

Example of a Helpful Review of a Rejected Paper

EMPIRICAL STUDY

MERGA RESEARCH PAPERS: REVIEWER REPORT FORM

I have reviewed the paper:

Title: Interactive learning and mathematical level raising ...

Code: RP27

As a research paper for presentation at MERGA 26 and publication in the conference proceedings, I recommend that the paper be (delete two):

REJECTED

Please supply below reasons for the acceptance or rejection of the paper commenting on each of the categories specified below, as appropriate. You may refer to more issues than suggested by the categories if you wish.

Statement of problem/issue and discussion of its significance:

The aim of the paper is to show how a particular data set was analysed from different theoretical positions. The authors did not say why it was important to do this research.

Literature review and theoretical framework:

The various theoretical positions are outlined in detail. This is necessary, but needs to be more succinct. As a result of the long theoretical discussion, there was very little room left for the presentation of results and a discussion of them. In the literature review, there was no reference to work in which similar studies have been attempted (e.g., Prior, 1998) and/or no writers mentioned who advocate the need for this kind of work to be undertaken (e.g., Moredon, 2001). Both of these references are cited in full below.

Methodology and data analysis (when applicable):

It is not clear exactly what data are being analysed or how the analysis produces the information found in Table 1. One paragraph is given to describing the analysis process. However, all we are told is that in each stage of the analysis is based on a different theory, and that the results are integrated. How/when/why are they integrated? Actually, it is not clear whether the integration was done or is being proposed—yet this is meant to be the crux of the paper.

Discussion:

Results are presented in Table 1 but are not appropriately discussed, other than to explain the bolding and use of italics. It is not at all clear how the columns labelled “A is working” and “B is working” relate to the data in the centre column, or how the authors have interpreted these data. The discussion of the data is superficial. The authors indicate that they will present more detail in the conference presentation – this is not appropriate for a published research report.

Conclusions and implications:

It is not enough to tell readers that no conclusions can be drawn. The conclusions should relate to the aim of the study. In this case, does the use of multiple theoretical perspectives for the various stages of the data analysis provide more useful/informative/relevant/interpretable findings? – at the very least, are there indications that this is the case?

General comments including reasons for the recommendation:

This was not an easy paper to review. The authors have not made good decisions about how to use the eight-page limit wisely. The introductory section contains too much detail, while the methods and results are not presented or discussed sufficiently.

The content of this paper may be of interest to the MERGA community in the future but not in its current form. The relevance and purpose of the study needs to be more strongly argued and contextualised. There also appeared to be little recognition of the pertinent work of others in this field. As presented here, the paper is not worthy of a place in the proceedings.

Minor revision: Notes for editorial team

Would you like copies of the comments of the other reviewer/s of this paper to be e-mailed to you?

NO

Prior, F. (1998). ----- (full citation)

Moredon, B. (2001), ----- (full citation)