

CERME12 Guidelines for Reviewers

Paper Submissions

The CERME12 Paper Review Form can be downloaded [here](#). Make a copy and use it for all your Thematic Working Group paper reviews. The following rules apply to all types of paper submissions (for poster proposals, see later in this document).

1. Papers should be about research, significantly related to mathematics and to education, and conform to the aims of CERME (see the [General Information](#) on the website). They should be original: i.e., not have been published previously. Contributions need not be limited to completed research. On-going studies may be submitted, provided that theoretical framework and preliminary results are provided in the text submitted. Papers should be concise (maximum **8** pages in the specified format), but must contain all information necessary to inform both reviewers and other researchers. Two types of papers are suitable for CERME: (A) Reports of studies (involving empirical or developmental research) and (B) Theoretical and philosophical essays.
2. To be accepted, papers should meet the review criteria set out below.
3. Authors are requested to refer to related research presented at previous ERME conferences, as well as other relevant published research. The authors should state what is new in their paper and how it builds on past research, or goes in new directions. Proposals too similar to papers previously published (or to papers previously presented at international conferences) cannot be accepted. Proposals that represent new and significant contributions to research in any aspect of mathematics education are especially welcome.
4. Since all development and research is conducted in a specific theoretical, scientific, and cultural context, the paper should briefly specify its context with an international audience in mind. For instance, while the use of English as a common language is often practical, it also necessitates a certain vigilance to avoid implicit generalization, or suppression, of various local conditions. The reviewer must check that the author(s) make explicit the key assumptions underlying the design of the study and explain why your work is relevant in your cultural context (e.g. pedagogy, research environment).
5. Each participant may propose only **ONE** paper, although a group of authors may propose several papers, each one to be attributed to a different person attending the conference (whose name must be underlined in the paper). Each person can have her/his name underlined at most in one paper **OR** in one poster proposal.
6. Papers accepted for discussion in any group may be considered also for inclusion in the post-conference proceedings. See below for further details.
7. The format of submitted papers must be as specified in the [Guidelines for Authors](#). **Only papers using this format in full will be accepted. The styles in the CERME12 paper template should not be modified.**

Timetable for reviews

CERME12 uses a [submission website](#) managed by ConfTool. The TWG Leader will organize an internal review in the TWG by assigning reviewers to papers in the ConfTool system:

- TWG teams assign papers to reviewers through ConfTool by **22nd September 2021**.
- The reviewers submit their reviews in ConfTool by **21st October 2021**.

Criteria for review of submitted papers

Papers should

1. Be relevant to the theme of the Thematic Working Group, and
2. Fit quality aspects that are outlined below.

Some authors may have had feedback via the [Early Bird Submission Process](#). If so, the TWG Leader will forward you a copy of this feedback. Please ensure that take this feedback into account when reviewing the paper.

Reviewers are asked to comment on the following aspects of submitted papers:

Reports of Studies (Empirical or Developmental)

Surveys, observational, ethnographic, experimental or quasi-experimental studies, case studies are all suitable. Papers should contain at least the following:

1. a statement about the focus of the paper: what is the question or the problem that is treated?
2. an indication of the theoretical framework of (or theoretical constructs used in) the study reported, including references to the related literature;
3. an indication of the methodology used (including problem, goals and/or research questions; criteria for the selection of participants or sampling; data collection instruments and procedures; data analysis procedures);
4. an indication on the scientific and cultural context in which this study is embedded (explaining crucial assumptions and the possible contingency of the relevance of the study for a specific cultural context);
5. results;
6. final remarks or conclusions, indicating the significance of the paper.

Theoretical and Philosophical Essays

These should include at least the following:

1. a statement about the focus of the paper and a rationale why the study is a relevant one;

2. an indication of the theoretical or philosophical framework within which the focus or theme of the paper is developed;
3. an indication of the scientific and cultural context in which this study is embedded (explaining crucial assumptions and the possible contingency of the relevance of the study for a specific cultural context);
4. reference to related literature;
5. a clearly articulated statement of the author's position on the focus or theme and of the arguments that support this position;
6. implications for the existing research in the area.

Presentation and Publication

Reviews should be uploaded to the ConfTool [submission website](#). Reviewers will make a clear recommendation on each paper, choosing one of the four points of view referring to the acceptance of a paper for the conference:

1. ACCEPT for presentation without further modification
2. ACCEPT for presentation subject to modification as detailed below
3. REJECT but resubmit the paper as a poster
4. REJECT

Papers may be accepted for presentation in the conference but not for publication if, for example, they do not achieve academic quality adequate for publication, but nevertheless raise interesting or novel ideas that are relevant for work group discussions. For this reason and due to the policy of inclusion, a rejection of a paper for presentation should be an exception.

**** It is very important that TWG Leaders ensure that all papers and poster descriptions use the CERME template which is available [here](#). ****

The reviewers are asked to indicate possible changes that should be done before the conference.

The TWG leader team will decide *after* the conference (based on the work in the group) whether an (the) author(s) should be given the opportunity to revise the **8** pages paper (based on specific modifications to be done) in view of publication in the proceedings, *or* if the author(s) should instead be offered to submit a shortened, two page version for inclusion in the proceedings (pending final approval of the TWG leaders, as for all other contributions).

Note that all accepted papers will be made available on the [CERME12 ConfTool website](#) prior to the conference. This process constitutes the paper presentation as a preliminary to its consideration within the relevant Thematic Working Group at the conference.

Poster Proposals

The following rules apply to poster proposals.

1. Poster Presentations are suggested for those whose work is more suitably communicated in a pictorial or graphical format or demonstration, rather than through a traditional written text. A time will be allotted within the conference, during which presenters will be available at their posters for informal discussion with conference participants.
2. Posters should be about research, significantly related to mathematics and to education, and conform to the aims of CERME (see the [General Information](#) on the website). They must relate to one of the Thematic Working Groups of CERME12.
3. The format of poster proposals must be as specified in the [Guidelines for Authors](#). **Only poster proposals using this format in full will be accepted.**
4. Each participant may propose only ONE poster, although a group of authors may propose several posters, each one to be attributed to a different person attending the conference, whose name must be underlined in the paper. Each person can have her/his name underlined at most in one paper OR in one poster proposal.

Criteria for review of poster proposals

TWG Co-Leaders will make their decisions about acceptance or rejection on the following aspects of submitted poster proposals:

1. a statement about the focus of the poster;
2. an indication of the theoretical framework (or constructs) of the study reported;
3. an indication of and justification for its content;
4. a statement about the format chosen by the author for the poster;
5. possible implications for the existing research in the area.

Presentation and Publication

For each poster submitted (this concerns the two-pages proposal), reviewers will make a clear recommendation, choosing between:

1. ACCEPT for presentation without further modification
2. ACCEPT for presentation subject to modification as detailed below
3. REJECT

Posters may be followed by a publication in the proceedings. But posters may be accepted for presentation in the conference but not for publication if, for example, they do not achieve academic quality adequate for publication, but nevertheless raise interesting or novel ideas that are relevant for work group discussions.

The reviewers are asked to indicate possible changes that should be done before the conference.

The TWG leader team will decide *after* the conference (based on the work in the group) whether an (the) author(s) should be given the opportunity to propose a contribution for the proceedings.