

# Predicting Employee Creativity Trajectories Through Longitudinal Deep Learning Models of Motivation and Job Design

Carlos. Méndez Alvarez<sup>1\*</sup>, Arvind Narayanan<sup>2</sup>


<sup>1</sup> Department of Business Administration, University of Barcelona, Barcelona, Spain

<sup>2</sup> Department of Organizational Behaviour and Human Resources, Indian Institute of Management Bangalore, Bangalore, India



\* Corresponding author email address: carlos.mendez@ub.edu

---

## E d i t o r

Mohammed Abdul Imran Khan  
Department of Financial  
Management and Economics,  
Dhofar University, Oman  
mimran@du.edu.om

## R e v i e w e r s

**Reviewer 1:** Mehrdad Bayat  
Assistant Professor, Department of Management, Payam Noor University, Tehran,  
Iran.  
Email: bayatmehrdad60@pnu.ac.ir  
**Reviewer 2:** Abbas Monavarian  
Professor, Management Department, Tehran University, Tehran, Iran.  
Email: amonavar@ut.ac.ir

---

## 1. Round 1

### 1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

The paragraph beginning “Despite these advances, existing empirical approaches remain limited...” identifies methodological shortcomings of prior research. However, the authors should more explicitly specify which empirical traditions (e.g., SEM growth models, multilevel growth modeling) fail and why deep learning offers unique theoretical advantages beyond predictive accuracy.

The manuscript states that “measurement invariance across time was confirmed,” yet no results are reported. Please include the invariance testing procedure, levels tested (configural, metric, scalar), and fit statistics.

The description of the LSTM model lacks sufficient detail for replication. Specify the number of layers, number of units per layer, activation functions, optimizer, learning rate, and number of epochs.

The sentence “Dropout regularization and early stopping procedures were employed” should be expanded to include dropout rates, patience parameters, and stopping criteria.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the new document.

### 1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

The final sentence of the Introduction defines the study's aim. This aim would be strengthened by explicitly stating the theoretical contribution (e.g., refinement of motivational theory, creativity development theory), not only the methodological innovation.

In the paragraph describing the Spanish sample, the manuscript provides demographic information but lacks a substantive justification for selecting Spain as the empirical context. The authors should clarify whether institutional, cultural, or organizational characteristics of Spain are theoretically relevant to creativity development.

The authors report an 89.6% retention rate. However, no analysis is presented to demonstrate whether attrition was systematic or random. Please include an attrition analysis comparing retained vs. dropped participants on key baseline variables.

The paragraph describing the four waves states that six-month intervals were selected to "balance model sensitivity with practical constraints." This explanation is insufficient. The authors should justify this interval with reference to creativity development theory or prior longitudinal creativity research.

The inclusion of variables such as "innovation climate" and "leader support" under job design blurs conceptual boundaries. The authors should justify why these were treated as job design variables rather than contextual moderators.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the new document.

## 2. Revised

Editor's decision after revisions: Accepted.

Editor in Chief's decision: Accepted.