Write Like a Reviewer: MERGA Conferences and Beyond

Jana Višňovská
The University of Queensland
j.visnovska@uq.edu.au

Emily Ross
The University of Queensland
emily.ross@uq.edu.au

Seyum Getenet
University of Southern Queensland
seyum.getenet@unisq.edu.au

Vince Geiger
Australian Catholic University
vincent.geiger@acu.edu.au

Greg Oates
University of Tasmania
greg.oates@utas.edu.au

There is little doubt that writing with the intention of publishing is one of the core practices in our field. As a result, concerted attention is devoted to supporting HDR students' and early career researchers' writing, as well as to establishing peer-based writing support structures. In this round table, we explore another avenue for improving the expression of mathematics education research ideas through writing: learning by participating in the review process.

Regularly reading others' manuscripts to highlight the strengths and to suggest ways to address weaknesses provides a fresh perspective on one's own writing. But what is required to become a reviewer? How do we learn to review? And what does a good review look like? We will examine the review processes for the annual MERGA conference and the *Mathematics Education Research Journal* (MERJ), a high-ranked journal in our field. Emphasising that the aim of reviewers is to help authors get their work published, the written reviews have two main purposes: (1) Providing the editor with justification for the review decision; and (2) Presenting the author with constructive feedback and support for producing a stronger manuscript (Messa et al., 2021).

Our discussion will focus both on the issues that good reviews should address and how the reviewers may need to go about addressing these issues.

Through examples of review comments, we will consider their accuracy and usefulness, focusing on review principles of constructiveness, sensitivity and humility. We will discuss reviewing texts written in English by authors for whom English is a non-dominant language (Geiger et al., 2022) and reviewing manuscripts written from a theoretical position different from that of the reviewer. We will share different MERGA-related review opportunities and encourage participants to engage in these. Participants will be invited to share their questions, experiences, and suggestions related to reviewing with the aim of building the strength of our community.

While the awareness gained through reviewing is said to benefit one's writing, it is also true that the more one writes, the better one can review. This round table will thus round off with the reassurance that to write better—and to review better—we all need to keep writing.

References

Geiger, V., Delzoppo, C., & Straesser, R. (2022). Supporting English non-dominant language authors' efforts to publish: Perspectives from the editors-in-chief of highly recognised journals in mathematics education. *Educational Studies in Mathematics*, *111*, 543–565.

Mesa, V., Bakker, A., Venkat, H., et al. (2021). Writing reviews: Perspectives from the editors of Educational Studies in Mathematics. *Educational Studies in Mathematics*, *108*, 419–428.