

Review of: "Can the definitions of SARS-Cov-2 and Covid-19 stand up to epistemological scrutiny?"

Klaus Kroy¹

¹ Universität Leipzig

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

In this beautiful essay, the authors take a profound step forward in the search for clarity in the muddled waters of sars-cov-2 terminology. They argue very clearly why we are facing here an instance of "technological invention of disease" (Björn Hofmann) that lacks convincing medical motivation and is built on a fragile tower of "turtles" of scientific and epistemological sloppiness (if not fraud). I would have loved to see these arguments in such a concise and enjoyable form, earlier in the debate, but it's still great to eventually read them, here. In particular, since the elucidated problems persist as sources of confusion around the notions and practices in the case of long-covid (recently addressed by Vinay Prasad and coworkers in *bmjebm*-2023-112338). I would hope that the article helps to initiate similar lines of research into medical practices in the context of other epidemic diseases with arguably unsatisfactory links between their clinical and microbiological manifestations, such as AIDS. In fact, I think there are good epidemiological arguments why we should not expect any major pandemic events in a highly globalised world, unless we facilitate them by our own counterproductive social and technological interventions.