

# Review of: "A Cognitive Investigation of the Zen Meditation through the Lens of Thousand-Brain Intelligence and the Cerebral Reward System"

Anas Rashid<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Federal University of São Paulo

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

In this manuscript "A Cognitive Investigation of the Zen Meditation through the Lens of Thousand-Brain Intelligence and the Cerebral Reward System", there are *still* several unanswered questions and drawbacks that warrant *major revision* of this manuscript:

Key concepts such as "Hawkins' theory of thousand-brain intelligence" and "cerebral rewarding system" are mentioned without any explanation or context, making it difficult to understand their relevance and application to Zen meditation.

The manuscript does not clearly state the research question or hypothesis. It is unclear what specific aspect of Zen meditation the article is focusing on and what the expected outcomes are.

The objectives of the study are not well-defined. Phrases like "decipher the Zen meditation experience" are broad and do not provide a clear direction for the research.

Statements such as "Zen meditation might involve both the construction and integration of cortical column models and the liberation from everyday addictive behavior" are speculative and not supported by specific evidence in the manuscript.

The claim that Zen meditation can be interpreted as a "form of cultural art and skill from a pre-scientific era" rather than "religious mysterious activities" is a broad generalization that is not substantiated with clear arguments or evidence.

The manuscript does not provide any insight into the theoretical framework or how Hawkins' theory is applied to Zen meditation, which is crucial for understanding the study's foundation.

The use of terms like "decipher," "construction and integration of cortical column models," and "liberation from everyday addictive behavior" without adequate explanation can be misleading and may not accurately represent the complexity of Zen meditation practices.

The term "pre-scientific era" is potentially problematic and might carry a pejorative connotation, suggesting a lack of appreciation for the cultural and historical significance of Zen practices.

The manuscript does not clearly articulate how the study contributes to existing literature on Zen Buddhism or meditation. It is important to specify what new insights or advancements the research offers.

The potential implications and applications of the research findings are not discussed, leaving the reader uncertain about the study's impact and relevance.

To improve the manuscript, the authors should:

1. Provide a clear and concise research question or hypothesis.
2. Offer detailed explanations of key concepts and methodologies.
3. Include specific findings and evidence to support the claims made.
4. Clearly articulate the contributions of the research to existing literature.
5. Avoid speculative statements and ensure that all claims are well-supported by data and analysis.
6. Use precise and respectful terminology when discussing cultural and religious practices.