

Depending on the format and type of research report being submitted, the proposals will be blindly reviewed by at least two reviewers, who are asked to take into account the criteria outlined below according to the type of the contribution. Symposia are evaluated both as a whole and as individual contributions. Each reviewer is asked to score the quality of each proposal, indicating a score between 1-100 and to provide brief and constructive feedback in the appropriate text box. Scores and comments are both communicated to the authors along with the final decision; we ask our reviewers to be as constructive as possible, while also being considerate of the efforts invested in writing a proposal.

Empirical paper

- Relevance to the domains of the EARLI SIGs 18 and 23
- Significance for theory, policy and practice
- 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 or preliminary results and conclusions
- Overall quality and scientific originality

Theoretical paper

- Relevance to the domains of the EARLI SIGs 18 and 23
- Significance for theoretical debate
- Theoretical framework, conceptual rationale or pragmatic grounding
- Embeddedness in relevant literature
- Clarity and robustness of theoretical argument
- Overall quality and scientific originality

Symposium as a whole

- Relevance to the domains of the EARLI SIGs 18 and 23
- Significance for theory, practice and policy
- Theoretical perspective, conceptual rationale or pragmatic grounding
- Organisation and internal logic of the whole symposium
- Overall quality and scientific originality

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

Round table

- Relevance to the domains of the EARLI SIGs 18 and 23
- 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

Review thresholds

The International Program Committee (IPC), comprised of the local committee and the SIG18 & 23 coordinators, has set the following thresholds for accepting a proposal at the EARLI 2017 conference:

Score	Review decision
Lower than 40	Automatic rejection for all contributions, including symposia.
Over 70	Automatic acceptance.
Between 40 and 69	Acceptance or rejection will be decided by the International Program Committee. Please note that the International Scientific Committee will not perform reviews but will make a decision based on, and respecting, the reviewers' suggestions and comments.

Whenever there is a discrepancy of over 25% between two review scores, the proposal is automatically sent to a third reviewer. The reviewer's scores are averaged and taken into account when deciding if a proposal is accepted or not.

Please note that all scores refer to "combined review scores" (average of review scores). When a symposium is rejected, the individual papers comprising the symposium are evaluated on their own merit. Individual papers that are accepted based on the received scores are likely to be scheduled in the same paper session.

Authors whose reviews are complete and within the automatic rejection or acceptance range will receive an automatic notification. This means that authors will be notified at different times, with all reviews expected to be communicated by the April 24th, 2018.