

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

Alberto Cupani

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

I find this article opportune and inspiring, especially regarding the teaching of science. The authors correctly introduce the main subject (the relation between doing science and a naturalistic philosophy) and the reference to the Feynman-Heisenberg-Bohr-Einstein theoretical differences illustrates well the difficulties of communication (translation?) between scientific and natural language. I regret not having presently enough time for a longer review; therefore, I will point only to three difficulties of the text. The first one is, in my opinion, the need for a definition of "naturalistic Philosophy", an expression that the authors seem to consider as obvious. The second regards the understanding of the expressions "a priori" e "a posteriori". Being myself a philosopher, I find rather unusual their explanation, although I see as ingenious their application to the difference between science and naturalistic philosophy. My third observation has to do with the relationship between naturalistic philosophy and the alleged moral responsibility in doing science. This point should be more elaborated, in my opinion (another reason why defining naturalistic philosophy). Anyway, I congratulate the authors for the choice of this subject.

*Alberto Cupani, Philosophy Department, Federal University of Santa Catarina, Brazil*