This is an interesting and innovative paper focusing on an issue which have not been addressed in depth in the psychoanalytic and group analytic literature. From my point of view, this paper should be published.

The paper includes a broad literature survey centred on the issue of the qualities and skills of “good supervision”. It is clearly elaborated that supervision of supervisors is necessary and that it has a logical place in the group analytic concept.

It is somewhat of a loss that the survey only includes English-speaking contributions, since there is also a discussion on this topic in France and in Germany.

The paper presents important dynamics at work in the supervision process: resonance, transference processes and “parallel processes”; one could perhaps also add the concept of “projective identification”, which is one of the dynamics for the phenomenon of parallel processes.

It is also stated that the fundamental qualifications for supervision are not only experience but include didactic elements as well. I would add that supervision works when one also stays with the group analytic method in the setting of supervision.

The author shows that a broad range of different and somewhat contradictory abilities and qualities a “good supervisor” should possess are indicated in the literature. She also shows how different supervisors are judged by supervisees. These differences are discussed and confronted with the phenomenon of “matching” of supervisor and supervisees. This phenomenon is due to unconscious processes which may be better understood in group situations. I am sorry the discussion of this phenomenon of “matching” was not further elaborated.

The vignette with the mirror gave me the association of “Snow White”. Out of mirroring, rivalry and narcissistic vulnerability may arise. The fairy-tale also reminds one of the succession of
generations. All these themes are crucial in the supervision process.

This association leads me to the question how "free" the supervisees in the supervision feel. Are they able to choose the supervisor, do they stick to a certain programme and – last but not least – are they going to be judged at the end of the supervision programme. In the older conception of psychoanalytic supervisions, supervisors were expected to give some recommendations on the ability to be a psychoanalyst. In training situations, supervision has an implicit dimension of judgment. This issue could have perhaps also been discussed in the paper.

From my perspective, supervision should not lead only to a "good practice" of the (group analytic) method but also to a personal integration of the method. This means that the supervisee should not only be identified with the method but also develop a state of "post-training identification" which allows professionals to have their own authentic and critical position. The supervisee should be released to go into the next generational stage. This idea has implications for supervision, which may be implicitly seen in such claims such as that the supervisor should be open to the unknown, to the difference, and to otherness in general. Implications are the careful approach towards judging supervisees and the process of supervision of supervision!

It is very interesting that the author informed her supervision group of the fact that she presented this supervision in a group of supervisors. This opened a new perspective for the supervision – a fruitful process of triangulation and process of understanding, symbolisation and professional identification.