



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)
Compulsory 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>	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General 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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Alan Garfield
Department, University & Country	University of Dubuque, USA