

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research and Reviews in Physics
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

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p>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.</p>	<p>The manuscript addresses an important issue in physics education by focusing on conceptual coherence and misconceptions regarding Newtonian mechanics. The use of the Force Concept Inventory (FCI) as a diagnostic tool provides robust data on the cognitive challenges faced by students. This study is particularly significant as it explores educational gaps in Bhutan, a context not widely covered in the existing literature.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The current title, "Conceptual coherence and dominant misconceptions in the concept of force among higher education students: The administration of Force Concept Inventory," is clear and appropriately reflects the content of the manuscript.</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>The abstract provides a concise overview of the research objectives, methodology, and results. However, it could be improved by briefly mentioning the implications of the findings for educators and policymakers, particularly in terms of instructional strategies to address the identified misconceptions.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>The subsections are appropriately structured, with clear delineation between the research background, methodology, results, and discussion. The inclusion of detailed data analysis adds depth to the study. However, the Discussion section could benefit from further elaboration on practical strategies for addressing misconceptions in classroom settings.</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>This manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. The use of the FCI as an evaluation tool is well-established in physics education research, and the analysis of contextual coherence across different student groups is insightful. The findings are supported by relevant literature and are presented clearly.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>The references are sufficient and up to date, reflecting current research in physics education. No additional references are necessary currently.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language is generally clear, but a few sections could be improved for smoother readability. Specifically, some sentences in the introduction and methodology sections are complex and may benefit from simplification.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The manuscript could emphasize more on the implications for curriculum development and teacher training, especially given the unique challenges faced in Bhutan. A future direction for the research could explore the impact of specific interventions aimed at improving conceptual coherence in Newtonian mechanics.</p>	

Review Form 3

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <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:	Mae Anne Migue-Villarosa
Department, University & Country	Eastern Visayas State University- Burauen Campus, Philippines