

Review of: "One Archaeology of Knowledge Constructs"

Rose Malik

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

There are some interesting points in this paper. As a critical review of theoretical or philosophical approaches. However much of the content is taken from authors of the 1990s or early 2000s, the philosophy of archaeology has moved on since then and requires updating.

The semantic inferences are not entirely fleshed out simply the obvious is pointed out. Working in the field and in academia, there is a patterned similarity but marked differences that are not considered.

The implications are that archaeology is a closed epistemology which creates and maintains preservation bias, this is not necessarily the case except in a philosophical construct or a logicians game.

If we are looking at a paper that is being critical and using philosophy as its backbone (which it clearly seems to be), then definitions early on in the work is paramount. Creating solid constructs early on, means nothing can be misconstrued further along in the paper.

Finally, proofreading this content would be an asset as currently, there are many sentences that are not constructed correctly or have missing words and therefore do not make sense.

But otherwise, an interesting read...