

Review of: "Occupation from a perspective of complementarity - Part 2 - Proposals for situating a complementarity perspective in occupational science"

Stanford Howdysell¹

¹ University of South Florida

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Overall this was an interesting and well written article and made a good case for the importance of intersubjectivity to occupational science.

Below are comments for the author, please take or leave them as you see fit. I've organized them by subheading.

Introduction

In the paragraph that starts with "Intersubjectivity is a term" you claim that "phenomenological perspectives have affinities with..." but don't go onto show how. Can you explain the phenomenological perspectives to show how they match up with the literature?

What is a "subject-object entanglement"? It seems kind of jargony.

It is not clear why we are talking about Bohr at all? Is there a special connection between physics and occupational science? Or does he just provide a useful model? It seems that later in the article he falls away entirely. Would it be better to simply talk about Husserl?

Conditions and axioms for a complementarity perspective in occupational science

Can you explain each of the conditions of a phenomena in more depth?

Does (1) involve extra-scientific influences? E.g. history, tradition, the motives of scientists, etc.

I think relating (1) and (2) back to Husserl would fill in and justify your claims more.

Is axiom (1) just restating the claim that for there to be intelligibility there has to be someone for whom the object is intelligible to (which would, seemingly apply to all sciences)? Or is it a claim that is particular to occupational science?

Complementarity between aspects of occupation

It is not clear how you get from each class of phenomena to their descriptions in paragraph 2. It would also be good to see

a justification for why you chose these classes for phenomena.

Background to a conflict over worldviews

In this section I think you're tying too many people together without enough of an explanation of how they relate. Why are we going from Dewey to Husserl? Do we need Dewey?

"Evidently, they had not read Barber's earlier article published in the same journal" sounds smug and condescending at first blush.

I'm not sure what the paragraph "we argue that there are aspects..." is doing for this paper. I think you either need to cut it or flesh it out more to explain why non-Western perspectives are important. This paragraph could be multiple papers in its own right and it seems like you aren't doing the topic justice.

Linking conditions of possibility to actual occupation

When you say "They are transformed from particulars to universals." It would be worthwhile noting how they are transformed, because it is a point of contention between Husserl and other philosophers.