

## REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: IJAR-54994

**Title:** ITEP: A Revolution in Indian Education System

### 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.

The manuscript offers a descriptive overview of the Integrated Teacher Education Programme (ITEP) and positions it within the broader context of the National Education Policy (NEP) 2020. Although the topic is timely and relevant to ongoing educational reforms in India, the paper remains predominantly narrative, includes repetitive content, and lacks sufficient academic depth, theoretical engagement, and empirical support. Substantial improvements in structure, clarity, and overall scholarly rigor are necessary.

**Recommendation:** Accept after minor revision.

## Detailed Reviewer's Report

### STRENGTHS

1. The manuscript discusses a significant reform initiative, ITEP, central to India's teacher education restructuring under NEP 2020, giving it strong national relevance.
2. It provides a clear descriptive overview of ITEP's objectives, features, and benefits, helping readers gain a foundational understanding of the programme.
3. Background on earlier National Education Policies (1968–2020) adds useful historical context for understanding the evolution of educational reforms.
4. Key NEP 2020 elements, access, equity, quality, affordability, ECCE, and the 5+3+3+4 structure, are effectively connected to ITEP's purpose.

# International Journal of Advanced Research

**Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP**

*www.journalijar.com*

---

## **REVIEWER'S REPORT**

5. The simple and accessible language makes the manuscript suitable for students and general readers seeking introductory knowledge.

## **WEAKNESSES**

1. The manuscript contains repeated paragraphs in sections like Introduction and Objectives, which reduces clarity and academic coherence.
2. It lacks theoretical, conceptual, and analytical depth, relying mostly on descriptive narration with limited scholarly engagement.
3. No empirical or methodological support is provided, leaving the claims without evidence or data-based justification.
4. Some sections are poorly structured, overly broad, and drift away from ITEP's core focus, weakening overall organization.
5. Grammatical errors, formatting issues, and incorrect terminology (e.g., "editor" for "educator") undermine the academic standard.