

Review of: "On the ongoing need for naturalistic philosophy to interpret what occupational science is doing"

Arlette Baljon¹

¹ San Diego State University

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Dear authors, I have read the article and my comments are based on my science/physics background.

The article distinguishes phenomenological subjective knowledge and empirical knowledge. It explores how these types of knowledge can be integrated into a field such as occupational science. The question is important and one wonders if the harder sciences like physics will benefit from some type of integration and phenomenological approach as well.

As a newcomer to the question, I found the article confusing. It might be good to give an example of empirical experimental knowledge and one of phenomenological experimental knowledge as applied to the occupational sciences in the introduction. Also, the differences between these approaches could be explained better. I for instance had to read the text several times before I could place Wilcock's work under empirical. I hoped the authors would have said more about A pluralistic approach but can wait for future publications. This article seems to be an introduction to that work.

I also would have benefitted from some more discussion around the term *naturalistic* which seems to be central.

All in all I enjoyed reading the article and the questions intrigue me. I acknowledge not being an expert, but then I was asked to write a review.