

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

Michael Buchholz

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Comment about the paper

by Michael B. Buchholz,

International Psychoanalytic University (IPU), Berlin, Germany

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

Author: Yaniv Hozez

The paper turns to a neglected topic in doing psychotherapy – the therapist's egoism, the therapist's egoism in relation to the patient's egoism and the range of ethical issues that are raised, especially those that follow from considering that egoism is a positive value in many societies, which leads to further ethical considerations under which conditions to respect the other's egoism more than one's own can be demanded.

The author uses a wonderful metaphor:

At the end one understands the metaphor better when the metaphorical source is delivered: medical doctors offer fluid medicine sometime to take in by drinking; the medicament is delivered in a cup and the volume must be measured. Cup, the material in the cup and the quantity of the material can be related in a kind of useful metaphorical mathematics. This guides the paper in a wishful way.

Another concept is the patient's and the therapist's "infrastructure", a concept which does not become clear; I understood it as something which was formerly named a person's "character". People with a tight "infrastructure" can sometimes receive another quantity of the medicament or another delivery than in a cup as compared to other patients.

The author's merits are the systematic explication of many ethical issues widely ignored in therapeutic dialogical practice.

Two minor critics:

1. At the end the author describes the lack of empirical studies; I wondered if he thinks of RCT-studies and in what kind? The better alternative, I propose here, is to study qualitatively what therapists do and how they do what they do; the research alternative number one is, of course an analytic approach using conversation analysis.
2. On page 8 the author writes: "therapists are obliged to avoid conflict" – I do not understand why this should be the case. In Rogerian and in many other psychoanalytic traditions the conflicts between therapist and patient are given

special attention – the author quotes Kohut and Winnicott who are psychoanalytic authors.

Both these minor critics should be commented on in a revision.

In general: The paper could be accepted with these minor revisions.