



EUROPEAN JOURNAL OF
EDUCATIONAL SCIENCES (EJES)

Paper: **“Creativity and Academic Achievement: A Meta-Analysis”**

Submitted: 05 April 2023

Accepted: 18 August 2023

Published: 31 October 2023

Corresponding Author: Ugur Akpur

Doi: 10.19044/ejes.v10no2a207

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Luka Pongracic

University of Slavonski Brod, Croatia

Reviewer 2: Blinded

EJES Manuscript Evaluation Form 2023

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: EJES promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.

EJES editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands EJES out from the crowd!

Date Manuscript Received: 6.7.2023.	Date Review Report Submitted: 17.7.2023.
Manuscript Title: Creativity and Academic Achievement: A Meta-Analysis Study Article	
Manuscript Number:	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: <u>Yes</u> /No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: <u>Yes</u> /No	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: <u>Yes</u> /No	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

Questions	Rating Result [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	4
The title of the article is clear and corresponds to what the article is about. The word "Article" should be removed from the title because it is redundant.	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	2

What is written in the abstract is clear and partially corresponds to the content of the article. The summary does not mention any link between creativity and academic achievement. Research methods are sufficiently described. The summary does not say anything about the results. The current content of the summary should be shortened and the main link between creativity and academic achievement should be stated in it, and at the end, the most important result obtained from the conducted meta-analysis should be stated.	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	5
There are no significant grammatical errors in the article. It is necessary to harmonize the writing of decimal numbers, because in some parts they are written with a period, and in others with a comma.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
The working methods are described and explained in sufficient detail. It is clear what analysis was done and what procedures were used. Everything is supported by relevant literature.	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	3
It is necessary to separate the titles discussion and conclusions. In the article, it should be clear what is the discussion and what is the author's conclusion. The scientific contribution of this article should be more visible. In this way, this article has practically no conclusion. The last paragraph of the article can also be placed before the conclusion with the subtitle "study limitations". It is necessary to write a complete and scientifically valid conclusion.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	1
It is necessary to write a conclusion that will highlight the purpose and results of the conducted meta-analysis.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
The references are very comprehensive and are totally appropriate.	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	
Return for major revision and resubmission	X
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

It is necessary to correct the summary and write the conclusion according to the previously mentioned instructions. Finally, it is necessary to state the scientific contribution of the conducted meta-analysis. When shaped like this, the article will offer a significant scientific contribution.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

I do not propose the article in this form for publication. It is necessary to make major changes in the summary and write a conclusion. Then this article will be favorable for publication and offer a significant scientific contribution. It should be returned for revision after the author has made changes.



**EUROPEAN JOURNAL OF
EDUCATIONAL SCIENCES (EJES)**