

## **Appeals Process Policy** *Journal for Research in Mathematics Education*

### **Overview of the Peer Review Process at JRME**

Manuscripts sent out for a full peer review are read by a panel of experts in the field. Although the reviewers' recommendations are not votes, the primary Editor (Editor-in-Chief, Research Commentary Editor, or Guest Editor; hereafter "Editor") considers their reading of the manuscript and the reviewers' comments when making an overall decision. The Editor has the discretion to rely more heavily on some reviewers with expertise relevant to the manuscript. The Editor then communicates the decision to the Submitting Author, including suggestions for a revision or an indication of the reasons for rejection.

### **Overview of the Appeals Process**

This Appeals Process Policy applies to rejected manuscripts that underwent at least one panel review (note that this does not include manuscripts that were desk-rejected, such as those that did not meet technical or stylistic requirements). The Editorial Team will consider one appeal per manuscript, and all decisions on appeals are final. The timely review and decision-making process for new submissions will take precedence over appeals.

The following outlines the steps the Submitting Author and Editor should take in an appeal process.

#### ***Steps for the Submitting Author:***

1. Determine whether to appeal the reject decision on a manuscript. Examples of reasons to appeal include, but are not limited to, the following:
  - a. Justifiable evidence that the editorial decision shows bias against the manuscript's theoretical framing, methodological approach, or topic.
  - b. Technical issues, for example evidence that the blinded nature of the review process was compromised or that a reviewer sent feedback unrelated to the manuscript.
  - c. Grounds to believe that a reviewer may have a personal or professional conflict of interest.
2. If the Submitting Author believes they have grounds to appeal the rejection, they should schedule a meeting with the Editor to discuss the decision and their concerns.
3. After this meeting, if the Submitting Author would like to formally appeal the decision to reject their manuscript, the Submitting Author should write a letter to the Editor explaining the request. This letter must describe why the Submitting Author disagrees with the decision by providing specific responses to the Editor's or reviewers' comments that contributed to the decision to appeal. This letter should be emailed to [jrme@nctm.org](mailto:jrme@nctm.org).

***Steps for the Editor:***

1. The Editor will handle the appeal in consultation with an Associate Editor and Editorial Panel Member.
2. The Editor, Associate Editor, and Editorial Panel Member may seek an additional ad hoc review from someone whose expertise aligns with the manuscript topic and who was not part of the original review process.
3. The Editor, Associate Editor, and Editorial Panel Member will either confirm the decision to reject or make an alternative decision.
4. If the appeal is upheld, the Editor will inform the reviewers of the original manuscript about the new decision.