

Review of: "Why the Standard Definition of Creativity Fails to Capture the Creative Act"

Elena Mulet¹

¹ Universitat Jaume I de Castellón

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The article is interesting and contains good arguments. The main conclusion is relevant and will help to better evaluate creativity. The author's approach is exciting.

At some points, the text talks indistinctly about aspects that are not identical. For example, it is stated that "employing external frames of reference when assessing the creative product has been erroneously applied to understand the creative mind". However, these metrics or methods (with external frames of reference) measure the result of the creative act, not the creative mind/act. Therefore, I think it is important to distinguish these aspects in a new version and to make clear what is being defined: creative idea or creative result? Something else? In addition, there are areas, such as industrial design, where the aim is to generate a novel result for a client, so the external frame of reference is more important than in other contexts. This is why it is important to be clear about what you want to evaluate, and perhaps with a little more elaboration, the article would be clearer.

If the article could include some visual representation showing the universality of its definition, it would be of great help to future readers: showing the level of reference and what each level affects, whether it affects the outcome of the creative act, etc.

I missed some references, such as Sarkar's definition of creativity or the CPSS scale (Besemer & O'Quin), which also includes the surprise factor as one of the elements of novelty. It would also be appropriate to mention that there are indeed studies that use both the internal and external frames of reference to assess the creativity of ideas, as already posted.

Sarkar, P., & Chakrabarti, A. (2011). Assessing design creativity. *Design studies*, 32(4), 348-383.

Besemer, S. P., & O'Quin, K. (1986). Analyzing creative products: Refinement and test of a judging instrument. *Journal of Creative Behavior*, 20, 115-126