

Example of a Helpful Review of a Rejected Paper

NON-EMPIRICAL STUDY

MERGA RESEARCH PAPERS: REVIEWER REPORT FORM

I have reviewed the paper:

Title: The contributions to mathematics education of Robert K. Dove: A critique

Code: RP43

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 author does not discuss the context of Dove's work, nor why a critique of this body of research is significant at this time.

Literature review and theoretical framework:

Using a post-structural perspective, the author has reviewed only a limited selection of Dove's work. The rationale for choices made is not clear. It is also not clear why Dove's first seminal paper, *Doing Arithmetic* (Dove, 1956), was omitted from the review.

Methodology and data analysis (when applicable):

Not applicable

Discussion:

The analysis of Dove's work was biased by the selective studies that were included in the review. The author makes dubious claims that appear to reflect strongly held personal convictions, rather than providing a synthesising Dove's research and making statements that could be supported and substantiated by the literature reviewed.

Conclusions and implications:

As a consequence of the inadequate coverage of Dove's work, the conclusions drawn, whilst defensibly within a post-structural context, were inaccurate. The implications drawn appear to be consistent with strongly held personal views – an inappropriate form of argument under the rubric of academic "critique".

General comments including reasons for the recommendation:

The writing style is alienating and many key terms were not defined. The paper is riddled with typographical errors suggesting that it was not carefully edited prior to submission. Many of these errors were avoidable - the spell- and grammar-checking facilities of the word-processing package could have been used. In future, the author should ask a colleague to read through an early draft of a paper to provide constructive feedback; the standard of the product is likely to improve.

Minor revision: Notes for editorial team

Please note here any minor revisions that can be completed by the editorial team (e.g., typographical errors, grammatical points, ways in which the paper does not conform to the MERGA layout and presentation guidelines for publication of MERGA papers)

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

YES