Nordic Studies in Mathematics Education
NORDISK MATEMATIKK DIDAKTIKK

Information for reviewers

About the journal

The journal *Nordic Studies in Mathematics Education* – Nordisk Matematikkdidaktikk, NOMAD – is a journal publishing results from research in mathematics education. It addresses all that are interested in following the progress in this field in the Nordic and Baltic countries, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Iceland, Latvia, Lithuania, Norway and Sweden. The main objectives of the journal are to stimulate, support and foster Nordic and Baltic researchers and post-graduate students in mathematics education and thereby contribute to the development of mathematics teaching and learning in theory and practice at all levels of the educational system. NOMAD publishes articles based on theoretical analysis as well as on empirical studies, reports on results from research projects and research-based developmental projects.

An article in NOMAD should be of high quality and contribute to the development of the field in the Nordic and Baltic region. The article should have a clear theoretical basis or originate from clearly defined assumptions. Most manuscripts submitted to the journal are not immediately accepted for publishing but authors will be requested to do minor changes or substantial rewriting based on the reviewers' recommendations. NOMAD depends on people volunteering to do the important work of reviewing without any economical compensation.

The purpose of the review

Each manuscript submitted to NOMAD will be reviewed by at least two persons, and the reviews are entered in the NOMAD editorial system provided by tidsskrift.dk. Each reviewer recommends to the responsible editor one of five possible outcomes: *Publish [Accept submission]*, *Publish after minor revision [Revisions required]*, *May be published after major revision [Resubmit for review]*, *Re-write and re-submit the manuscript [Resubmit elsewhere]*, and *Should not be published in NOMAD [Decline submission].* Based on the reports from the reviewers the responsible editor produces a final review report with a decision, which is sent to the author(s) and to the reviewers.

All articles published in NOMAD undergo double-blind peer review. In this process, both author and reviewer are anonymised. The purpose of this process is to ensure that articles that are accepted are of a high academic standard and that this is determined through impartial peer review. The reviewer's task is therefore both to judge whether a submitted article is of sufficient quality to be considered for publication and to provide constructive feedback to the author on how it can or should be improved to be published in NOMAD. We want authors and reviewers to preserve intellectual rights, confidentiality and right to data privacy. This means they can not use tools including AI that violate these principles.

In addition to giving recommendations to the editor-in-charge regarding publishing (categories 1–5 below), the reviewers are asked to write one or two pages of comments to the author, including reasons for the recommendation and providing suggestions for changes. The reviewers should point to strengths and weaknesses of the paper and write their comments in such a way that they can be copied and sent to the author. If recommending revision, reviewers are asked to express their suggestions for improvement as clear as possible. The more explicit and detailed the reviewers' comments are, the more help and support the author and the editors will have from them. Especially, remember that one of the aims of NOMAD is to foster Nordic and Baltic researchers and post-graduate students in mathematics education. If the reviewers find it necessary to write comments that only the editor (and not the authors) is supposed to read, the reviewers are asked to do so in a separate note.

We recommend that the reviewers consider the following aspects in their review:

- **Purpose and rationale of study**, for example
    - Is the purpose for the study clear? Does the study establish why the general area of study is important? Is the contribution to the research field justified and articulated?
- **Research question(s),** for example
    - Does the study include a clear researchable aim or/and question(s)?
- **Background and literature review**, for example
    - Does the study provide an adequate background and literature review for the study? Does the study position itself with respect to recent and up-to-date research?
- **Theoretical framework/assumptions**, for example
    - Is the study guided by a relevant theoretical framework and/or explicit assumptions? Does the study's design, data collection, analysis, and interpretation of findings align with the chosen framework?
- **Research methods**, for example
    - Does the article clearly describe and argue for the chosen methods and data sources? Are the details of the procedures and theoretical concepts used to analyse the data described?
- **Results, conclusions, discussion and implications**, for example
    - Are results and claims supported by data? Is the contribution of the study situated in relation to previous research and are implications discussed? Do the conclusions clearly answer the research question? Are limitations of the study discussed?

Based on the review, please recommend one of the following five decisions:

1. *Publish [Accept submission]*
The submitted paper is of very high quality and should be published. The editors, in cooperation with the author, make possible changes during the process of preparing the final manuscript.

2. *Publish after minor revision [Revisions required]*
The submitted paper is very good, but certain changes should be made before it can be published. The reviewer may know of certain studies, which should be included among the references made, or may be of the opinion that some of the ideas in the discussion should be developed and made more explicit. A new review of the manuscript is not needed. When the author has made the necessary

changes, the responsible editor will prepare the manuscript for publication. Papers that need a considerable revision should not be placed in this category.

3. *May be published after major revision [Resubmit for review]*
The submitted paper is good, but some parts of the paper need further work. When the author has revised the paper, it will be sent to a new review. If possible, some of the reviewers from the first review will look at the paper again and assess to what extent the shortcomings have been dealt with.

4. *Rewrite and resubmit the manuscript [Resubmit elsewhere]*
The submitted paper is of interest to NOMAD, but considerable revision and/or development is needed. A paper placed in this category will, if resubmitted, be subject to review as if it was a new manuscript. Normally, in addition to appointing new reviewers, one of the reviewers from the first review round will be asked again, to assess to what extent the author has incorporated previous suggestions for changes.

5. *Should not be published in NOMAD [Decline submission]*
The submitted paper is not suitable for NOMAD. Reasons could be unsuitable design, insufficient empirical base, difficulties in relating the work to relevant literature or that the manuscript does not add sufficiently to the development of the field. This category should be used if the reviewers think that even after substantial re-writing it is unlikely that the paper can be brought to the level of quality needed for publication. Authors should not be encouraged to carry out a revision when there is little hope that the changes will result in a manuscript that could be published. The author will of course have the right to resubmit a revised version of a rejected manuscript on a later occasion.