

Review of: "Can the definitions of SARS-Cov-2 and Covid-19 stand up to epistemological scrutiny?"

Ramakrishnan Nagaraj¹

¹ Centre for Cellular and Molecular Biology

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Arifat et al in the paper entitled "Can the definitions of SARS-Cov-2 and Covid-19 stand up to epistemological scrutiny?" makes interesting and thought provoking reading. At the end of the abstract, the authors state "we argue that the definitions of SARS-Cov-2 and Covid-19 do not stand up to epistemological scrutiny: these definitions do not hook on to a new natural kind that is pertinent for epidemiology". In the conclusion section, the authors state "One must establish a specific pattern in macro-biological data that can count as the manifestation of the genomic entity SARS-Cov-2. However, there is no such pattern that could warrant the classification of what is known as Covid-19 as a new kind of respiratory disease and thus as a natural kind in nosology. In short, the Covid-19 disease is an artefact of the PCR test instead of a new kind of respiratory disease".

Comments

1. The SARS corona virus was identified in 1966 and the TEM image was published in 1967. While the symptoms caused by the virus then was mild and it did not involve fatalities like Covid-19. Hence, Covid-19 may not be called a new kind of respiratory disease as the authors assume.
2. The authors have not commented on the extensively documented biochemical manifestations such as cytokine storm, loss of taste, smell and highly variable mortality. The statement "If anything, excess deaths seem to be positively correlated to over-reactions bordering on hysteria, containment measures and possibly also the adverse effects of the vaccines", borders on conjecture rather than detailed scientific analysis.
3. Several aspects of covid-19, such as long covid and immune responses, are not solely based on PCR. In fact, even for covid-19, there are reports of more detailed tests that have been carried out for diagnosis.

The conclusion, the single point argument: "In short, the Covid-19 disease is an artefact of the PCR test instead of a new kind of respiratory disease" is an overstatement.