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

Kenith Sobel[1]

1 University of Central Arkansas

The writing is crystal clear, thorough, and comprehensive. It serves as both an introduction to ontological categories as well as a user's guide for developing them. I have only a few minor quibbles. Below are parts of the paper that either stand out as particularly well written or could stand improvement.

The principle to express ontological categories as "A [parent class] that [specification of characteristics that distinguish the entity from other members of the parent class]" is clear and forceful, and the example definition of Perceptual Process is complete as well as concise.

p4: "*Less good definition:* A product made or derived from tobacco that is intended for human consumption, including any component, part, or accessory of a tobacco product. (As worded, this definition, used by the US Food and Drug Administration, includes pharmaceutical nicotine products even though the intention is to exclude them.)" How do the authors know that the intention of the FDA is to exclude pharmaceutical nicotine products from its definition of a Tobacco-containing product?

p4: "Definitions should avoid use of negations (saying what the class is not) unless required for linguistic clarity or when the class is inherently negative." Brilliant advice, but the reader may fail to understand why it is so important to avoid negatives in definitions.