

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

Noriaki Okamoto¹

¹ London School of Economics and Political Science, University of London

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

As I have been interested in social ontology from philosophical and sociological perspectives, it is really interesting to know how relatively more rigorous science-based scholars think about the concept of ontology. Generally speaking, I agree with the authors' conclusion that ontological definitions should be clear and concise so that we can understand and contrast each object and entity. In particular, it would be more important for biology or medical sciences as there are innumerable number of genes in our body and in other creatures.

But can we define and classify all the objects? How about 'justice', 'democracy', 'happiness' and 'patriotism'? Can we clearly define them? You can perhaps refer to the dictionary definition, but it is of course abstract, and each individual has his/her different interpretation. For instance, for some Russian people, ongoing invasion might be a patriotic activity. Let me directly mention the content of the article. As one of the conditions for ontological definitions, the authors suggest 'No. 9: Good definition: Behaviour that is judged by a population or group to contravene its moral precepts. (Subjectivity is avoided by making reference to the judgement of a population rather than asserting a value judgement oneself).' In this case, the good definition heavily relies on a specific population's collective (moral) decision. Any population is possible? Social ontology specifically works on this matter as it should be based on the collective acceptance of group of people, community or society.

I hope more scientists can learn something from the recent development of social ontology.