

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

Amy Koerber<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Texas Tech University

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

Echoing the comments of other reviewers, I find a lot of interesting material in this article, but I am struggling to see the big picture. This may be because I lack the necessary disciplinary expertise, but if I'm understanding this platform correctly, it seems that authors should attempt to make their material accessible to diverse readership from across the disciplines. The most useful part of the article for me is when the author starts presenting examples--the specific examples that are offered to illustrate both substantive and stylistic aspects of ontological definitions are extremely compelling, and this is where I feel like I start to understand what this article is about. Up until this point in the article, I felt very confused about what exactly is an ontological definition and how it differs from dictionary definitions. If the author is going to revise, I would suggest foregrounding some of these concrete examples at the beginning. Also, providing some stories or case studies to show how ontological definitions are used in practice would be extremely beneficial. Finally, and again echoing other reviewers' comments, when the author is referring to specific connections to Qeios, I found myself completely lost. Maybe that's because I'm not yet familiar with this forum, but since there may be other readers like me, it would be great to provide a little more context here. Interesting work, and I hope the author continues to develop it!