

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: IJAR-54465

Title: UNIFORM ASSESSMENT OF SKILLS IN PHYSICAL EDUCATION AND SPORTS IN SECONDARY SCHOOLS IN BENIN: TOWARDS A UNIFORM AND OBJECTIVE SUMMATIVE ASSESSMENT MODEL

Recommendation:

Accept after major revision

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

Reviewer Name: Dr Lastri Wahyuni Manurung

Detailed Reviewer's Report

The article has potential value and addresses an important educational issue. However, it requires major revision in:

1. Methodological clarity
2. Structural coherence (Results/Discussion separation)
3. Language refinement
4. Proper citation formatting

Once these major issues are revised, the manuscript could make a meaningful contribution to research on standardized assessment in PE in African contexts.

Major Comments

1. Clarity of Research Problem and Objectives
 - a. Lines 63–81: The “State of the problem” section repeats ideas already presented in the introduction. It should more sharply define *why* the current PE assessment lacks objectivity and how this research fills the gap.
 - b. *Suggestion*: Condense redundant background and highlight the novelty of the proposed model.
2. Research Questions and Hypotheses
 - a. Lines 85–104: The research questions and assumptions are too general and descriptive. They do not clearly show the *expected relationship* between variables or constructs.
 - b. *Suggestion*: Reformulate into testable hypotheses or analytical objectives that connect directly to the methodology.
3. Methodological Coherence
 - a. Lines 105–189: The methodology section is lengthy but lacks clarity on research design type (qualitative, quantitative, or mixed methods). The sampling method (“non-probability”) is stated, but justification and validity are missing.

International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

www.journalijar.com

REVIEWER'S REPORT

- b. *Suggestion:*
 - Explicitly state research design type and rationale.
 - Explain how the validity and reliability of instruments were ensured.
 - Include ethical considerations (consent, approval, data protection).
4. Data Analysis and Presentation
 - a. Lines 190–213 & 254–286: The presentation of results in Tables 3 and 4 is overly detailed but lacks narrative interpretation. The tables are not self-explanatory and contain inconsistent labeling (“Êts” / “Ets”).
 - b. *Suggestion:*
 - Simplify or summarize results into key findings.
 - Use clearer legends and consistent terminology.
 - Discuss the implications of each table more deeply rather than describing cell content.
5. Theoretical Framework Integration
 - a. Lines 10–15: The study refers to four theoretical models but does not clearly explain *how* they were operationalized in the analysis.
 - b. *Suggestion:* Create a sub-section explaining how each theory contributed to the assessment model design and data interpretation.
6. Language and Style
 - a. The manuscript contains many grammatical issues and literal translations from French that affect clarity (e.g., “Première class,” “tools conforming to prescribed formats”).
 - b. *Suggestion:* A full English language editing by a professional or native speaker is essential for publication.
7. Results Interpretation and Discussion
 - a. Lines 214–286: The section blends result and discussion but lacks analytical depth. It should connect findings back to the literature and theoretical models.
 - b. *Suggestion:* Separate Results and Discussion clearly, integrating theoretical implications and previous studies’ support or contrast.
8. Conclusion Section
 - a. Lines 288–298: The conclusion mostly repeats findings without indicating practical recommendations or limitations.
 - b. *Suggestion:*
 - Add 2–3 specific recommendations for policy or practice.
 - Identify limitations and potential areas for future research.
9. References and Citations
 - a. Lines 299–366: Several references are incomplete, inconsistently formatted, and not aligned with the IJAR citation style (APA 7th). Some are duplicated (Artigue 1988 / 1990 / 1992).
 - b. *Suggestion:*
 - Check for consistency in formatting and years.
 - Verify DOIs and reference accuracy.
 - Ensure all in-text citations appear in the reference list.