



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Education, Society and Behavioural Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JESBS_51413
Title of the Manuscript:	Relationship between Creative Thinking and Academic Performance of Students: The Moderating Role of Gender
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	<p>"Literature on creativity seem to be scanty" – Not at all. You should change this and clearly go back to review some recent RECENT lit.</p> <p>"There was a return rate of 100%." I am conflicted here. Congrats, on the one hand, but do you realize how suspicious this looks? 100%??? You have to footnote this and explain just how/why 100%. You have an obligation to show neutrality in the use of these instruments and 100% makes one think, perhaps, otherwise.</p> <p>You have to identify this study as Ghana.</p> <p>"regards" does not have an apostrophe.</p>	<p>The literature in terms recent ones has no binding on this looking at the variable combination. We worked assiduously to range 2019 years and ourselves between 2000 but few were found and were duly used as basis of the study. Discarding in totality would not bring anything new but compound the issues. We therefore suggest that there is the literature be maintained as our findings might complement the literature base in this dimension. Again, we have duly provided justifications for the 100% return rate with any conflicts or interference in any way from our research perspective.</p> <p>"Regards" duly corrected</p>
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	