

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: IJAR-**54928**

Title: *Implementation of NEP 2020 and the RPwD Act (2016) in Promoting Inclusive Sports in India*

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. Anam Zehra**

Reviewer's Comment for Publication.

A well-articulated, policy-focused manuscript that critically examines the convergence between NEP 2020 and the Rights of Persons with Disabilities Act (2016) in strengthening inclusive sports in India. The paper offers a strong conceptual base, uses credible national and international policy references, and provides a coherent discussion connecting legal mandates, institutional mechanisms, and programme-level implementation. The inclusion of Khelo India, SAI, PCI, and other schemes enriches the argument and enhances practical relevance. Some sections, particularly the literature integration and programme descriptions, can be condensed for improved flow. Minor formatting, sequencing, and citation consistency issues should be addressed.

Recommendation: Accept after minor revision.

Detailed Reviewer's Report

STRENGTHS

1. Provides a strong conceptual and policy-based examination of inclusive sports, effectively linking NEP 2020 and the RPwD Act (2016).
2. Integrates national schemes (Khelo India, SAI initiatives, PCI) comprehensively, demonstrating multi-level institutional convergence.
3. Uses updated and credible references, including Government of India reports, UN documents, and peer-reviewed sources, enhancing scholarly rigor.

International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

www.journalijar.com

REVIEWER'S REPORT

4. Clearly identifies strengths, gaps, and implementation challenges, allowing for nuanced interpretation of policy execution.
5. Recommendations are specific, actionable, and aligned with adaptive physical education, accessibility audits, and teacher capacity-building.

WEAKNESSES

1. Some policy descriptions (especially NEP and RPwD provisions) are repeated across sections and can be streamlined to reduce redundancy.
2. Implementation pathways occasionally read descriptive rather than analytical; deeper critical commentary would strengthen academic depth.
3. A few paragraphs are very dense and would benefit from clearer sub-thematic breaks.
4. Formatting inconsistencies in section numbering, spacing, and table alignment should be corrected for publication readiness.
5. The conclusion is comprehensive but slightly lengthy; condensing would enhance clarity and focus.