**CERME 14 – REVIEW GUIDELINES**

**REVIEW FORM HEADINGS**

**(no more distinction between theoretical and empirical papers)**

1. Focus and rationale of the paper

2. Theoretical framework(s) and related literature

3. Methods and argumentation quality

4. Statements and discussion of results

5. Clarity

6. Relevance to this CERME TWG audience

7. Adherence to the CERME Template and APA 7 styles

8. Summary points and suggestions for change

**Scale for the final decision about oral communications:**

1. ACCEPT for presentation **without further** revisions

2. ACCEPT for presentation **with modifications** as detailed below

3. REJECT

GUIDELINES FOR DECISIONS: ORAL COMMUNICATIONS

1. **Accept for presentation without further revisions.** The paper has high quality, the content is original and relevant, and the report is solid; the research is solid both theoretically and methodologically, it is well-structured and well-written.
2. **Accept for presentation with modifications.** The paper has high quality, the content is original and relevant, and the report is solid; the research is solid both theoretically and methodologically, it is well-structured and well-written. However, it requires some revisions or improvements. *We trust and expect the concerns expressed in the review being really solved in the final version for presentation at the conference.*
3. **Reject.** The paper does not meet the essential requirements of solid research or is not relevant to the field of research in mathematics education; the research is solid, but the paper structure and presentation require important revisions and cannot be accepted for presentation at the conference.

**Scale for the final decision about posters**

1. ACCEPT for presentation **without further** modifications

2. ACCEPT for presentation **subject to modifications** as detailed below

3. REJECT

GUIDELINES FOR DECISIONS: POSTERS

1. **Accept for presentation without further revision.** The poster proposal is of high quality, the content is original and relevant, there is a clear research aim, there is a reference to relevant literature, the methods are outlined, and key results (even if preliminary) are given.
2. **Accept for presentation with modifications.** The poster proposal is of good quality, the content is original and relevant, there is a clear research aim, there is reference to relevant literature, the methods are outlined, and key results (even if preliminary) are given. However, it requires some revisions or improvements. *We trust and expect the concerns expressed in the review being really solved in the final version for presentation at the conference.*
3. **Reject.** The poster proposal is not clear and well understandable, it is not original, or it is not relevant to the field of research; it lacks consistency, clarity, a solid theoretical background, key references, clear research aims, good writing, etc.