

Guidelines for the TWG leaders: Organisation of the review process

Initial submission, reviewing and revised submission for the conference: overview and timeline

The purpose of the CERME review process is to promote communication and collaboration through engaging participants in an in-depth analysis of a portion of TWG contributions, as well as to assure their scientific quality.

CERME15 uses [ConfTool](#) for the submission and review process of papers and poster proposals, ensuring a streamlined and efficient management of these processes. Please ensure that submissions, reviews, and submission status are all processed through ConfTool. In particular, do not allow submissions to be made by email. Authors submit the initial version of their paper or poster through ConfTool, indicating a first TWG choice and a second TWG choice. This second choice will be used if TWG leaders consider that the paper does not fit the group's focus, or if a TWG receives too few submissions and must be cancelled.

The TWG teams have access to the submissions corresponding to their TWG through ConfTool. They need to organise the internal review (see the next section) within the TWG. The final versions of the papers and poster proposals will also be directly submitted by authors using ConfTool. The TWG leaders then check whether these final versions include the suggested revisions and adhere to the CERME15 template. After CERME15, the TWG leaders will organise the internal review of the final papers and poster proposals for the conference proceedings (see section on post-conference submission procedure below).

The review process follows the timeline shown below.

- **15th of September 2026:** Submission deadline for papers and poster proposals
- **15th to 17th of September 2026:** Given the impossibility of CERME15 hosting more than 900 participants in total, only 600 contributions can be accepted for presentation at the conference, including posters. TWG leaders will get an overview of the number of submissions from the IPC and determine the number of acceptable papers and posters in their TWG according to the rule of “same ratio” ($600/\text{Number of proposals for CERME 15} \times \text{received papers in a TWG}$, which will be shared by the IPC). The TWG leaders and co-leaders need to initially conduct a format check on the submitted papers and poster proposals. Papers and poster proposals that do not fulfil the layout and template requirements (given in the template) may be rejected directly.

- **17th of September 2026:** TWG leaders can download all the submissions to their TWG and will also be able to see a table in ConfTool showing the corresponding author(s) for each paper, with their email address, the title of their paper, and the keywords.
- **17th to 23rd of September 2026:** TWG leaders assign reviewers: two TWG authors (including co-authors) for each paper and two TWG co-leaders for each poster proposal. It is important to ensure that all submissions will be reviewed by at least one experienced researcher among the TWG authors and co-authors. If necessary, not just the presenting authors may be required to review.
- **14th of October 2026:** Deadline for reviewers to submit their reviews with an evaluation of quality criteria referring to five categories with recommendations for improving a paper (see Guidelines for reviewers).
- **14th to 28th of October 2026:** TWG leaders decide on the basis of the reviews whether to accept a paper with or without modifications or reject a paper and decide on changes for improving a paper for a possible acceptance for the conference proceedings (see also [post conference submission procedure](#)). TWG leaders can decide to reject a paper if its authors did not correctly contribute to the review process.
- **28th of October 2026:** Deadline for TWG leaders to enter the contribution status in ConfTool, and send a bulk email to the authors to inform them of the review results, the status of their submission and revisions requested. Each TWG team may also consider rejecting more papers than necessary, with regard to the maximum number of papers that can be accepted.
- **10th of December 2026:** Deadline by which the authors upload the final version of their submission for the conference with a description of the changes made.
- **12th of December 2026:** The TWG leaders can check the submission list. After this date, no further changes can be made before the conference.

TWG leaders send out the preliminary schedule for TWG sessions before **15th of January 2027**.

Internal review process for the papers (for posters see below)

The internal reviewing process for the papers proceeds as follows, respecting the above timeline.

1. The TWG leaders distribute the papers more or less evenly between their co-leaders (including themselves), according to common topics or methods. If the number of papers received per member of the TWG team (leader + co-leaders) exceeds 6, the TWG leaders may, in consultation with the IPC Liaison for the group, opt for additional co-leaders from among those

who submitted papers. Note that TWGs are cancelled if they - once the ratio of acceptance has been applied - received fewer than 12 papers. If the TWG team considers that a paper is more appropriate for another TWG, they should contact their IPC liaison and, in critical cases, the IPC Chair immediately, but in any case, **before 22nd September, 2026**. In cases of relocation, the ratio of acceptance (see above) is applied to the number of papers in a TWG after relocations are completed.

