



## Review Guidelines

Papers should be about research, significantly related to mathematics textbooks in paper or digital format or other curriculum resources, such as learning materials, teacher guides, OERs, learning trajectories, etc.

Papers are to be written in English.

Papers should be original, i.e. not have been published previously. They 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 6 pages in the specified format: see [template](#)), but must contain all information necessary to inform both reviewers and other researchers.

Papers may be presented as oral communications or posters at the conference. The same review criteria apply for both, oral communications and posters.

Two types of papers are suitable for ICMT3:

- (A) Reports of studies (involving empirical or developmental research) and
- (B) Theoretical essays or methodological contributions.

**Reports of empirical studies** should cover, as a minimum, the following:

- a statement regarding the focus and rationale of the presented research (including problem, goals and/or research questions);
- the study's theoretical framework including references to the related literature;
- a description of the research methods used (criteria for sampling and/or choice of participants; data collection instruments; data analysis procedures)
- results (including a sample of data additional data can be presented at the conference but some data ought to accompany the proposal).



**Theoretical essays and methodological contributions** should cover, as a minimum, the following:

- a statement regarding the focus, the rationale and the aim of the theoretical or methodological contribution;
- a statement about the paper's theoretical, philosophical or methodological framework including references to related literature;
- a clearly articulated statement of the author's position on the focus or theme and of the arguments that support this position;
- implications for existing and further research in the respective area.

Accordingly, reviewers are supposed to judge each proposal in terms of the following criteria:

- 1) Rationale, aim/goals, research questions
- 2) Theoretical framework and related literature
- 3) Methodology / statement of authors position and argumentation
- 4) Results
- 5) Clarity

For each category, the proposal may be evaluated as

- 2: below the standard
- 1: slightly below the standard
- 0: meets the standard
- 1: good
- 2: excellent

Finally, reviewers need to make a clear recommendation on each paper, choosing one of the three points of view referring to the acceptance of a paper for the conference:

- ACCEPT for presentation without further modification
- TO BE CORRECTED as detailed below
- REJECT

The reviewers are supposed to provide comments that explain their evaluation of the proposal regarding the different categories and suggestions for improvement in a free text field for the authors.