not just a few passages where this issue appears. The article has the quality of clarity and relevance of the theme, but lacks greater depth in the bibliography on the subject in the writers with whom the article debates.