

Review of: "Changing chiropractic's subluxation rhetoric: Moving on from 'deniers', 'vitalists', and 'unorthodox', to realists, post-realists, and absurdists"

Timothy Mirtz

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

I have been requested by the website Qeios to provide a second review of this paper. I compliment the author on a better presentation of his argument. I do not know what value my review will have. As this manuscript has a high statistical chance of being published in the Asian-Pacific Journal of Chiropractic (as indicated by the author in a comment to another reviewer), for which the author is an editor. This carries a tremendous amount of influence that even the author declares in his criticism of two opposing contemporaries. This declaration reveals that this paper is going to be published regardless and any review may be seen as superfluous.

This brings me to one point. The author claims *"It is time we collectively moved forward with courteous debate in the mode of philosophical argument from our respective positions as a 'realist', a 'post-realist', or an 'absurdist'. There are no members of the discipline or of the profession who are entitled to utter evidence-free rhetoric as discourse used both to account for and to influence political decisions that impact the chiropractic profession."* My review of this paper will more than likely be an argument against the many opinions (opinions he considers evidence while those who present evidence are relegated to the mere opinion category) and would best be suited for a rebuttal.

From this one point, two questions arise:

1. How can a courteous debate ensue when one side of the debate is already being demeaned as an absurdist and/or post-realist based on the author's own definitions? That is no different, for example, of a person who holds the strong belief that a person has a constitutional right to own a firearm yet the opponent of such a right claims the proponent is an "absurdist" and has no evidence for their opinion and should not be allowed to utter their rhetoric to sway the political argument. Yet, the opponent still believes that a courteous debate can nonetheless ensue.
2. When this manuscript is published, will the author, who serves as an editor (which carries a significant amount of influence) and has criticized several as either being an absurdist and/or post-realist, who the author claims to have no evidence or need to show their evidence, be allowed an opportunity to present the evidence of their opinion in a fair and meaningful way in his journal? As the author describes *"It is time we collectively moved forward with courteous debate in the mode of philosophical argument from our respective positions."* If the answer is to a "no", then why the call for a "courteous debate"?

To summarize my "review" (if one can call it that), I am in full agreement when the author states *Qeios may be of use to*

those who join in the call of this paper for much greater debate in the chiropractic literature of contemporary issues, however as a pre-print service it may not be the best forum for arguments back and forth.

As I am in complete agreement as indicated above and there is high hope that I will be able to supply a rebuttal to the many points made by the author in the Asian-Pacific Journal of Chiropractic for which he serves as an editor when this manuscript is officially published. I will take my leave at this time and wish the author safe journeys and good health.