

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

Rubén Sampieri¹

¹ Universidad Veracruzana

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The article raises interesting questions about the relationship between naturalistic philosophy and science, including how they seek to relate to language and reality, and the existential and political implications for these two conceptions of knowledge and the world that arise from Hannah Arendt's warning about the technification of thought and the alienation of the human condition from the world as presented by modern science.

The discussion here presented by the authors puts forward an interesting debate about how the language of science and that of naturalistic philosophy should be complementary to reincorporate the subjective to the image of the world as described by science. And asks if Arendt's warning would still hold if that was the case.

It is a thought-provoking paper that raises questions about philosophical dichotomies such as language-world, theory-observation, science-existence, objective-political, and scientific realism-philosophical subjectivism. Ultimately, the paper suggests a possible answer: the connection between these dichotomies could lie in the subjective, existential condition expressed in natural language, through which we refine our ideas into abstract concepts and develop our capacity to create, imagine, and formulate hypotheses and plausible scenarios about the world in a heuristic fashion. These insights hold promissory opportunities for science education.

It engages as well with relevant philosophical debates about the relationship between naturalistic philosophy and science, as well as the implications of this relationship for the human condition and society. The paper also suggests a novel and potentially fruitful approach to understanding the connection between language and the world through the complementarity of naturalistic philosophy and science, which could be of interest to readers in both philosophy and science education: this approach is the horizon of subjective creativity. Overall, it seems that the paper could make a valuable contribution to ongoing discussions in these fields.

Conclusion:

The overall organization and balance of the paper appear to be effective, and the quality and relevance of the references are important factors that contribute to the strength of the argument. The readability of the English is also a crucial factor, as it gives clarity to the message and the overall impact of the paper. Additionally, the focus on philosophical theoretical reflection and the clear outline of the relevance of the work to science (physics) education research suggest that the

paper may have significant value and contribution to the field.

Summary:

So, I think the paper is publishable according to the next considerations:

- The overall structure of the paper well organized and well balanced.
- The references are essential, well prepared and of good quality.
- English readable and good enough to convey the philosophical-scientific meaning correctly.
- The main focus of the paper give raise to fertile theoretical reflections and meets its purpose.
- The relation and relevance of the work to science (particularly, physics) education research clearly outlined.