

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommend as part of the revision.

ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Date Manuscript Received: January 25, 2016	Date Manuscript Review Submitted: January 26, 2016
Manuscript Title: “Materialism and the Subject of Experience”	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0236/16	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a brief explanation for each 3-less point rating.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	4
<i>(a brief explanation for 3-less point rating)</i> With so much talk in the paper about “the location problem,” a possible alternative title might be “Materialism and the Locus of the Subject of Experience.”	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3
<i>(a brief explanation for 3-less point rating)</i> Needs thorough restructuring. It is not appearing as an abstract. Could add more on the purpose of the paper and its thesis and approach. The present abstract mentions a “no-self” view, but I don’t see much on that in the paper.	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<i>(a brief explanation for 3-less point rating)</i> The paper does need proof reading. Typos appear on 8 of 10 pages.	

4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>(a brief explanation for 3-less point rating)</i> Proper research gap should be identified Could say some more about how to resolve the empirical questions noted and also about why thought experiments are needed.	
5. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>(a brief explanation for 3-less point rating)</i> Is it better to say “we take no stand” or to say “we take an agnostic stand”?	
6. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>(a brief explanation for 3-less point rating)</i> Just wondering whether it would be a good idea to add some more recent references.	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revisions needed	X
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Accept with minor revisions. This sophisticated, analytic paper does a fine job pointing out various problems with a number of views about the locus of the subject of experience within materialism. I do, however, have some questions.

The last paragraph says “We do not take a stand on the problem here.” Would it be better to say that “After taking a materialist point of view and reviewing the many difficulties with its various competing views about the locus of the subject of experience, we are left with an agnostic stand on this question”?

Also, what exactly is “the location problem?” Which is it? Where is the locus of the subject of experience, or how can a mental state be physically locatable? If the latter, it may be worth considering Shaffer’s argument (p. 47 *Philosophy of Mind*) that such talk doesn’t make sense. Carruthers (p. 147 *Introducing Persons*) also discusses a problem of spatial position. Both of them take it as a problem for materialism.

Would it be worth saying more in your paper about why the “location problem” is important? If it is hard for materialists to make clear the locus of the subject of experience, why isn’t this a weakness for their position?

One last question – could an immaterial soul be having the experiences inside Smart’s brain in vitro?