

Review of: "Neuropsych psychoanalysis and Dual-Aspect Monism"

Rudra B. Bhandari¹

¹ Patanjali Research Foundation

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The author/s sets the intention of conducting a "good-faith assessment of the use of DAM in justifying neuropsych psychoanalysis." However, it's worthy to address the below comments to enhance the quality of the publication.

1. Emphasize the significance of this assessment within the broader context of neuropsych psychoanalysis.
2. What is at stake, and why is it necessary to address the compatibility of neuropsych psychoanalysis with DAM?
3. The need for "faithful reconstruction of Solms' account of dual-aspect monism" is crucial, as this will serve as the basis for evaluating the subsequent case studies.

Solms' Dual-Aspect Monism:

1. When discussing Chalmers' premises for the mind-body problem, it might be helpful to briefly explain why these premises are relevant in the context of DAM and neuropsych psychoanalysis. Connect the dots between these premises and the central question being addressed in the paper.

Case Study 1: Brain Connectivity:

The analysis of brain connectivity about DAM is comprehensive and well-structured. The argument that all three notions of brain connectivity presented by Salone et al. are incompatible with DAM is logically sound.

1. Consider providing real-world examples or illustrations to make the concepts more accessible to readers who may not have an extensive background in neuroscience.
2. Additionally, the section might benefit from a summary or conclusion reinforcing the critical findings of brain connectivity and DAM.

Case Study 2: Affect:

Evaluating neuroscientific and psychoanalytic concepts of affect is well-structured and logically presented.

1. However, it might be helpful to give some context on why these distinctions matter in neuropsych psychoanalysis.
2. Suggest alternative approaches to integrating Mosri's model of combining neuroscientific and psychoanalytic effects.

Conclusion:

The conclusion effectively summarizes the key points made throughout the paper and reiterates the importance of DAM in neuropsych psychoanalysis.

1. It would be better to discuss the implications of the paper's findings. How might the incompatibility between DAM and specific aspects of neuropsych psychoanalysis affect the field and its future directions?
2. Discussing the ramifications of the paper's findings would be beneficial. What potential effects might there be on the field and its future directions if DAM and other components of neuropsych psychoanalysis are incompatible?

Overall, the research presents a strong case for using DAM with neuropsych psychoanalysis. It provides insightful information about the difficulties and possible misuses in the industry. The author/s needs to address the above comments to improve the manuscript.