

# Paper: "Exploring Interactive Simulations as a Powerful Tool in STEM-PBL Approach in Physics"

Corresponding Author: Mariana Mirela Stanescu

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2020.v16n21p1

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Shaimaa Abdul Salam Abdul Salam Selim, Damietta University

Published: 31.07.2020

## **ESJ** Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020

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: Dr. Shaimaa Abdul Salam Abdul Salam Selim		
University/Country: Damietta University- Egypt		
Date Manuscript Received: 21/5/2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 26/5/2020	
Manuscript Title: Learning physics through interactive simulations		
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0479/20		
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes/No yes, I don't mind		
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes/No yes		
You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes/No 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.

Questions	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] <b>1-5</b> [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	1
The title does not reflect the content of the article.	
What is the relationship between STEM Approach and interactive simulation?	
I hope the article expresses interactive simulation and its relationship to physics education.	

2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	1	
The abstract did not explain the article's purpose, method, results and conclusions.		
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	5	
The style is not bad but there are redundancies and repetit information.	ions of some	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	1	
The material and method not clear and the researcher does not describe well the procedures used to collect data.		
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	5	
not contain errors.		
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	1	
The summary is not clear.		
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4	
The references are pertinent		

### **Overall Recommendation** (mark an X with your recommendation):

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

### **Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

This study focuses on interactive simulation without clarifying its importance in physics education, as well as the relationship of interactive simulation to the STEM entry

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: The topic is timely and will be of interest to the readers of the journal.

But the topic needs more clarification

### **ESJ** Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020

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: Dr. Shaimaa Abdul Salam Abdul Salam Selim	Email:	
University/Country: Damietta University- Egypt		
Date Manuscript Received: 10/6/2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 16/6/2020	
Manuscript Title: Exploring interactive simulations as a powerful tool in STEM- PBL approach in Physics		
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0479/20		
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes/No yes, I don't mind		
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes/No yes You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes/No 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.

Questions	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] <b>1-5</b> [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	5
The title became clear	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	5
The abstract explains the article's purpose, method, results and conclusions.	

<b>3.</b> There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	5	
The style is not bad but there are redundancies and repetit information.	ions of some	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4	
The material and method are clear and the researcher describes well the procedures used to collect data.		
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	5	
not contain errors.		
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4	
The summary is clear.		
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4	
The references are pertinent	•	

### **Overall Recommendation** (mark an X with your recommendation):

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

### **Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

This study focuses on interactive simulation without clarifying its importance in physics education, as well as the relationship of interactive simulation to the STEM entry

#### Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: The topic is timely and will be of interest to the readers of the

journal.