CERME13 Guidelines for Reviewers

The CERME13 review process will completely run through an electronic submission system called [ConfTool](#). Papers will be peer reviewed within TWGs, whereas poster proposals will be reviewed by TWG leaders and co-leaders. These initial reviews only concern acceptance for the conference, and not inclusion in the post-conference proceedings. TWG leaders will organize the review process.

Contributions should be about research, significantly related to mathematics and to education. They should be original and not have been published previously. Contributions need not be limited to completed research. On-going studies may be submitted, provided that a theoretical framework and preliminary results are provided in the text submitted. The contributions should, however, contain all information necessary to inform both reviewers and other researchers.

The contributions should be in the format specified in the [Guidelines for Authors](#) and make full use of the CERME13 template. The styles in the CERME13 paper template should not be modified. Only papers using this format in full will be accepted. Length restrictions (eight pages for papers and two pages for poster proposals) should be respected.

Timeline of the Review Process

The TWG leader wills organize an internal peer review within their TWG according to the following timeline and through ConfTool.

- February 15, 2023: Submission deadline for papers and poster proposals
- March 1, 2023: TWG leaders assign reviewers: two TWG participants for each paper, two TWG team members for each poster proposal
- March 22, 2023: Reviewers submit their reviews
- April 5, 2023: The TWG leader sends the decision and details of revisions requested to the authors
- April 26, 2023: The authors submit a revised version with a description of the changes made
- May 5, 2023: The TWG team takes the final decision and informs the authors
- May 17, 2023: The authors upload the final version of their submission

Reviewing Paper Submissions

Both reports of studies (involving empirical data, including surveys, observational, ethnographic, experimental or quasi-experimental studies, case studies) and theoretical and philosophical essays are suitable for CERME. Papers should be relevant to the theme of the Thematic Working Group they are submitted to, and should position themselves in the field, referring to related research. It should be clear what is new in the paper and how it builds on past research, or goes in new directions. Proposals that represent new and significant contributions to research in any aspect of mathematics education are especially welcome. Papers should briefly specify their cultural context with an international audience in mind.

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 you take this feedback into account when reviewing the paper.

Please use the CERME13 Paper Review Form 1 for your reviews. It includes the following criteria for **reports of studies**:

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.

For **theoretical and philosophical essays** the CERME13 Paper Review Form 2 includes the following criteria:

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.

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

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

Note that all accepted papers will be made available on the CERME13 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.

Reviewing Poster Proposals

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. Posters should be about research, significantly related to mathematics and to education. They must relate to one of the Thematic Working Groups of CERME13.

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.

For each poster 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

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