

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

Adnan Malik¹

1 EMBL-EBI

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

Definitions should be unique, and the article provides clear guidelines to non-specialist ontology users in writing good ontological definitions with several examples shown. However, several guidelines set out by Seppälä *et al*, 2017 have been missed in this article such as avoiding the use of plurals in definitions, avoiding definitions that are too broad/too narrow and avoiding the enumeration of examples/counterexamples of things within the definition (use of words such as 'etc', 'for example', and 'such as'). Covering these examples along with others that have been left out will make the article more comprehensive.

Qeios ID: UTD5J8 · https://doi.org/10.32388/UTD5J8