

Review of: "Femmes finales: natural selection, physiology, and the return of the repressed"

Marta Linde

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

I am glad to see a biologist bringing the debate of final causes in biology back to present. In my view, this is a relevant issue of interest to the general audience.

I think the text is valuable and the author touches a lot of interesting points, but I should say that I found it confusing. As the author stresses in p. 21 "[f]inal cause and teleology are not univocal terms" and "[a]ll of these senses are muddled together in nineteenth century arguments about the role of final causes in biology". By revisiting the debate, I was expecting the author not to bring this muddle back again, but to unravel it so that it could be better understood. He also stresses that "it is useful to keep in mind a distinction between the final causes of organismic parts and the final cause of all things", but this is shortly explained after the debate has been introduced. Clarifying all these points before, or at the same time, the debate is being introduced would help the reader. It seems that the "barren virgin" and the "mistress" are not the same woman.

Section 6 does not reflect an actual view about this issue. Maybe the author would like to have a look at the following paper:

Bejan, A., & Lorente, S. (2011). The constructal law and the evolution of design in nature. *Physics of life Reviews* 8(3), 209-240.