REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: IJAR-56249

Title: Indian Knowledge Systems in Modern Classrooms: A Comparative Analysis of Student Perception in Government and Private Secondary Schools.

Recommendation:

Accept as it is ……………………………

Accept after minor revision………………

<mark>Accept after major revision ………………</mark>

Do not accept (*Reasons below*) ………

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

Reviewer Name: Dr. Sukhvinder Singh

Detailed Reviewer's Report

Detailed Reviewer's Report

Major Weaknesses (Requiring Substantial Revision):

Methodology-Presentation Mismatch (Critical Flaw): This is the most significant weakness.

Vague Methodology: The methodology section is underdeveloped. It states a "mixed-method approach" was employed with 200 students, 10 teachers, and classroom observations. However, it lacks crucial details: How were the schools/sample selected beyond "stratified random sampling"? What were the specific questions in the "structured questionnaire"? What were the protocols for the "in-depth interviews" and "classroom observations"?

Missing Results: The paper fails to present the primary data from this study. There are no tables or figures showing the descriptive statistics from the student survey (e.g., mean scores on awareness, standard deviations). No quotes or themes from the teacher/student interviews are presented to support the qualitative findings. The only original data appears in **Table 4 (Page 16)**, which provides percentages for awareness and engagement.

Over-Reliance on Secondary Sources: The bulk of the analysis in sections like "Current Status of IKS Integration…" (Page 8 onwards) relies heavily on hypotheticals ("This structural advantage suggests…") and citations of other studies (e.g., Sharma & Kumar, 2025; Vageeshan & Kamalakar, 2025). It reads as a literature review of what *might* be happening, rather than a presentation of what the authors' own study *found*. The "Comparative Analysis" section (Page 12) explicitly states "direct comparative data… is limited in the provided information," which is a startling admission for a paper claiming to conduct such an analysis.

Structural and Organizational Issues:

International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Lack of Clear IMRaD Structure: The paper does not follow the standard Introduction, Methods, Results, and Discussion (IMRaD) format. Policy frameworks and literature review are interwoven throughout the early sections, and the actual results are not clearly demarcated.

Repetitive Content: Several paragraphs and concepts are repeated verbatim (e.g., the explanation of student perception surveys and the need for mixed-methods appears on both Page 11 and Page 12). This suggests a lack of final editing.

Incoherent Flow: The paper jumps from policy analysis to hypothetical benefits to a discussion on mental growth and IQ (Page 13), which, while interesting, feels disconnected from the core comparative analysis of perception.

Inadequate Data Presentation and Analysis:

A Single Source of Truth: As noted, only Table 4 presents comparative data. The paper would be vastly improved by including more tables showing the survey results for each question, broken down by school type.

Unsupported Claims: Statements like "Private school students linked IKS with health, sustainability, and stress management" (Table 4) are presented as findings, but with no supporting data (e.g., "55% of private school students agreed that IKS helps with stress management, compared to 20% in government schools").

The "Mental Growth and IQ" Section: The inclusion of Table 3 and its interpretation is problematic. The paper does not explain how "IQ" or "Emotional and Moral Growth" were measured. This appears to be a conceptual framework (the IKS lens) applied speculatively, not an empirical finding of the study. It confuses the study's analytical framework with its results.

Scholarly Presentation and Errors:

References: The reference list is extensive but poorly formatted and contains numerous inconsistencies and errors (e.g., repeated entries, incomplete URLs, mixing of APA styles). For example, references 11 and 14 appear to be the same paper.

Table Formatting: Table 1 on Page 7 is poorly formatted with "&" in the text, indicating a copying error. Table 2 is split across pages with a stray "1" on Page 10.

Unsubstantiated Claims: The statement in the abstract, "Current data suggests that overall student awareness... remains moderate across demographics," is not supported by any data presented in the paper until Table 4 on Page 16. The "moderate" claim is qualitative and needs numerical backing.

Specific Recommendations for Major Revision:

Restructure the Paper: Adopt a clear IMRaD format.

Introduction: Briefly introduce the topic, state the research gap, and clearly articulate the study's aims and research questions.

Literature Review: Consolidate the policy and theoretical discussions (IKS, NEP 2020, NCF-SE) into a dedicated section that leads to the formulation of research questions.

Methodology: Rewrite this section in detail. Describe the sample selection, the exact composition of the questionnaire (with Likert scales, etc.), the protocols for interviews and observations, and the methods of analysis (e.g., thematic analysis for qualitative data).

Results: Present the findings of the study. Start with descriptive statistics of the sample. Use tables to show the quantitative survey results (e.g., mean awareness scores, percentage agreement on relevance questions), comparing government and private schools. Then, present the qualitative findings, using anonymized quotes from students and teachers to illustrate key themes.

Discussion: Interpret the results in the context of the literature and policy. Why do the observed differences exist? How do the findings support or contradict previous research? Discuss the implications of the "Mental Growth" framework as an analytical lens, not as a result.

International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

www.journalijar.com

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Conclusion & Recommendations: Summarize the key findings and offer recommendations based *specifically* on the study's evidence.

Integrate Primary Data: Remove speculative language ("suggests," "might") and replace it with evidence from the study. For example, instead of "Private schools… might exhibit more positive attitudes," state "The survey data revealed that 60% of private school students reported active participation in IKS activities, compared to 35% in government schools (see Table 4), indicating a higher level of engagement."

Revise for Clarity and Conciseness: Edit the manuscript to remove repetitions and ensure a logical flow of ideas. Proofread carefully to correct grammatical errors and formatting issues in the text and tables.

Clean Up References: **Thoroughly review and correct all references according to a consistent, standard format (e.g., APA 7th edition). Remove duplicate entire**

.