

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: **IJAR-55356**

Date: **22/12/2025**

TITLE: Enhancing Employability through NEP 2020 Integrating Skill Development in India's 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. Touseef Malik**

Date: **24/12/2025**

Reviewer's Comment for Publication:

The manuscript presents a clear, policy-relevant overview of how NEP 2020 can enhance employability through vocational integration, multidisciplinary learning, and soft-skill development. However, it requires major revision due to policy terminology inaccuracies, the absence of a clear methodology or evidence base, and limited analytical depth on implementation and measurable outcomes. With corrected terminology, stronger sourcing, and a more rigorous analytical framework, it could be considered for publication.

Recommendation: Accept after Major Revision

Detailed Reviewer's Report

Strengths

1. The manuscript addresses a highly policy-relevant theme: how NEP 2020 can strengthen graduate employability by embedding skill development within mainstream education.
2. The structure is clear and logically sequenced (vocational education, multidisciplinary learning, soft skills, implementation challenges, expected impact), which improves readability.
3. It captures key NEP-aligned levers in a straightforward manner—early vocational exposure, reduced stigma around vocational tracks, and alignment of curriculum with labor-market needs.
4. The emphasis on soft skills (communication, teamwork, adaptability) alongside technical competence reflects contemporary employability discourse and employer expectations.

International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

www.journalijar.com

REVIEWER'S REPORT

5. The paper acknowledges implementation constraints (infrastructure, trained educators, industry partnerships) and proposes broad solution directions (teacher training, labs, stakeholder coordination).

Weaknesses

1. Conceptual and terminology errors undermine credibility: the text incorrectly expands NEP as “New Economic Policy” and “National Environmental Policy” in places, which is a serious accuracy issue for a policy-focused article.
2. The piece is largely descriptive and does not present a defined research method (no review protocol, data sources, analytic framework, or empirical evidence), limiting its academic contribution.
3. Several claims are asserted without adequate substantiation or specificity (e.g., projections and broad impact statements), and would benefit from authoritative policy citations and/or data.
4. The discussion lacks a nuanced treatment of implementation realities (financing, governance capacity, teacher supply constraints, state-level variability, assessment reforms, industry absorption) and associated risks/trade-offs.
5. The references list appears uneven in credibility and verification; the paper would be stronger with more primary sources (official NEP documents, government/NSDC reports, NSSO/PLFS labor data, World Bank/UNESCO evidence) and tighter source quality control.