

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: **IJAR-54117**

Date: 29/09/2025

Title: The truth about the world of education in another Dronacharya play.

Recommendation:

Accept as it is

✓Accept after minor revision.....

Accept after major revision

Do not accept (*Reasons below*)

Rating	Excel.	Good	Fair	Poor
Originality		✓		
Techn. Quality			✓	
Clarity			✓	
Significance		✓		

Reviewer Name: **Dr. Touseef Malik**

Date: 30/09/2025

Reviewer's Comment for Publication:

The manuscript critically explores the play *Ek Aur Dronacharya*, which portrays the realities of the Indian education system through a fusion of mythological and contemporary characters. It addresses corruption, commercialization, political interference, and the erosion of ethical values in education. The theme is culturally relevant, thought-provoking, and socially significant. However, the article requires structural refinement, more analytical depth, and broader referencing to enhance its academic value.

Recommendation: Accept after minor revision

Detailed Reviewer's Report

Strengths:

- Cultural Relevance:** Skillfully connects mythological figures like Dronacharya and Ashwatthama with present-day teachers and institutions.
- Moral Dimension:** Highlights the struggles of idealistic teachers facing corruption, pressure, and moral compromise in education.
- Social Significance:** Draws attention to systemic issues such as exam malpractice, political dominance, and teacher exploitation.
- Engaging Narrative:** The metaphorical framework encourages critical reflection on the decline of values in education.
- Originality:** Provides a creative interpretation by using literature as a lens to critique contemporary education.

Weaknesses:

International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

www.journalijar.com

REVIEWER'S REPORT

1. **Structure:** The paper lacks conventional sections (methodology, discussion, conclusion) and reads more like a descriptive essay.
2. **Critical Depth:** The analysis is largely descriptive; stronger theoretical framing would improve academic rigor.
3. **Language:** Some parts are repetitive and lengthy, which affects clarity; more concise expression is needed.
4. **Referencing:** Relies mainly on the text of the play; incorporation of wider scholarly literature would strengthen credibility.
5. **Conclusion:** Needs a sharper synthesis of insights and a clearer statement of scholarly contribution.