

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No. IJAR-55072

Title: Impact of NEP 2020 on Teacher Education in India: Implementation Challenges and Opportunities

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.

This manuscript provides a comprehensive literature-based analysis of the transformative effects of NEP 2020 on teacher education in India. It explores structural, pedagogical, and professional reforms while identifying implementation challenges and emerging opportunities. The topic is timely and academically relevant, particularly as NEP 2020 continues to reshape teacher preparation frameworks nationwide. The paper is well-organized, draws from updated secondary literature (2022–2025), and offers a balanced understanding of policy intentions versus institutional realities. However, methodological explanation lacks specificity, some sections (particularly *Discussion* and *Findings*) are overly long and repetitive, and the analysis would benefit from stronger synthesis across reviewed studies to avoid descriptive summarization. Overall, the manuscript is strong but requires refinement to improve academic rigor, conciseness, and analytical depth.

Recommendation: Accept after minor revision

Detailed Reviewer's Report

STRENGTHS

1. **The manuscript focuses on a nationally significant policy reform**, providing timely academic insight into how NEP 2020 reshapes teacher education and contributes meaningfully to policy and institutional discussions.

International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

www.journalijar.com

REVIEWER'S REPORT

2. **The literature review demonstrates comprehensive and up-to-date coverage**, drawing from multiple peer-reviewed studies, institutional reports, and policy documents that collectively strengthen the conceptual foundation of the paper.
3. **The paper clearly explains major reform components**, including the four-year integrated B.Ed., CPD requirements, digital pedagogy, and multidisciplinary restructuring, enabling readers to grasp the depth of NEP-mandated changes.
4. **The author offers a balanced analysis of challenges and opportunities**, effectively contrasting policy vision with ground-level barriers such as infrastructural deficits, faculty shortages, and uneven implementation across states.
5. **The manuscript is logically structured and written in a coherent academic tone**, with well-defined objectives, methodology, discussion, and concluding remarks that support readability and conceptual flow.

WEAKNESSES

1. **The methodology section lacks a detailed explanation**, particularly regarding criteria for selecting literature, analytical frameworks adopted, and procedures for ensuring reliability in synthesising secondary data.
2. **Some sections, especially the introduction and discussion, are overly lengthy**, containing repetitive explanations that should be condensed for improved clarity, focus, and academic precision.
3. **The analysis relies heavily on descriptive summaries**, without adequately integrating or comparing findings across studies to develop stronger thematic connections and interpretative insights.
4. **The absence of primary empirical data limits contextual depth**, and the manuscript would benefit from explicitly acknowledging how this restricts its ability to capture real-time implementation realities in TEIs.
5. **The conclusion repeats earlier content instead of offering a crisp synthesis**, and it does not sufficiently highlight limitations, policy implications, or future research directions that would enhance the paper's scholarly impact.