

Peer Review

Review of: "The Polyvagal Theory in Contemporary Psychology: Why Popularity Should Not Be Confused with Scientific Validity"

Jesse S. Bettinger¹

1. Claremont Graduate University, Claremont, United States

I admire the thoughtfulness that the author applies to Porges' polyvagal theory, and the ability to identify the limitations of the present (original) formulation of the approach. My only suggestion is that more care be spent trying to reconcile or reframe the polyvagal theory into an itemized account of updates that strengthen the biological foundations of the approach (e.g., with the holobiont approach offered by the author). The category errors identified are insightful and instructive, but more so if reconstructed in a positive sense beyond simply identifying the discrepancies. However, such papers are what help take theory forward one step at a time, and to help refine a conventional approach and give it a makeover keeps the continuity of the scientific method moving forward. At the same time, if a better overall model arises, be able to show step by step how we go from Polyvagal theory to whatever the portrait of the new or modified model discloses. Many thanks for the opportunity to review this article, and best of luck to the author.

Declarations

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.