

EARLI 2025 – REVIEW CRITERIA

All proposals will be blind peer reviewed by at least two reviewers, who are asked to take into account the criteria outlined below according to the type of the contribution.

Each reviewer is asked to score the quality of the proposal, indicating a score between 1 (very poor) - 10 (excellent) and to provide brief and constructive feedback in the appropriate text box. Both numeric scores and comments are communicated with the authors along with the final decision. Therefore, we ask our reviewers to be as constructive as possible, while also being considerate of the efforts invested in writing a proposal.

Symposia are evaluated as a whole, in terms of coherence and overall significance, as well as on an individual basis for each paper contribution (following the criteria for single paper contributions).

Proposals which clearly fall outside of the scope of EARLI, or which do not clearly demonstrate relevance for the field of learning and instruction should be scored "0" across all review criteria. This will result in an automatic rejection of the proposal.

Please be advised that there are both empirical and theoretical submissions. The review questions containing "OR" will therefore need to be considered with regards to whether the submission is of an empirical or theoretical nature.

SINGLE PAPER (EMPIRICAL)

- Theoretical framework, conceptual rationale or pragmatic grounding
- Research method and design for both qualitative and quantitative approaches (research questions, context, participants, data sources, sampling, procedure, ethical issues)
- Clarity of results and conclusions
- Significance for theory, policy and practice
- Overall quality and scientific originality

SINGLE PAPER (THEORETICAL)

- Theoretical framework, conceptual rationale or pragmatic grounding
- Embeddedness in relevant literature
- Clarity and robustness of theoretical argument
- Significance for theoretical debate
- Overall quality and scientific originality

POSTER (EMPIRICAL)

- Theoretical framework, conceptual rationale or pragmatic grounding
- Research method and design (research questions, context, participants, data sources, sampling, procedure, ethical issues)
- Clarity of results and conclusions
- Significance for theory, policy and practice
- Overall quality and scientific originality

POSTER (THEORETICAL)

- Theoretical framework, conceptual rationale or pragmatic grounding
- Embeddedness in relevant literature
- Clarity and robustness of theoretical argument
- Significance for theoretical debate
- Overall quality and scientific originality

SYMPOSIUM AS A WHOLE

- Theoretical perspective, conceptual rationale or pragmatic grounding
- Organisation and coherence of the whole symposium
- Significance for theory, practice and policy
- Overall quality and scientific originality

Each paper in a symposium will also be reviewed as an individual paper using the criteria outlined above.



ROUNDTABLE

- Significance for theory, policy and practice
- Theoretical framework, conceptual rationale or pragmatic grounding
- Research method and design (research questions, context, participants, data sources, sampling, procedure, ethical issues)
- Clarity of issue at stake
- Overall quality and scientific originality

DEMO SESSION

- Significance for theory, policy and practice
- Theoretical framework, conceptual rationale or pragmatic grounding
- Validation in domain of application (as research method, data collection, research procedure, etc.)
- Quality of demonstration activities
- Overall quality and scientific originality

REVIEW THRESHOLDS

The International Programme Committee (IPC) has set the following thresholds for accepting a proposal at the EARLI 2025 conference:

Score	Review Decision
35% or less	Automatic rejection.
75% or more	Automatic acceptance.
Between 36% -74%	Acceptance or rejection will be decided by the IPC, considering the total number of proposals and with respect to safeguarding the overall scientific quality. The IPC will not perform individual reviews nor decide on a case by case basis.

Please note that all scores refer to “combined review scores” (average of review scores).

Whenever there is a discrepancy of 25% between two review scores for those proposals scoring between 36% - 74% on average, the proposal is sent to a third reviewer.

In the event of three review scores, preference is given to the two scores that are closest to each other, with consideration for the outlier being minimal or disregarded.

Please note that, in case a symposium fails to meet the acceptance criteria either as a whole or for one of the individual contributions, the symposium could be rejected as a whole, without splitting it into separate, standalone paper presentations. We therefore encourage submitters to ensure that a symposium submission presents a coherent set of high-quality papers.