



**The 46th Annual Conference of the
Mathematics Education Research Group
of Australasia, 2024**
Gold Coast, QLD

Conference Paper Review Instructions

MERGA acknowledges many forms of scholarly inquiry and welcomes the presentation and publication of conference papers to achieve the following goals:

- Bring our community together to share ideas and progress across different lines of research enquiry within the field of mathematics education.
- Bring the community together to discuss and debate contentious areas in the field – local, national, and international.
- Bring forward new ideas and hold them up for critique by our community, that is, are there contributions to new knowledge (even if a small incremental step).
- Help induct new researchers into the community and assist them in appropriating the standards for publication.
- Provide opportunity for the development of research collaborations.
- Provide an opportunity for researchers to learn to write their ideas down in a limited number of pages.

The *peer review process* contributes to the growth and development of quality practice in mathematics education research and publication in two ways: (1) Reviewers assist authors by providing feedback that would make the reviewed or a future paper suitable for publication in a research journal; and (2) The collaborative review process encourages mentor-mentee relationships and growth of the strong reviewer base.

The role of review feedback is to assist authors and editors in finalising conference contributions.

Pairs of reviewers, and review panels, are expected to collaborate to determine a final recommendation for each contribution. Around 80% of papers are typically “*accepted for publication in the proceedings*”, with the remainder “*accepted for presentation only*”.

Recommendation

ACCEPTED as a paper to be published in the proceedings and presented at this conference	
<u>Excellent & Good Standard</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All or almost all of the Review Criteria (see below) are adequately addressed. • Minor (or no) editing may be required, possibly to be completed by the editorial team (e.g., a small number of typos or minor typesetting issues). • Minor corrections may be required by some authors prior to publication. Examples may include: important factual information is missing or incorrect (e.g., ethical statement is missing); typos where it is not clear how to correct them; paper needs a couple of lines reduction to fit the page limit; citations and references need corrections; formatting needs adjustments. <p><i>[Historically, about 30-40% of papers used to fall into this category]</i></p>
<u>Acceptable Standard</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Papers in this category do not meet all the relevant Review Criteria but productive revisions across all criteria are conceivable. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Papers do acceptably discuss at least one of the study purpose, significance, or contribution to mathematics education research. ○ At least some of the claims made are acceptably supported by research literature or by the analysed data. ○ Methodology might lack clarity but is (in principle) defensible within the

	<p>research paradigm the paper follows.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is expected that via revision with feedback, an acceptable standard will be accomplished on more criteria. • These papers would require “revisions” or “major revisions” for research journal publication. Feedback on necessary key changes should be provided for authors’ future reference, but authors might <i>not be required to make all changes</i> prior to publication in the proceedings. • Please provide clear notes to editors on changes that could be reasonably made prior to publication to strengthen the paper. Revisions requested prior to publication will be subject to the editors’ discretion, considering reviewers’ comments to editors. Revisions may include formatting. <p><i>[Historically, about 30-50% of papers used to fall into this category]</i></p>
<p>NOT ACCEPTED for publication, but ACCEPTED FOR PRESENTATION</p>	
<p><u>Developing Standard</u></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Papers in this category typically do not meet most of the Review Criteria. The claims made are not acceptably supported by literature or analysed data. Papers with substantive problems in methodology (beyond lack of clarity of its description) belong to this category. • Papers in this category, even when extended in length, would tend to fall within “reject” or extensive “major revisions” categories of research journal standards. Feedback on key needed changes should be provided for authors’ future reference. • The editorial team will invite authors of papers in this category to present their paper at the conference as a Short Communication and provide a one-page abstract for publication in the proceedings. <p><i>[Historically, about 20% of papers used to fall into this category]</i></p>

Note

There is no option for rejection of a paper. A paper considered by a panel to be not suitable for inclusion in the conference (e.g., it is an advertisement for teaching materials, it is not related to mathematics education research, or it involves plagiarism) should be referred to the VP Conferences, A/Prof Greg Oates (greg.oates@utas.edu.au) for a final decision.

MERGA 46 Review Form Detail

Content of online form provided FYI below. Please complete the ONLINE FORM at <https://forms.fillout.com/t/8UwdP3obvEus>

Paper Details

Paper Code (Please enter just the 3-digit number from the beginning of the file name.)

Paper Title (Please copy and paste the title of the paper into this field.)

