

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Research and Reviews in Physics</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJR2P_123793
Title of the Manuscript:	Conceptual coherence and dominant misconceptions in the concept of force among higher education students: The administration of Force Concept Inventory
Type of the Article	

#### **General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

#### **Important Policies Regarding Peer Review**

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

### Review Form 3

#### **PART 1:** Review Comments

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The article is appropriate and a good idea, but it needs fundamental reforms	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	yes	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	A clearer conclusion should be presented in the abstract and the innovative idea of the article should be expressed	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The wording needs to be edited and needs to be checked by the editor	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	It is suitable	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	It is suitable	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	The article is appropriate and a good idea, but it needs fundamental reforms	

#### **PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

#### **Reviewer Details:**

Name:	Elias Mazrooie Rad
Department, University & Country	Khavaran Institute of Higher Education, Iran