Instructions for Reviewers

Manuscript Analysis

Review Guidelines	*There are a group of questions that guide the reviewers throughout the review process:* • Is the topic of the manuscript appropriate for the SHO2022 Symposium? Is the information of significant interest to the broad readership? • Do the title, abstract, keywords, introduction, and conclusions accurately and consistently reflect the paper's major point(s)? • Is the writing concise, easy to follow, and engaging without repetition? Are the terms and symbols consistent along with the manuscript? • Is the aim clearly stated? • Are the methods appropriate, scientifically sound, current, and described clearly enough to repeat the work by someone else? • Is the research ethical, and have the appropriate approvals/consent been obtained? • Are appropriate statistical analyses used? Are they sufficiently justified and explained? Are statements of significance justified? • When results are stated in the text of the paper, are they supported by data? Can you verify them easily by examining tables and figures? Are any of the results counterintuitive? • Are all tables and figures necessary, clearly labelled, well designed, and readily interpretable? Is the information in the tables and figures redundant? Is it repeated in the text? Do they have the quality to be published? • Are the conclusions supported by the data presented? • Are the references cited the most appropriate to support the manuscript? Are citations provided for all assertions of fact not supported by the data in this paper? Are any key citations missing? There are references from the last three years in the manuscript? There is a good number of high-quality scientific references? • Consider the length of the manuscript relative to the content. Should any portions of the manuscript be expanded, condensed, combined, or deleted? • Does the manuscript comply with the [Instructions for Authors](#)?
Review Sections	*Include the indications deemed appropriate for the authors, always distinguishing three sections:* • (a) general observations on the article, • (b) suggestions for minor improvements that may be considered without being essential. • (c) changes that must necessarily be made.

Instructions for Reviewers

Grading System	*For evaluating the papers, the EasyChair scores mechanism will be as followed:*

VALUE	EXPLANATION	EXAMPLE
3	strong accept	The paper is original and identifies broad and insightful implications for theory practice consistent with study limitations and the inferences and conclusions. The paper is highly readable and logical and adopts an appropriate research methodology for the paper with insightful critical analysis and interpretation.
2	accept	The paper provides clear implications for practice and further research. It adopts an appropriate research methodology with critical analysis and interpretation evidence. Relevant to one or more conference themes and relevant to at least one audience group. Most aspects of the written work conform to a high academic standard.
1	weak accept	The paper draws basic implications for other practitioners. Appropriate methodology with elementary analysis. Relevant to at least one conference theme and relevant to at least some audience members. Most aspects of the written work conform to an acceptable academic standard. While the paper may be difficult to read at times, overall, it retains logic.
0	borderline paper	The article itself has low relevance to any of the conference's themes or to any of the audience groups.
-1	weak reject	Although the article is situated in the university context with a limited but relevant connection to teaching and learning literature and/or policy, it does not connect to the research questions. Methodology lacks academic rigour. Some aspects of the written work do not comply with a high academic standard.
-2	reject	The paper does not extend beyond the immediate context. Knowledge of literature or policy context is not demonstrated or integrated into the paper. It has inadequate research methodology without critical analysis and interpretation. This paper is difficult to read, or the logic is difficult to follow at times.
-3	strong reject	Knowledge of literature and policy context is not demonstrated or integrated into the paper. The paper lacks appropriate analysis and insight, and the methodology lacks academic rigour. This paper is difficult to read, and the logic is difficult to follow most of the times.

Note: A paper should not be rated highly if required information is missing.