

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<b>Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AJESS_122532</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Navigating the way through some Innovative Assessment Techniques in line with India's National Educational Policy-2020</b>
Type of the Article	

## Review Form 3

### PART 1: Review Comments

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments		<b>Author's Feedback</b> (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p><b>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b></p>	<p>The manuscript underscores the significance of India's latest educational policy in the context of global trends that prioritize critical thinking and student-centered learning. By aligning with contemporary educational practices and policies, the innovative assessment techniques is expected to enhance student engagement and understanding. Furthermore, the manuscript addresses the challenges posed by traditional assessment methods, providing a critical lens on their limitations. By detailing various innovative assessment strategies, this work contributes valuable insights to the scientific community, promoting discussions on effective educational practices and their implications for future research and policy development.</p>	
<p><b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b></p>	<p>Yes, it is suitable . However, if open for another suggestion, considered the following: "Innovative Assessment Practices Aligned with India's National Educational Policy-2020"</p>	
<p><b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</b></p>	<p>The abstract is acceptable; however, I noticed that the methodology and articulation of the findings are missing.</p>	
<p><b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p>	<p>I recommend implementing a clearer structure that includes an introduction, methodology, findings, conclusion, and recommendations. Additionally, it would be beneficial to incorporate more defined subsections. For instance, the section detailing the Innovation Assessment Technique, which occupies a significant portion of the document from pages 7 to 20, could be reorganized and reworded for better clarity.</p>	
<p><b>Please write a few sentences about the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b></p>	<p>The technical aspects are satisfactory, as the content is clear and free of jargon, with references. However, I believe it would enhance the scientific accuracy if the alignment of the innovative assessment techniques to the NEP-2020 were better articulated, supported by justifications and evidence that include data and analysis methods.</p>	
<p><b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b></p>	<p>Yes, there are sufficient references, including recent citations.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p><b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>Yes it is satisfactory.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>The manuscript contains valuable information that could serve as a foundation for other researchers in the field. However, it tends to be more descriptive and would benefit from the inclusion of a methodology section, clearer clarification of the findings, and suggestions for further research. For instance, it could propose longitudinal studies that investigate the long-term impact of these innovative assessments on student outcomes, or comparative studies between traditional and innovative assessment methods.</p>	

**Review Form 3**

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <i>(if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Tedros Samuel</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Binary University of Malaysia, Malaysia</b>