Reviewer Details

Name of Reviewer(s) for the Proceedings

(This information is SOLELY for acknowledgement as a reviewer(s) in the Proceedings, and will NOT be shared with authors.)

Reviewer Group (Please indicate which review group you belong to, so that we associate your acknowledgement with the right group.)

Recommendation

Please select your recommendation (choose from the following menu options):

- **EXCELLENT & GOOD STANDARD:** Accepted for publication & presentation.
- **ACCEPTABLE STANDARD:** Accepted for publication & presentation subject to minor revision.
- **PRESENTATION ONLY:** Accepted for presentation as a Short Communication.

Feedback to Authors

Please provide feedback for the authors and Editors to support your recommendation. For papers in the “Excellent & Good Standard”, this may be a brief comment in support of the quality of the paper, and with any brief notes of minor editing points. For other papers, please provide feedback to help the authors improve their paper.

It may be helpful to include a *track changes* file if this makes it easier to identify areas that need attention. Please ensure your track changes file is anonymous (i.e., remove your details from the data/comments, see the [MS Website](#) for further information).

When providing feedback, **please keep in mind the nature of an 8-page conference paper**, which does not allow space for extensive literature reviews and methodological details. Authors may elaborate on these sections in their presentation, or in a subsequent journal article.

Review Criteria

Reviewers attend to clarity and robustness of the paper in following categories (if relevant to the type of contribution): purpose of the study/paper, significance of the problem, literature and/or theoretical perspective, methodology, findings and their discussion, contribution to research in mathematics education.

In addition, concerns were raised in relation to MERGA authors’ use of deficit language – e.g., in relation to teachers and marginalised or under-resourced groups of research participants. In line with commitments to research ethics standards and to advancing cultural/social justice agendas, we encourage reviewers to provide feedback on checking and correcting deficit language (and perspective) where relevant in the reviewed article, and in suggestions for MERGA presentations.

- Has the purpose of the manuscript been made clear?
- Is the significance of the problem that frames the research made clear via reference to scholarly work or through connection to educational policy settings?
- Does the literature review and/or theoretical framework inform the reader of the current state of the field aligned with the identified research problem?
- Is the methodological approach and selected data collection appropriately described, justified and applied?
- Are claims from the research supported by evidence? Are the findings trustworthy? Are the conclusions/claims justified? Is language used in accounting for analysed phenomena appropriate?
- Does the manuscript contribute to new knowledge? If so, what new knowledge? If not, what value is added to the field by the manuscript?

Formatting, Structure, and General Editing Points

- Is the manuscript coherent and consistent with the technical requirements of a MERGA conference paper (correct template and use of APA7 style, spelling and grammar are of a high standard)?

Any Other Feedback

- Please include suggestions for the author/s about their presentation during the conference; or related to extending the paper into a journal article.

Reviewers' Attachments

- If you have annotated the original paper or completed a [Reviewers' Recommended Changes Form](#) these may be uploaded here. You may upload multiple attachments. Please do NOT include your name/affiliation in any uploaded files (see the [MS website](#) for how to [remove personal information](#)).

Beth Southwell Practical Implications Award

The Beth Southwell Practical Implications Award (BSPIA) recognises high-quality mathematics education that produces insights for the teaching profession and/or student learning.

- If you think this paper represents a body of work by the author team that has important practical implications for teaching profession and/or student learning, and it is of sufficient quality to be extended to a plenary presentation, then you should nominate this paper for the BSPIA (please tick).

FYI: BSPIA Judging Criteria include:

- Identification of a persistent and significant research problem;
- Synthesis of recent research literature and relevant policy initiatives;
- Robust methodology producing valid, reliable findings;
- Insightful discussion of practical implications for the teaching profession and/or student learning; and
- Clear, succinct style of academic writing.

Quick Reads and Teacher Quick Reads

Please select the relevant category if the paper might be suitable to be developed as a:

- Quick read;
- Teacher quick read
- Not suitable.

Based on recommendations, the author(s) will be invited to provide the relevant quick read, and, where needed, supported in its development.

If needed, please refer to existing quick reads available at MERGA website (within MERGA website, search “quick reads”). Teacher quick reads should be practically oriented and bring to the fore tasks, tools, or pedagogies that teachers might be keen to trial in their classrooms.

Notes to the Panel Convenor or Editorial Committee

Optional confidential notes to the Panel Convenor or the Editorial Committee.