

# Review of: "[Essay] Not Quite Like Us? — Can Cyborgs and Intelligent Machines Be Natural Persons as a Matter of Law?"

Emad Dahiyat<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> United Arab Emirates University

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

## RELEVANCE

The paper addresses an interesting philosophical topic. It discusses whether intelligent machines can be seen as independent persons. It also nicely summarizes the debate but needs more clarification. It seems the author believes the reader already knows the concepts.

## VALIDITY

The paper is philosophical in nature. That is fine, as long as that is acknowledged in the introduction. In fact, Many arguments have been advanced against calls for the robot rights. The primary argument is that a computer is not an intentional entity and hence does not have the power to intend or express intent. It lacks the critical element of intentionality such as feelings, consciousness, free will, and so forth (Searle's arguments). Before Artificial Intelligence technology reaches a level of technical sophistication at which machines become reliable, able to consent, and bear legal consequences issuing from certain facts of their acts, they cannot be considered separately from their users.

## STYLE

The text is well written and it is easy to understand, and it is well-structured. However, the introduction is not doing its job: position the Essay relative to literature, explain the research problem, explain the method, and the main purpose and scope of the Essay. It is also useful if the Abstract determine the main findings of the Essay.

## DETAILED COMMENTS

The author must examine in detail the theory of subjectivity without personality. (The analogy with slaves under Roman law). He needs also to clarify whether or not we need to re-evaluate the legal status and role of intelligent machines and robots so we may develop a theory of liability accordingly. This makes a convincing research question for the Essay. The issues of the intentionality of "Robots" should be dealt with more in depth. Also missing is a detailed examination of the recommendations of the European Parliament to the Commission on Civil Law Rules on Robotics. More analysis of the key legal provisions would add strength to the argument presented. Finally, the bibliographic references are relevant but not exactly updated. There are more recent papers that should be mentioned.

I wish all the best for the author and hope to see more of his work in the future.