



REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No. IJAR-55161

Title: *A Critical Exposition of the Two Physical Criteria of Personal Identity*

Recommendation:

Accept as it is

✓Accept after minor revision.....

Accept after major revision

Do not accept (*Reasons below*)

Rating	Excel.	Good	Fair	Poor
Originality		√		
Techn. Quality		√		
Clarity		√		
Significance			√	

Reviewer Name: **Dr. Anam Zehra**

Reviewer's Comment for Publication.

The manuscript presents a clear and well-structured philosophical exposition of the bodily criterion and brain criterion of personal identity, engaging deeply with major thinkers such as Bernard Williams, Shoemaker, and Wiggins. The discussion is conceptually rich, logically organized, and demonstrates sound understanding of contemporary debates. Minor improvements in clarity, argument synthesis, and structural refinement will enhance its academic strength.

Recommendation: Accept after minor revision

Detailed Reviewer's Report

STRENGTHS

1. The manuscript offers a strong conceptual introduction explaining why personal identity poses philosophical challenges beyond material identification (page 1).
2. It provides clear exposition of the bodily criterion, drawing accurately on Bernard Williams' critique of memory-based identity claims.
3. The critique of Locke's memory theory, especially through Flew's formulation and Williams' duplication argument, is well-articulated and logically coherent.
4. The section on the brain criterion effectively explains Shoemaker's and Wiggins' perspectives, supported by detailed thought experiments such as brain transplantation and fission.
5. The paper concludes with a meaningful comparison of the two criteria, clarifying distinctions between bodily continuity and brain-based persistence conditions.

REVIEWER'S REPORT

WEAKNESSES

1. The introduction is detailed but would benefit from a clearer statement of the paper's specific objective and philosophical scope.
2. Some explanations, especially in the Williams–Flew discussion, are lengthy and could be more concise for sharper argumentation.
3. The manuscript summarizes theories well but offers limited original analysis or critical evaluation beyond established arguments.
4. The transition between bodily and brain criteria could be smoother, with clearer signaling of conceptual shifts.
5. The conclusion restates comparisons but could integrate stronger evaluative insights and implications for contemporary identity debates.