



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Education, Society and Behavioural Science</a>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JESBS_51413</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Relationship between Creative Thinking and Academic Performance of Students: The Moderating Role of Gender</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

**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>)



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

**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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>The manuscript is an interesting one but I have the following suggestions for consideration: The title is really captivating but I feel it has masked some important information about the study like the subject of interest (Maths and English Lang.) and may be the subject area (which may not be compulsory to reflect in the title. I feel author(s) should consider modifying the title to reflect this suggestion.</p> <p>In your abstract, you may not need to include (n=140 and general p=0.05) in the results of your findings because, you ought to have mentioned it earlier. Also, you mentioned male students having higher creative thinking abilities than female but there was no results to back it up. Note that you are at liberty to add up to 5 keywords.</p> <p>In your review of literature (Introduction), you may not need to dwell extensively on the study but make it as brief as possible and possibly focus on the results as related to your study. I am not comfortable with the way you presented your two hypotheses. I feel they are not presented in a conventional manner. Your null (H<sub>0</sub>) should be presented in order to reject and both null (H<sub>0</sub>) and alternative (H<sub>1</sub>) should be written. It could be presented like this; a. H<sub>0</sub>: There is no significant relationship between creative thinking and academic performance of students.</p> <p>H<sub>1</sub>: There is significant significant relationship between creative thinking and academic performance of students.</p> <p>b. H<sub>0</sub>: Gender will not significantly moderate the relationship between creative thinking and academic performance of students.</p> <p>H<sub>1</sub>: Gender will significantly moderate the relationship between creative thinking and academic performance of students.</p> <p>Your fig. 1 was good but should convey more information about the study than just the three components included. You need to include the influencing factors. Just search the literature in addition to your own construct for better conceptual frame work for this study.</p> <p>In your research methodology, you may not need to include these references in this section (41, 42, 43 and 44). You may not need to explain in details by defining like this "Chaudhury (as cited in [43]) defined population as an entire group about which some information is required to be ascertained" among others. References are included here to validate the methods employed not to explain the method or the concept. You are not meant to do that in this section. Please, delete them appropriately.</p> <p>You mentioned multistage sampling techniques using Random sampling, stratified sampling and systematic sampling but you did not explain how you were able to select your respondents through these procedures. Presenting table1 is good but will not be enough because it should support your sample selection procedure. You are also to discuss briefly on the instruments used in this study for your readers to clearly understand how you were able to carry out your survey using these instruments.</p> <p>You table 3a 3b are not clear enough. The headings of these table are somehow confusing to me. You may need to check it. Check literature for better understanding. Which test is this? You did not include it. In your Table 4a and 4b, you need to explain the justification for using this method (bootstrapping method- 5000 bootstrap samples?). You were able to relate your findings with other previous empirical studies in your first test but in your second</p>	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	test (Table 4a & 4b) you did not do that. You need to compare your findings with other works in the literature either to support your findings or refute them.	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	Nil	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	Nil	

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Olutosin A. Otekunrin</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Federal University of Agriculture, Abeokuta (FUNAAB), Nigeria</b>