I think this is a strong draft already, and have every confidence that the final version (with conclusion) will comfortably pass the PhD.

I have a few suggestions that I think will help improve the current draft. Since I’ve previously given feedback on various of the “heavy-lifting” chapters, I’ve focused my comments on the opening sections, where you are overviewing your material and bringing the whole thesis together, which I’m seeing for the first time. (If you’d like me also to provide specific feedback on other sections--e.g. if you’ve made substantial changes to parts I’ve read previously and would like me to re-read them--feel free to direct my attention there and I’ll take a look when time allows, bearing in mind that I am on sabbatical leave this term.)

In addition to my marginal comments and suggestions in the pdf, here are summaries of some of the principal larger-scale issues.

1. I strongly recommend including (at least brief) definitions of key terms (especially ones appearing in central theses and theorems, such as ‘information theory’) when they first appear. Even where you take yourself to be assuming ‘standard’ definitions, it is a very rare piece of jargon that is understood by all philosophers in a uniformly standard way, and some of your terminology has no standard meaning in philosophical contexts. In any case, it’s never a bad idea to specify what *you* are taking your terminology to mean, especially when you have multiple technical terms playing crucial roles in your argumentation.
2. When you are referencing results, criteria, arguments, etc. try to convey—at least briefly—a sense of the *substance* of whatever you are referring to. This will come over much better than mere lists of unexplained labels and/or references, which tend to convey an impression of philosophical superficiality (something to be avoided at all costs in all situations, and in your case an inaccurate impression of your actual abilities).
3. Some of the explanations that do appear in the introduction and early material are very compressed (occasionally to the point of unclarity) and come across as cursory. Again, the risk is that this creates an impression of philosophical superficiality. To avoid this, where you cannot expand for reasons of space, direct the reader to the section of your thesis where you are going to say more. This issue comes up often in the introduction (I just flagged a few instances in marginal comments) but I recommend this as something to look out for all the way through the dissertation.
4. Extended descriptions of a purely descriptive, historical, and/or biographical nature are also sometimes conveying the impression of lack of engagement with the philosophical content and issues. When referencing the history of an issue, rather than just providing a list of who wrote which paper when, you should include at least some details of what those papers said. So instead of “X disagreed with Y and then Z said p”, it’s crucial to explain at least briefly *what the arguments were* and *why they matter* *philosophically*. This is necessary to maintain a consistent sense of your thesis as a work of philosophy as opposed to, say, intellectual history or biography. (Most importantly of all, you don’t ever want to give the impression that you are homing in on quasi-personal issues about authors, to the exclusion of philosophical content.) This bundle of issues comes up quite a lot in chapter 2 particularly. (I flagged a couple of instances in marginal comments.) If space is an issue, it would be fine to be more selective and focused in order to allow you to get to the task of actually unpacking the ideas. I think this will create a much better impression in the end than a cursory spin through a large tranche of literature that is all being gestured at rather than unpacked, explained, and discussed.
5. I am emphasizing points 1-4 because I believe these things will really matter for the purposes of convincing readers (including examiners and/or potential academic employers) that you are fully cognisant with disciplinary norms in philosophy, which place a heavy emphasis on argument, understanding, careful reasoning, and the ability to explain difficult and complex philosophical ideas. Philosophers reading your work with a view to (say) hiring you for an academic job in a philosophy department will want to be assured beyond doubt that you excel at all these things, so anything that creates a contrary impression could potentially negatively impact career prospects since most jobs in philosophy involve teaching a wide range of topics at undergraduate level. In addition, any philosopher working in a formal area of the discipline is already at higher risk for being perceived by other philosophers as “narrow” or “only technical”. So my advice is to head such perceptions off at the pass as much as you can, by making it absolutely clear that you are both *invested* in, and *good* at, thoroughly philosophical work.
6. The references should be in a uniform format: either give first names for everyone, or give initials only for everyone, but do not use a mix of both.