

# Review of: "Creating ontological definitions for use in science"

Sandrine AUZOUX<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Cirad - La recherche agronomique pour le développement

**Potential competing interests:** The author(s) declared that no potential competing interests exist.

The idea of creating a good practice guide for ontological definitions in science for non-specialist users proposed by the authors seems essential to me. The article proposes clear rules that are accessible to all. Each rule is illustrated by two examples of a good and a less good ontological definition, which can be taken from medicine or the humanities and social sciences. To introduce the notions of ontological definitions, I appreciated the comparison with dictionary definitions.

As far as the structure and content of the article are concerned, a detailed introduction with a scientific state of the art on the issues of ontological definitions is missing to give substance to the approach and to complete the list of bibliographical references.

The context of the study is poorly described. This makes the article confusing to read. The link with the QEIOS platform should be explained at the beginning of the article.

It would be appropriate to add a section entitled "Case study of the good practice guide to ontological definitions", before the conclusion. This would demonstrate the interest of the guide and how it could be mobilised in a specific project or domain.

In the conclusion, it would be interesting to detail the next steps in this process. I fully agree with the authors that this is an interesting first work that deserves to be supported and deepened in order to move towards a harmonisation of ontological definitions.