

Review of: "Theory of infrastructure: Impact of egoism manifestation by a therapist towards a patient in psychotherapy"

Nadia Baatouche¹

¹ University of Angers

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

General Observations: The article offers a unique perspective on the role of egoism in psychotherapy, focusing on three key aspects: the patient's understanding and mental state, the therapist's self-esteem and confidence, and the therapist's ability to handle situations involving egoism. This holistic approach is interesting as it acknowledges the complex interplay between the therapist and patient dynamics. However, there are areas that could be strengthened or clarified, for example, the term "egoism satisfaction infrastructure" is central to your study but is not clearly defined. It would be beneficial to provide a more explicit definition or framework at the outset to help readers understand the dimensions and implications of this concept in the psychotherapeutic context.

Introduction: Your introduction raises important questions about the impact of egoism in psychotherapy. By expanding on the mentioned points, you could provide a more solid foundation for your argument and better guide your readers on what your study aims to explore and demonstrate. Although the author identifies two interesting scenarios, their context and impact on therapy could be further developed. How do these situations specifically affect the therapeutic relationship and the healing process? Moreover, it would be useful to clarify what you mean by "egoism satisfaction infrastructure" in these two scenarios. How is it concretely manifested in therapeutic practice? Your reference to Mordecai (1991) and to Jung (1951) is relevant, but a deeper integration of these ideas into your argument would strengthen the theoretical foundation of your article. How do these theories specifically apply to the scenarios you describe? You discuss the ethical and practical implications of egoism in psychotherapy, but it would be beneficial to develop further on how these implications concretely affect therapeutic practice. The modification you propose to the English proverb is intriguing, but its link to the main theme of your article could be made more explicit. How does this idea relate to the need to manage egoism in psychotherapy? Clarifying further the objectives of your study and the specific research questions you wish to address could help guide the reader from the beginning.

Method:

The methodology section of your article presents an innovative equation to quantify the concept of "egoism satisfaction infrastructure." This is an interesting approach that attempts to provide a mathematical representation of psychological concepts, which is uncommon in the field. Nevertheless, to strengthen your argument, it is essential to clarify how these concepts will be measured, validated, and applied in clinical practice. Moreover, the methodology section is very detailed

and seems to merge theoretical elements with methodological aspects. In a classic scientific article structure, the methodology focuses on how the research was conducted, that is, the description of the methods of data collection and analysis. Theoretical and conceptual discussions are generally reserved for the introduction or a separate theoretical section. The methodology section should be revised to improve clarity and ensure that it focuses on the description of research procedures. This will help avoid confusion and allow readers to better understand and evaluate your research. The variables V (volume of the cup), C (content inside the cup), and M (material of the cup) must be operationally defined. How would a therapist or researcher measure these variables in practice? How do you ensure that these measures are both valid (they actually measure what they claim to measure) and reliable (they produce consistent results over time and across different individuals)? Are there pilot studies to demonstrate the validity and reliability of your model? How can practitioners use this formula in the context of psychotherapy? What does a score of 0.72 as opposed to a score of 0.25 indicate about an individual's psychological state or ability to manage egoism? A discussion on the interpretation of scores would help readers understand how to apply the results of this equation. Any methodology, especially those involving numerical evaluations of psychological concepts, must consider the limitations and ethical implications. How do you manage the risks of reductionism or stigmatization? Do you have comparative or control data to support the claim that the egoism satisfaction infrastructure is a significant factor in therapeutic success?

Results: The results section is very succinct for a study that seems to address complex and potentially variable concepts. Results should be presented with enough detail for readers to understand the specific findings of the study. It would be helpful to provide concrete examples or case studies to illustrate how the egoism satisfaction infrastructure affects the therapist's ability to calm a patient or provide objective advice.

Discussion and Limitations: The discussion part would be more convincing if it were supported by empirical data. Theories must be tested against real observations to confirm their validity. The limitations part highlights that the lack of human subjects to test the hypotheses is a major gap. Purely theoretical results can be difficult to generalize in clinical practice without concrete proof. This underscores the need for future research that includes direct observation and experimentation. There is a need to integrate existing studies that support the arguments and discuss ways in which your theory could be empirically tested in the future.