



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Education, Society and Behavioural Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JESBS_48126
Title of the Manuscript:	Improvement of skills in solving physics numerical problems
Type of the Article	

General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	I think the title has to refer to Bhutan, as the paper and study surely do.	
Minor REVISION comments	"24 class nine students" in abstract. What does this mean? What is a "class nine student"? Confusing. It does make me wonder why your bibliography is so dated. Why not use more modern studies, like this one: https://www.mff.cuni.cz/veda/konference/wds/proc/pdf12/WDS12_317_f12_Snetinova.pdf This is from Prague and is very well respected. 2012. Your stuff is rather old.	
Optional/General comments	I think this is a good paper which, with these simple revisions, could significantly improve your conclusions.	

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Alan Garfield
Department, University & Country	University of Dubuque, USA