2. The TWG leaders assign each paper submission to two TWG authors (including co-authors) for review, making clear the deadline and the expectations, referring to the Guidelines for Reviewers. These are not blind reviews, i.e., both reviewers' and authors' names are shown in ConfTool. Situations where there is a close relationship between the author and the reviewer should be avoided. For example, a student's paper should not be assigned to be reviewed by their supervisor or vice versa. Early career researchers should be included in the review process, but all papers must be reviewed by at least one experienced researcher. No author or co-author should have more than two papers to review. Some authors may have had feedback via the CERME15 Pre-submission support procedure. TWG leaders will receive a copy of this feedback. Please ensure that reviewers are provided with this feedback.
3. The TWG co-leaders receive an evaluation against six quality criteria on the basis of five categories, accompanied by a rationale for this evaluation and suggestions for revisions described in the Paper Review Form. On this basis, TWG co-leaders synthesise the two reviews for each paper into a meta-review and decide accordingly whether to accept the paper with or without modifications or reject the paper. The meta-review should include the reasons for the decision and a clear statement of the modifications that must be made. These changes are the basis for the presentation of the paper at the conference and for acceptance of the paper for the conference proceedings. Please refer to section [Decision about the status of a paper for the conference](#). In difficult cases, co-leaders can consult the wider TWG team.
4. TWG co-leaders' decisions about the acceptance of papers are shared with the TWG team (leader and co-leaders). The TWG leader must approve the final decision and insert it in ConfTool. The decision of acceptance for the conference and the required revisions of the paper are communicated via ConfTool to the corresponding author through a bulk email. The TWG leader then sends a composite decision list for all paper proposals to (a) all the co-leaders of their TWG, and (b) the Chair and the co-Chair of the IPC.
5. The authors upload the revised version of their paper to ConfTool by **10th of December 2026**.

6. The papers will be available online. The TWG leader should remind participants that group members are expected to read the provided papers before the conference to prepare for their work in the TWG.

Managing the internal reviewing process for the poster proposals

The internal review process for the poster proposals proceeds as follows, respecting the above timeline:

1. The TWG leaders distribute the poster proposals more or less evenly between the co-leaders (including themselves).
2. The co-leader reviews the poster proposals. In difficult cases, they can consult the TWG leader or another co-leader of their TWG.
3. TWG leaders or co-leaders insert the meta review in ConfTool and change the status of the posters.
4. The decision regarding acceptance is communicated via ConfTool to the corresponding author (**28th of October 2026**).
5. The authors submit a revised version with a description of the changes made to ConfTool (**10th of December 2026**).

Decision about the status of a paper for the conference

The TWG leaders receive an evaluation against six quality criteria on the basis of five categories, accompanied by a rationale for this evaluation and suggestions for revisions by reviewers. On this basis, TWG co-leaders synthesise the two reviews for each paper into a meta-review and decide on the following aspects:

1. ACCEPT for presentation with minor or without further modifications: The paper is of high quality, the content is original and relevant, and the report is coherent; the research is solid both theoretically and methodologically; the paper is well-structured and well-written; it may require some revisions, mainly consisting of details, clarifications, language editing, references, etc.
2. ACCEPT for presentation with major modifications. The paper has potential in terms of relevance and originality, offering possible contributions to the field; however, substantial changes are required in different aspects of the paper, including (but not limited to) clarity, structure, content, and language.

3. REJECT. The paper does not meet the essential requirements for quality research, is not relevant to the field of research in mathematics education, or lacks clear potential in terms of originality and possible contribution to the field or the respective TWG.

Decision about the status of a poster for the conference

The TWG leaders synthesise the two reviews for each poster from the TWG team into a meta-review and decide on the following aspects:

1. ACCEPT for presentation with minor or without further modifications: The poster is of high quality, the content is original and relevant, and the report is coherent; the research is solid both theoretically and methodologically; the poster is well-structured and well-written; it may require some revisions, mainly consisting of details, clarifications, language editing, references, etc.
2. ACCEPT for presentation with major modifications. The poster has potential in terms of relevance and originality, offering possible contributions to the field; however, substantial changes are required in different aspects of the poster, including (but not limited to) clarity, structure, content, and language.
3. REJECT. The poster does not meet the essential requirements for quality research, is not relevant to the field of research in mathematics education, or lacks clear potential in terms of originality and possible contribution to the field or the respective TWG.

Post-conference submission procedure

The post-conference procedure is based on the review before the conference and the changes made by the authors before the conference. Possibly, the discussion at the conference could result in further recommendations for improving a paper. TWG leaders may consider these recommendations for changes in the papers after the conference (also authors may ask TWG leaders to have the possibility to change their papers after the conference). The post-conference procedure includes the following steps:

1. **Evaluation of the changes made before the conference:** TWG leaders check the changes made by the authors on the basis of the reviews before the conference by **12th of December 2026**.

2. **Decision about a revision of a paper after the conference:** TWG leaders make a decision about revisions of a paper based on the changes made before the conference and the discussion at the conference. TWG leaders send this decision to the authors by **15th of March 2027**.
3. **Submission:** Authors upload the revised version of their paper/poster to ConfTool by **15th of April 2027**. Revisions must address feedback from the TWG review process and follow the CERME template.
4. **Proofs:** TWG leaders ensure that revisions meet the recommendations. They check adherence to the CERME template and formatting requirements and inform authors in ConfTool about acceptance or rejection by **30th of April 2027**. In case of deviations from the template, the TWG leaders can ask the authors to make adjustments, but are also allowed to make small changes themselves.
5. **Finalisation:** Accepted papers and posters will be included in the official CERME15 proceedings. No changes are allowed after the final deadline (**15th of April 2027**).