

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

Telma Santos¹

¹ Universidade de Evora

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The thematics of the paper are really interesting, and it is written in a way that engages different types of readers from different fields of expertise, which is satisfying.

There are two points in this paper that I propose clarifying:

1. In page 7, the author writes that the new definition - "a creative idea is one that is both novel and satisfying" – offers researchers the possibility of using internal frames of reference (generator/creator), external frames of reference (receptor), or both, allowing researchers to understand creative processes better. This means that it can be used only from the perspective of external frames of reference. In page 9, the author affirms that the first implication of the new definition is the "recognition that the perspective of the creator must necessarily be considered when examining their creative process", which may seem incoherent. In fact, even if the researcher is only interested in external frames of reference, it is difficult to not take into account at least some information on how satisfying it is for the generator/creator, but I propose the author to clarify this point, highlighting the impossibility of not considering some information on internal frames of reference, or changing the conclusion and not using "necessarily" when referring to the perspective of the creator.
2. In page 9, the author writes "some have proposed giving up on the prospect altogether by rendering creativity to be indefinable", referring to Paul J. Silvia in *The Nature of Human Creativity*, which I believe is not accurate. The author refers to the difficulty of considering a fixed and closed definition for a human endeavor that is complex and layered: creativity. To grasp a hard concept and study the complexity of its nature does not mean that it is indefinable in the sense of giving up; instead, it asks researchers to take into account its complexity.

I also want to point out that it would be interesting to consider the use of Interpretative Phenomenological Analysis (IPA) as a way to make sense of creators' perspectives when researching a creative idea, and also to highlight differences between definitions. It allows researchers to grasp this new definition in different fields and even to understand how creators make sense of different definitions. Many researchers have been using IPA to understand creativity and its relationship with artistic creation and mental health, and this new definition opens new possibilities in this direction.