

**Guidelines to referees**  
for reviewing proposals for the scientific program of the

**8<sup>th</sup> EUROPEAN SUMMER UNIVERSITY**  
**ON HISTORY AND EPISTEMOLOGY IN MATHEMATICS EDUCATION**  
**ESU-8**  
**OsloMet – Oslo Metropolitan University, Norway**  
**20 - 24 July 2018**

***The reviewing process***

(a) Each proposal will be reviewed by two independent referees, who will complete the attached *Blind Review Form*.

(b) In case of conflicting reports (one positive and one negative), the paper will be adjudicated by a third referee. The final decision will be made by the chair and co-chairs of ESU-8, on the basis of all three reports.

(c) Any proposal receiving two negative reports will not be accepted. All other proposals should be revised satisfactorily according to the referees' suggestions and comments before they are finally accepted for inclusion in the ESU-8 scientific program.

Referees should comment on the proposal, by taking into account the *evaluation criteria* listed below. The referees' comments should be as explicit, detailed and constructive as possible, in order to provide the chair and co-chairs with a sound basis for their decision and to help the authors revise their proposal, if necessary.

It is left to the referees' discretion to differentiate between a commentary to the Editors and comments to the authors.

***Evaluation criteria***

It would be of great help if the referees' recommendations are based on the following evaluation criteria<sup>1</sup>:

**A. Relevance:** Is the proposal *clearly* related to at least one of the 6 themes mentioned in the *Review Form*? Is it appropriate for the activity proposed by its authors'<sup>1</sup>?

**B.1. Interest for other researchers:** Does the subject have a sound motivation? All proposals should clearly indicate the scientific interest of the results.

**B.2. Importance for teachers & students' education:** Is the subject matter of the proposal expected to be useful, insightful and stimulating for students' education, including teacher education?

**B.3. Originality:** Is the work novel? Does the work contain and/or refer to significant additional material to that already published? If you feel that the proposal lacks sufficient originality, it would be useful to supply references for transmission to the authors.

**B.4. Interest and relevance of empirical investigation** (if applicable): Is the research plan and design, as well as any eventual presentation of data meaningful and interesting?

**B.5. Appropriateness for a 2-hour Workshop** based on historical/epistemological material (if applicable). Is there reference to the material to be used and/or is necessary for the proposed workshop; namely, historical and/or epistemological texts like excerpts from original sources, texts with an

---

<sup>1</sup> For their numbering see the *Blind Review Form* to be completed.

epistemological analysis of historical developments etc? Please see the *Application Form* for more details on what is expected from proposals for such workshops.

**B.6. Appropriateness for a 1.5-hour Workshop** based on didactical/pedagogical material that integrates historical elements (if applicable): Is there reference to the material to be used and/or is necessary for the proposed workshop; namely, texts for using in the classroom and/or for teachers' information and education, worksheets for students, outline of didactical activities etc. Please see the *Application Form* for more details on what is expected from proposals for such workshops.

**B.7 Clarity & readability:** Are the main ideas and the focus expressed clearly and concisely? Are the concepts understandable? Is the proposal written in readable English, French or Norwegian? A proposal needing *major* language revision should not be considered further, except if the referee thinks that it is particularly worthwhile.

### **Important note**

(a) **Oral presentations** and **short oral communications:** Each *oral presentation* includes 25 minutes of presentation and 5 minutes of discussion. Each *short oral communication* includes 5 minutes of presentation (aiming at communicating some specific results, usually concerning work in progress) and 5 minutes of discussion. Both are activities in the spirit of a conventional research conference.

(b) **Workshops:** A major part of each ESU program consists of *workshops*: They are activities aiming at engaging participants into some kind of practical work by studying a specific subject and having a follow-up discussion. To this end, the workshop organizer prepares, presents and distributes the historical/epistemological or didactical/pedagogical material, which motivates and orients the exchange of ideas and the discussion among the participants. Participants read and work on the basis of this material (e.g. original historical texts, didactical material based on such texts, students' worksheets etc).