

International Journal of Sport Studies for Health

Journal Homepage



Evaluation of Design, Governance, and Implementation of Khelo-India University Games Policy: An Assessment through RIDIT

Merajuddin. Faridi¹, Md. Kamran Khan¹, Adnan. Khan^{1*}, Iftikhar Ahmad. Wani², Saddam. Hussain¹

¹ Department of Physical Education, Aligarh Muslim University, Aligarh, India

² Directorate of Physical Education and Sports, University of Kashmir, Srinagar, India

* Corresponding author email address: adnan010khan@gmail.com

Editor

Sajjad Pashaie¹
Assistant Professor, Sport
Marketing Management, University
of Tabriz, Tabriz, Iran
sajjad.pashaie@yahoo.com

Reviewers

Reviewer 1: Yaghob Badriazarin¹
Associate Professor of Sport Sciences, Tabriz University, Tabriz, Iran.
Email: badriazarin@tbzmed.ac.ir
Reviewer 2: Masoud Mirmoezi¹
Department of Physical Education and Sport Sciences, Islamic Azad University,
Central Tehran Branch, Tehran, Iran. Email: massoudmirmoezi@live.com

1. Round 1

1.1 Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

In the sentence “KIUG aims to find and develop athletic talent...”, the authors should clarify whether this aim is explicitly stated in official KIUG policy documents or inferred from secondary sources, and cite accordingly.

The paragraph starting “The KIUG policy represents a pivotal shift...” would benefit from a clear analytical framework, explicitly defining how policy design, governance, and implementation are operationally distinguished in this study.

The rationale for choosing RIDIT analysis over alternative ordinal methods (e.g., ordinal logistic regression or median tests) should be more explicitly justified in relation to the study objectives.

While Table 1 is detailed, the accompanying paragraph focuses mainly on RIDIT category interpretation. Please add a substantive interpretation of what these distributions imply for KIUG policy effectiveness.

The sentence “Ha: Rejected for all items except PDGI-05” should be rephrased for clarity and supplemented with a brief explanation of why PDGI-05 uniquely differed across stakeholder groups.

The ranking of PDGI-15 as lowest is important. Please expand the discussion on why long-term vision perceptions are weak, linking this finding to governance or policy design theory.

The claim “RIDIT analysis unveiled that respondents generally perceive the central government as consultative” appears somewhat inconsistent with PDGI-01’s low rank. Please reconcile this apparent contradiction more explicitly.

Author revised the manuscript and uploaded the updated document.

1.2 Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

While multiple governance sources are cited, the review remains largely descriptive. Please include a critical comparison highlighting gaps in prior KIUG or Indian university sport policy evaluations that this study specifically addresses.

The sentence “Researcher personally administered the questionnaire...” raises concerns about interviewer bias. Please justify this choice and describe any procedural safeguards used to minimize influence on respondents.

The explanation for unequal group sizes is reasonable; however, please discuss how this imbalance might affect statistical power and the comparability of RIDIT scores across stakeholder groups.

The term “mixed-method sampling” is used, but the study itself is quantitative. Consider replacing this with “mixed sampling strategy” or clarifying the terminology to avoid methodological ambiguity.

The manuscript reports Cronbach’s alpha ($\alpha = 0.87$), which is commendable. However, please specify whether this reliability coefficient applies to the entire 15-item scale or to sub-dimensions (policy design, governance, implementation).

The CVR calculation is shown, but the manuscript does not report item-level CVR values. Please clarify whether all items met the minimum Lawshe threshold or if any were revised or removed.

Author revised the manuscript and uploaded the updated document.

2. Revised

Editor’s decision after revisions: Accepted.

Editor in Chief’s decision: Accepted.