

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

Nico van Rensburg¹

¹ University of the Western Cape

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Reviewer's Comments:

Author and Title of the paper/article under review:	Theory of infrastructure: Impact of egoism manifestation by a therapist towards a patient in psychotherapy
General comment:	This is a well-written paper/article with good academic value. The study is novice and addresses a unique area of egoism in psychotherapy and patient behavior that can enjoy further academic research.
Introduction:	The writer gave a well-structured introduction to the paper/article, which gives the reader a concise overview on the research background, research questions, existing gaps in research relevant to the topic, and the study's value added relevance regarding the effects of egoism on psychotherapy and patient behavior.
Literature Review:	The writer did not include a literature review section in the paper/article. Academically, this can be seen as a major shortcoming by other reviewers and/or researchers in the field. I suggest that the writer add a brief review of related literature section to the paper/article addressing the following three concepts: Egoism, Psychotherapy, and Therapy in Psychotherapy. Include a brief paragraph or two about each of the above concepts supported by references and how it relates to the current study. There are many existing journal articles and books written on all three concepts. (For example: Nowhere in the article did the writer define the concept of Egoism, what it entails, and others' opinion, research, or definition about the concept). (Further, what is Psychotherapy? What is Therapy in Psychotherapy? – The writer and I know what it entails; however, the reader (or broad reader audience that are not familiar with Egoism/Psychotherapy research) should be provided with more background, evidence and clarification about the concepts). It remains the writer's choice if he wishes to add a literature review section or not. However, I strongly recommend adding one, as this will strengthen the article considerably.
Methodology:	The study followed a novice methodology (Egoism satisfaction infrastructure - $f(V,C,M)=C * MV$) which was created by the writer. From a reader's perspective, I feel it matches the study framework. The writer did a good job and presented his findings well.
Results:	The results prove to be consistent with the study's analysis.
Discussion:	Similarly, the discussion proves to be consistent with the study's analysis.
References:	The reference list proves to be consistent with the references used in the text.
Grammar:	The paper/article can be considered grammatically sound.
Other remarks:	Overall, the writer did a great job. The paper/article is well-written, easy to read, and has good academic value.
Decision/Recommendation:	Generally, I am satisfied with the overall value and quality of the paper/article. However, I do feel that a brief review of literature section can be added. Other than that, I don't see a reason why the article cannot be published in the given journal.

Please rate the following: (1 = *Excellent*) (2 = *Good*) (3 = *Fair*) (4 = *Poor*).

Originality:	1
Contribution to the Field:	1
Technical Quality:	2
Clarity of Presentation:	2
Depth of Research:	3