

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Original Manuscript_AJESS_117818
Title of the Manuscript:	Innovation and Creativity A Way to Construct Knowledge: An Explorative Research among Adolescents
Type of the Article	

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalajess.com/index.php/AJESS/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Compulsory REVISION comments 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	<p>Interest in creativity and innovation is increasing, along with awareness of their importance. To successfully respond to the expansion of the information society and enhance competitiveness in economic and social aspects, it is acknowledged that there is a need to bolster creativity and innovative potential.</p> <p>The article's title is appropriate.</p> <p>The article's abstract is thorough but excessively lengthy. Some sentences may be difficult to comprehend. Should condense and consolidate into a single paragraph.</p> <p>The manuscript's subsections and organisation are suitable.</p> <p>The manuscript is scientifically accurate.</p> <p>The references are adequate but outdated. They should have done so in the last 5 years.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	<p>The article's English quality is appropriate for scholarly communications, while certain sentences may be difficult to comprehend.</p>	
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Supparang Ruangvanich
Department, University & Country	Chandrasakem Rajabhat University, Thailand