

LETTER OF REVIEWERS

Reviewer A:

Recommendation: Revisions Required

Relevance: Very high

Novelty: High

Presentation and writing: Very high

Comments for authors:

1. The introduction appropriately presents the debate on Cartesian dualism in the context of psychology and psychiatry. However, the main argument regarding the alleged false attribution of dualism in mental health requires more empirical references or concrete examples of how this assumption appears in the current literature, beyond the study by Carpio et al.
2. As this is a letter to the editor, a methodology section is not required. However, it would be helpful to clarify whether the analysis is based on a theoretical-argumentative review and a critique of Carpio et al. (2024). Although the authors state, “We discuss this view in the framework of Mental Health and take as a target a well-written piece published in *Interacciones* (Carpio et al., 2024),” it would be beneficial to explicitly state that this is the primary objective of the letter.
3. The authors mention, “Actually, that is what seems to get Nobel Prizes to psychologists, such as Geoffrey Hinton.” However, they do not specify which particular work by Hinton they are referring to. It is recommended to add a reference and clarify this statement or remove it.
4. While the article demonstrates strong argumentative coherence, some points would benefit from further conceptual elaboration. For example, the claim that the mind-body relationship implies non-dualism requires more philosophical development and additional references to support it. Expanding on this could help readers unfamiliar with the philosophical model being discussed better understand the topic.
5. The sociological section on the professionalization of psychology in Latin America is interesting but seems to divert attention from the main argument. It is recommended to more explicitly link this discussion to the philosophical and psychological analysis of the term “mental” in mental health.
6. The authors are encouraged to provide a concrete example from psychiatric or psychological practice where the confusion between dualism and mentalism is evident. This could help readers less familiar with these philosophical aspects better understand the issue being addressed. Feel free to exceed 1,000 words if this improves the manuscript's clarity and strength.
7. It is recommended to revise the final paragraph to emphasize the article’s contribution to the debate and its relevance to psychological practice.

RESPONSE LETTER

We thank the editor and the reviewer for their quick and exhausting response to our letter. In the following pages we respond to the reviewer comment's using text in bold. The changes are highlighted in yellow in the main text.

1. The introduction appropriately presents the debate on Cartesian dualism in the context of psychology and psychiatry. However, the main argument regarding the alleged false attribution of dualism in mental health requires more empirical references or concrete examples of how this assumption appears in the current literature, beyond the study by Carpio et al.

The goal of this letter to the editor is to comment on Carpio et al paper. Given the theoretical nature of the critique there is no empirical evidence available. We provide philosophical and logical arguments to criticize Carpio's point. Also, in the third paragraph we provide examples of other behaviourist making the same mistake.

2. As this is a letter to the editor, a methodology section is not required. However, it would be helpful to clarify whether the analysis is based on a theoretical-argumentative review and a critique of Carpio et al. (2024). Although the authors state, "We discuss this view in the framework of Mental Health and take as a target a well-written piece published in *Interacciones* (Carpio et al., 2024)," it would be beneficial to explicitly state that this is the primary objective of the letter.

See new first paragraph, we specify the objective as suggested.

3. The authors mention, "Actually, that is what seems to get Nobel Prizes to psychologists, such as Geoffrey Hinton." However, they do not specify which particular work by Hinton they are referring to. It is recommended to add a reference and clarify this statement or remove it.

Normally Nobel Prizes in physics are not win by one or two publications but a life of constant work in the area. But as requested, we are happy to add one of Hinton's firsts work. We also update the sentence: "And it turns out to be the philosophical bases for psychologists who win Nobel Prizes, such as Geoffrey Hinton (e.g., Rumelhart, et al., 1986). But this is an issue beyond the scope of this letter."

4. While the article demonstrates strong argumentative coherence, some points would benefit from further conceptual elaboration. For example, the claim that the mind-body relationship implies non-dualism requires more philosophical development and additional references to support it. Expanding on this could help readers unfamiliar with the philosophical model being discussed better understand the topic.

Just to clarify, we did not say mind-body relationship implies non-dualism. We said that mind-body causation (i.e., mentalism) implies non-dualism. We included extra references (see Rozemond, 1998) and mentioned of Pierre Gassendi and Princess Elisabeth of Bohemia) and developed further the ideas. See new sections in paragraphs 3 and 4.

5. The sociological section on the professionalization of psychology in Latin America is interesting but seems to divert attention from the main argument. It is recommended to more explicitly link this discussion to the philosophical and psychological analysis of the term "mental" in mental health.

Thank you for the suggestion. We still want to make that point. However, now we make the link between the two sections more explicit and we considerably changed the manuscript so this part is clearer and integrates more smoothly with the first section.

6. The authors are encouraged to provide a concrete example from psychiatric or psychological practice where the confusion between dualism and mentalism is evident. This could help readers less familiar with these philosophical aspects better understand the issue being addressed. Feel free to exceed 1,000 words if this improves the manuscript's clarity and strength.

In the second section we mentioned that these theoretical debates are not needed in psychological practice. Thus, we cannot give an example in a clinical setting where dualism and mentalism is evident. Our point is that that debate is not relevant in clinical practice.

7. It is recommended to revise the final paragraph to emphasize the article's contribution to the debate and its relevance to psychological practice.

Paragraph improved. See new version.