

Review of: "Is creativity the seed of innovation?"

Dian Prihadyanti

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

This article aims to explore the relationship between creativity and innovation performed at universities with the aid of technology transfer offices. It is an interesting topic and has great potential to provide theoretical and practical contributions. This article also has the potential to create/build awareness and make an investment in developing, retaining, maintaining, managing, and developing/boosting creativity. To harness the potential and bring more sound of novelty, I think several improvements and adjustments need to be considered.

First, it would be better to write an introduction section to justify that this article is unique compared to the available literature. This section should also explain why it is necessary to determine whether creativity is just the initial step of innovation and the need to understand that it occurs in all stages of an innovation process. It is also important to state and relate it to the importance of performing innovation at universities concerning technology transfer offices.

Second, to create uniqueness, it would be more appropriate to describe the innovation process based on the analogy from a 'biology/botany perspective.' Based on the title, of which creativity is considered the seed (of innovation), it would be more interesting to show the process of the seeds from the "undeveloped plant embryo" further growing to sprout, and so on until it grows to be a plant with leaves, branch, and even fruitful which can be considered a form of innovation.

Sometimes, the seeds' quality and characteristics may determine the resulting fruit's quality. The seeds must live in an ecosystem (which in this article may occur in the form of university/technology transfer offices), needing air, water, soil, fertilizer, nutrition, etc., which are needed for growth. Sometimes during growth also face difficulties from pests/bugs or any kind of 'interruption' from the environment/ecosystem. Making an analogy to such a process may clearly show the dynamics of the process and improve the Three I's Innovation Model, which I think is too general and has not yet provided appropriate context to answer the purpose. Adapting, elaborating, and synthesizing concepts from additional literature (especially the most recent ones) may help to achieve it.

Third, it would be more interesting to provide comparisons and discussions to other innovation process models (with particular intention and relation to creativity) and comparisons to different contexts or 'innovation environments' other than university/technology transfer offices. Finally, overall improvement should lead to a change in the abstract, which should describe more unique points based on the synthesized results to make the section more attractive as it becomes the first impression of this article for the reader. Providing additional subtitles/subsections may also improve the clarity of the flow of this article. The conclusion section should elaborate and synthesize the results to better answer the purpose of this article. That is all from me. Thank you for the opportunity to review this article.