

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

Arne Dietrich¹

¹ American University of Beirut

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Review for Qeios (Abraham)

Title: Why the Standard Definition of Creativity Fails to Capture the Creative Act.

The manuscript makes two important points. The first is transmitted in the title. The second is an alternative definition. The paper is useful and, as expected from this author, thorough in the treatment of the subject matter. Both points are welcomed.

The critique on the current dominant use of the external frame in assessing the creative mind is devastating. If the author thinks that this means that we can toss out just about the entire literature on the neuroscience of creativity, which uses the external frame to make suppositions about the internal working of the mind of the creator, I recommend that the author states so explicitly.

I think it might also be good to differentiate more clearly the use of an internal frame from introspection. The internal frame is the judgement about the creativity of the product (by the creator), not the creator's guesswork about how s/he did it. Given that it is well known that we have no direct insight into our own minds, and given how common in the literature the practice is of asking creators how they think they did it, it would be good to devote some space in the manuscript to make this clear.

Lastly, I'd like to see the author elaborate a bit on the inclusion of "surprise" in the definition, especially how it is addressed in the author's use of "satisfying". Boden's inclusion is now very much in use. The US Patent and Trademark Office, for instance, uses it to assess creativity, as it demands a "non-obvious step" in the discovery process before a patent is granted. Simonton (2013), along with Tsao et al. (2019), even make surprise the overwhelming determinant of what counts as creativity. By taking creativity to be inversely related to sightedness (less surprise) or related to implausibility (more surprise), they seem to want to exclude from creativity the products that don't shock anyone (including the creators themselves). It would eliminate from creativity, for instance, the discoveries of radium and polonium by Curie (which the author uses as an example), as she expected both elements to exist before looking for them.

Simonton, D. K. (2013). Creative thought as blind variation and selective retention: Why creativity is inversely related to sightedness. *Journal of Theoretical and Philosophical Psychology*, 33(4), 253–266.

Tsao, J. Y., Ting, C. L., & Johnson, C. M. (2019). Creative outcome as implausible utility. *Review of General Psychology*,

23(3), 279–292.