

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

Heloise Haliday¹

¹ Université de Bourgogne

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Before we start this review, we would like to underline the fact that as a non-native English scholar, our wording might convey different emotions than those we intended to elicit. While our review will be quite critical, the author must know we are doing it as a way for him to improve his manuscript.

Indeed, while the paper is of a certain interest, the reader cannot help but wonder why some key elements are missing.

First, returning to a formula-type of thinking is interesting. Many great therapists, from Bion to Lacan, have tried synthesizing the psychoanalytic experience by using logic. The issue is, sometimes reading pure conceptual thinking dealing with the therapeutic alliance and relationship feels like having to listen to a cooking recipe when being hungry. Even wise words and concepts cannot fully compensate the absence of real clinical material, be it a case study.

The introduction is quite didactic, but the whole psychoanalytic literature and more recent works on therapeutic alliance have shown how transference or countertransference can also prevent the therapist from really connecting with his patient. The two situations from which the author starts his paper do not sum up what the author names by the term "egoism". The literature cited is too scarce, when the author should on the contrary demonstrate how he masters the subject. In epistemological terms, the reason why he chose "egoism" instead of egotism or narcissism (and though the author consciously uses the three terms in a similar fashion) is not put forward.

When offering his formula, the author probably thought of Freud's theory of our always limited quantum of libido. If he didn't, why is the term "egoism satisfaction infrastructure" needed when it is possible to use the "connected vessels" model which Freud uses in *On narcissism* ? To be able to convince the reader, we definitely advise the author to more closely refer to psychoanalysis.

Some practical principles given by the author are also quite surprising. When considering a patient responding "I know" too often, the author writes "Providing adequate infrastructure and not insulting this patient is also important.". What exactly are we reading ; are these guidelines really meant to be part of a scientific paper ?

The main issue in this paper is quite probably the lack of any discussion regarding transference and countertransference, while quite directly hitting at exactly what these terms mean when writing : "This study sought to demonstrate how insufficient (or unstable) egoism satisfaction infrastructure can result in therapists not always being able to ignore their

own issues when treating patients. This study's major conclusion is that a significant gap between therapists' ethical commitment and their behaviors in practice may primarily result from their natural weaknesses as human beings". Our "weaknesses" should rather be named "blind spots", to avoid any mixing of therapeutic and moral material.

The paper addresses an important subject, but we deem it necessary to considerably add references to support the author's thinking with old and new scientific material. Not mentioning transference, and not linking what he tries to explain to previous works on narcissism, might give the impression that the author is grappling with what some scholars have named the "Toothbrush problem" : <https://www.psychologicalscience.org/observer/the-toothbrush-problem>.