

Review of: "The Truth about the Origin of Omicron"

Christine ROUZIOUX

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

This article aims to discuss arguments that could suggest that the origin of the Omicron variant is linked to transmission from mice to humans. The article presents hypotheses and author's point of view, much more than evidence; the scientific elements discussed are quite poor, including the lack of proximity with mouse viruses.

Very little is mentioned about the origin of the other variants, nor why Omicron would have a different animal origin, while the literature on this point is missing. Nothing is mentioned about the origin of the bat currently admitted for initial variants. Nothing is discussed about the geographical origin, nor the fact that it is in South Africa that an Omicron wave has been described, as well as the nearby viruses BA.4 and BA.5. The fact that there are different species of mice distributed around the world is not addressed. The bibliography concerning the origin of the different variants and the many animal species susceptible to coronaviruses would make it possible to place the Omicron variant in the more general question of the origin of these epidemics related to coronaviruses.

The question of variants at the furin site is certainly important but probably insufficient to fully support the author's theory. It is a Chinese article that first evokes the hypothesis of the mouse as an animal responsible for transmission to humans. But without substantiating it sufficiently.

The fact that mouse cells could be infected with omicron is not enough, because probably those of many other animal species can also be infected.

The references are not mentioned in the text which makes it difficult to read.

There are sentences mentioned twice in the text: The 2nd paragraph on page 2 is reproduced in full in the "Facts about Omicron" section. The 2nd sentence in the paragraph "Omicron and furin cleavage" is repeated in the second part of this paragraph

With these repetitions, the reader is lost in the demonstration, which in total is unclear.

In conclusion, this article discusses hypotheses that are poorly documented scientifically, especially since no complete study in referenced animals supports this theory. This paper is more a point of view, than a scientific analysis based on well supported hypotheses.

The only elements discussed concern mutations and are not sufficient to convince. The term Truth in the title is very strong, while nothing is certain of what is being advanced.