

Paper: “On Relations between Creativity, Innovation, and Quality Management Culture in Europe as a Response to Crisis and Post-crisis Period”

Submitted: 14 September 2022

Accepted: 10 January 2023

Published: 31 January 2023

Corresponding Author: Enriko Ceko

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2023.v19n1p50](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2023.v19n1p50)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Luca Scaini
Al Akhawayn University, Morocco

Reviewer 2: Brian Sloboda
University of Maryland, USA

Reviewer 3: Blinded

Reviewer 4: Blinded

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2022

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: ESJ 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.

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

Reviewer Name: Luca Scaini	
University/Country: Italy (sabbatic year)	
Date Manuscript Received: 20.12.2022	Date Review Report Submitted: 21.12.2022
Manuscript Title: ON RELATIONS BETWEEN CREATIVITY, INNOVATION, AND QUALITY MANAGEMENT CULTURE IN EUROPE AS A RESPONSE TO CRISIS AND POST-CRISIS PERIOD	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 106.09.22	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes	
You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes	

Evaluation Criteria:

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

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	2

<i>Not clear, potential language issues</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3
<i>The value should outline how this exploration is actually and practically encouraging further researches. It is not clear the practical or industrial value.</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>Almost correct</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
<i>Academically speaking, there are several parts of the paper that state something that is unsupported, hence very questionable. The bibliography and citations are not appropriate. For example, the opening quote of the introduction, like many more cases.</i> <i>Methodologically speaking, the methods of research are clear, but it seems hard to work following the flux of ideas without any appropriate hypothesis-based method, which I advise to use.</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>No errors and clear.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	1
<i>Not really appropriate or satisfying. Conclusions are so short that it seems like that there not a clear idea of what was concluded, discovered, or any robust consequence. Any application result vague. limitations are in the wrong place, they should have a place in the next paragraph.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	2
<i>Very comprehensive, but there is an evident mismatching between the bibliography and the in-text references. They should be split between general sources and bibliography, because more than 75% of them find no place in the text, and appear like being written to make the paper more robust than it is.</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Accepted, minor revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Return for major revision and resubmission	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reject	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

I am humbly suggesting a major revision of:

1. use of sources and related citations

2. a robust revision and full reconsideration of the conclusions/demonstration, which parts seem reaching nothing clear
3. Consider the use of hypothesis

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2022

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: ESJ 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.

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

Date Manuscript Received: 20/12/2022	Date Review Report Submitted: 31/12/2022
Manuscript Title: ON RELATIONS BETWEEN CREATIVITY, INNOVATION, AND QUALITY MANAGEMENT CULTURE IN EUROPE AS A RESPONSE TO CRISIS AND POST-CRISIS PERIOD	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 09106/22	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: No	
You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes	

Evaluation Criteria:

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

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	3
The title is clear and reflects the essence of the paper.	

2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
The abstract is well structured. It clearly presents the purpose, methodology adopted and findings of the research.	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
The body of the paper is well structured. However, there are some grammatical errors that needs to be corrected starting from the introduction.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
The study methodology was well explained	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
The results are clear and easy to understand.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
The conclusions and recommendations are supported by the findings of the research.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	1
The reference style needs to be consistent. Your in-text and your reference list citations should follow the same citation style, for example if it is APA style it should be APA style all the way.	
There are articles listed in the reference section that are not mentioned in the body of the paper. Also, there are articles cited in the body of the article but not on the reference list.	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

The author should take some time to review this paper ensuring that grammatical errors are corrected. Overall, this is a well presented research paper. The author has done a good job and committed reasonable time in conducting the research, analyzing and presenting the findings.

The author should ensure that the referencing style is consistent. Articles mentioned in the body of the paper should be listed under the reference section and vice versa.

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2022

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: ESJ 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.

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

Reviewer Name: Brian W. Sloboda	
University/Country: University of Maryland, Global Campus	
Date Manuscript Received:	Date Review Report Submitted: January 8, 2023
Manuscript Title: ON RELATIONS BETWEEN CREATIVITY, INNOVATION, AND QUALITY MANAGEMENT CULTURE IN EUROPE AS A RESPONSE TO CRISIS AND POST-CRISIS PERIOD	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 106-09-2022	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes/No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes/No	
You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes/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.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	5

The current title for this paper is fine.	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	5
The abstract for this paper is good. The structure of the abstract is logical	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<p>Yes there are grammatical errors in the paper. From what I can see, there are no spelling mistakes in the paper. Do not use contractions in scholarly writing. Also for the citations in the paper, there should be a comma after the surname, not a period. Some of the citations did not have any punctuation. Here are more specific comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • On page 2, Already more over-65s there are in Asia than people in the USA. Should be rewritten as Already more over-65s in Asia than people in the United States. • Under subsection 1.4, after OECD should be the year in parentheses and remove about 35 years ago. • Remove James from the citation (Utterback, James, 1971) • In the last paragraph of subsection 1.4, take out the word crisis • et al not et Al 	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<p>In the first sentence of the paper, factors of production are land, labor, and capital. What about entrepreneurial methods?</p> <p>Under subsection 1.2, there are five factors of production listed wouldn't innovation and entrepreneurship be considered as one factor of production?</p> <p>The study methods in this paper is explained clearly. Instead of doing a regression, would it be better just to calculate the correlations?</p>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<p>The empirical results seem plausible for each of the cases presented in this paper. Here are some specific comments on the empirical results:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Security level should be replaced with significance level. • Make sure that the 0 and 1 in the null and alternative hypotheses are subscripted • Are the standard errors in the regressions results robust standard errors? • In each of the tables, there is a duplication of the Lower 95% and Upper 95%. Remove the duplicated items. • What does the coefficient mean in each of the tables? Wouldn't these coefficients be the values of the correlation coefficient? • Under the Innv. Index, the .7965% should be rewritten as 79.65% • Under the Creativity Index table, 0.58% should be rewritten as 58.0% 	

6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
The conclusions are presented well and summarized this research. What are some avenues for future research?	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	
The references are comprehensive and appropriate for this paper.	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Accepted, minor revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Return for major revision and resubmission	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reject	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: