

Научная статья | Original paper

Commentary on the response of A. Koutsoklenis, Yu. Solovieva, and L. Quintanar Rojas

T.V. Akhutina¹ ✉

¹ Lomonosov Moscow State University, Moscow, Russian Federation
✉ akhutina@mail.ru

Abstract

This commentary continues the discussion with A. Koutsoklenis, Yu. Solovieva, and L. Quintanar Rojas on the understanding of ADHD mechanisms. It questions the authors' assertion that abandoning the term ADHD will reduce the stigma of children with this syndrome.

Keywords: cultural-historical neuropsychology, attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder (ADHD), stigmatisation

Funding. The study was conducted under the state assignment of Lomonosov Moscow State University № ыАААА-А20-120012890168-8.

For citation: Akhutina, T.V. (2025). Commentary on the response of A. Koutsoklenis, Yu. Solovieva, and L. Quintanar Rojas. *Cultural-Historical Psychology*, 21(4), 114–115. <https://doi.org/10.17759/chp.2025210412>

Комментарий к ответу А. Куцоклениса, Ю. Соловьевой, Л. Кинтанара Рохаса

T.B. Ахутина¹ ✉

¹ Московский государственный университет имени М.В. Ломоносова, Москва, Российская Федерация
✉ akhutina@mail.ru

Резюме

Комментарий продолжает дискуссию с А. Куцокленисом, Ю. Соловьевой, Л. Кинтанаром Рохасом о понимании механизма СДВГ. В нем подвергается сомнению точка зрения названных авторов о том, что отказ от термина СДВГ приведет к уменьшению стигматизации детей с этим синдромом.

Ключевые слова: культурно-историческая нейropsychология, синдром дефицита внимания и гиперактивности (СДВГ), стигматизация

Финансирование. Исследование выполнено в рамках государственного задания МГУ имени М.В. Ломоносова № АААА-А20-120012890168-8.

Для цитирования: Ахутина, Т.В. (2025). Комментарий к ответу А. Куцоклениса, Ю. Соловьевой, Л. Кинтанара Рохаса. *Культурно-историческая психология*, 21(4), 114–115. <https://doi.org/10.17759/chp.2025210412>

I welcome the authors' response to my commentary, as it once again demonstrates the commonality of our theoretical positions — our commitment to the principles of cultural-historical psychology

and Luria's syndrome analysis, as I noted in my review.

Regarding our dispute, in their response, the authors of the article ignore my main criticism regarding the in-

consistency of their presentation of the current understanding of ADHD mechanisms. First, they write that "according to the DSM, which reflects the prevailing view, ADHD is a 'complex, multifactorial neurodevelopmental disorder.'" I cannot disagree with this definition (in fact, by revealing their understanding of the syndrome, the authors make the same point both in the article and in their response to my comment). However, later in the article, they express doubts about the validity of ADHD as a diagnosis and cite the lack of "biomarkers" for the syndrome, according to Stefan Schleim (Schleim, 2022), as the primary reason. I'm criticizing the "biomarker" theory specifically, but the authors of the response turn a blind eye to it. The assertion in the response that "a truly diagnostic approach must move beyond surface-level descriptions to uncover the functional syndromes responsible for a child's difficulties" should be addressed to the author of the "biomarker" idea, and not to me, I agree with that.

The authors write that "the ADHD concept lacks internal consistency and neuropsychological validity.

It is disconnected from materialist-dialectical thinking, which underpins cultural-historical psychology". Is this referring to the concept that the syndrome is a "complex, multifactorial neurodevelopmental disorder"? Do the authors disagree with that?

The response states that "Prof. Akhutina claims that this concept (concept of the 'social situation of development' — T.A.) is unrelated to ADHD diagnosis". I don't understand how my words, "The neuropsychologist's recommendations will depend on what support is actually available in the child's social situation," can lead to such a conclusion. I also don't understand how abandoning the term ADHD will reduce the stigma surrounding children with developmental disabilities.

In my opinion, the scientific concept of ADHD shouldn't be confused with the myths about it that are widespread in the pseudo-scientific literature. Let's combat the popular medicalization of ADHD, which oversimplifies the problem, and seek optimal ways to help children.

Список источников / References

1. Schleim S. (2022). Why mental disorders are brain disorders. And why they are not: ADHD and

the challenges of heterogeneity and reification. *Frontiers in Psychiatry*, 13, 943049. <https://10.3389/fpsy.2022.943049>

Information about the authors

Tatiana V. Akhutina, Grand PhD in Psychology, Chief Researcher, Laboratory of Neuropsychology, Lomonosov Moscow State University, Moscow, Russian Federation, ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8503-2495>, e-mail: akhutina@mail.ru

Информация об авторах

Ахутина Татьяна Васильевна, доктор психологических наук, главный научный сотрудник лаборатории нейropsychологии, Московский государственный университет имени М.В. Ломоносова (ФГБОУ ВО «МГУ имени М.В. Ломоносова»), Москва, Российская Федерация, ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8503-2495>, e-mail: akhutina@mail.ru

Поступила в редакцию 29.10.2025

Поступила после рецензирования 05.11.2025

Принята к публикации 10.12.2025

Опубликована 29.12.2025

Received 2025.10.29

Revised 2025.11.05

Accepted 2025.12.10

Published 2025.12.29