

Guidelines to referees
for reviewing papers submitted for publication to the Proceedings of the

8th 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 paper will be reviewed by two independent referees, who should 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 paper receiving two negative reports will not be accepted. All other papers should be revised satisfactorily according to the referees' suggestions and comments before they are finally accepted for inclusion in the ESU-8 Proceedings.

Referees should comment on the paper, 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 paper, 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 criteria¹:

A. Relevance: Is the paper *clearly* related to at least one of the 6 themes mentioned in the *Review Form*? ¹

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

B.2. Importance for teachers & students' education: Is the subject matter of the paper 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 paper 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. Appropriate description of a Workshop (WS)

For papers concerning workshops it is expected that the text provides information on:

(i) The material used and/or was necessary for the workshop; namely,

- For **1.5-hour WS** based on historical/epistemological material: Historical and/or

¹ For their numbering see the *Blind Review Form* to be completed.

epistemological texts (excerpts from original sources, texts with an epistemological analysis of historical developments etc).

- For **2-hour WS** based on didactical/pedagogical material that integrates historical elements: texts for using in the classroom and/or for teachers' information and education, worksheets for students, outline of didactical activities etc.

(ii) The age and level of education of students to whom the workshop refers, including teachers' pre- and in-service education.

(iii) Description of how this material was used in the workshop, the way participants were guided to interact with this material, whether there was group work during the workshop and/or plenary discussion on the given material etc.

B.6 Clarity & readability: Are the main ideas and the focus expressed clearly and concisely? Are the concepts understandable? Is the paper written in readable English, French or Norwegian? A paper needing *major* language revision should not be considered further, except if the referee thinks that it is particularly worthwhile.