Paper: **"Examination of Prospective Science Teachers' Content Knowledge on Image in Plane Mirrors in Terms of Their Approaches to Error"**

Corresponding Author: Salih Degirmenci

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Blinded
Reviewer 2: Blinded

EJES Manuscript Evaluation Form 2022

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: EJES 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.

EJES editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands EJES out from the crowd!

Date Manuscript Received: 12.03.2023	Date Review Report Submitted: 03.04.2023
Manuscript Title: Examination of Prospective Science Teachers' Content Knowledge on Image in Plane Mirrors in Terms of Their Approaches to Error	
Manuscript Number:	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes/No No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes/No No 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	*Rating Result* [Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	5
(Please insert your comments)	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	5
(Please insert your comments)	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
The corrections to be made about the article's grammar are shown in the draft and will also be examined.	

4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
(Please insert your comments)	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	5
(Please insert your comments)	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
Mainly the discussion and conclusion section, the findings were discussed in detail and fluently.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
(Please insert your comments)	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):
Parts of the article were clear and understandable. The findings have been discussed successfully.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: