

Editorial

Norma Presmeg

Published online: 3 December 2010
© Springer Science+Business Media B.V. 2010

More than ever, now at the start of my third year as editor-in-chief of *Educational Studies in Mathematics*, I am grateful for the dedicated work of the editors who work with me, Paolo Boero, Candia Morgan, Heinz Steinbring, Luis Radford, and Book Review editor Gail FitzSimons. Their willingness to go beyond the call of duty and their commitment to quality contribute enormously to the continuing strength of the journal. The number of manuscripts submitted to the Editorial Manager has increased dramatically: In 2006, 115 manuscripts were submitted; this figure had increased to 187 in 2009, and I am sure that the increase has continued or even accelerated in 2010. It is worth noting that the number of papers accepted over the last 5 years has remained roughly constant.

These events have also placed an increased load on the dedicated members of the Editorial Board (EB), who are expected to review about 12 manuscripts per year. Several members have reviewed many more than this figure. We are all grateful, not only to the EB members, but to all who have reviewed manuscripts for the journal in the last year, and for the high quality of most of the reviews. It is especially appreciated when reviewers adhere to the required timeframe of 6 weeks in submitting reviews. The purpose of the reviews is twofold: on the one hand, reviewers are advising the handling editor of a manuscript about the decision that will be taken, in one of the following categories.

- Accept the manuscript as it is.
- Accept the manuscript after minor revisions, without a further reviewing cycle.
- Ask the author(s) to resubmit the manuscript after major revisions; a new reviewing cycle is possible, and there is no guarantee that the paper will subsequently be accepted for publication.
- Reject the manuscript, but recommend that the author(s) carry out substantial work and resubmit the paper as a new manuscript.
- Reject the manuscript.

On the other hand, a second purpose of the review is to help the author(s) to strengthen the paper, whatever the recommended decision. Thus reviews should always be respectful and helpful, while maintaining the high standards that ensure the quality of published papers. Authors who receive reviews from reviewers who appear to misunderstand the authors'

N. Presmeg (✉)
Illinois State University, Normal, IL, USA
e-mail: npresmeg@msn.com

intentions, are sometimes understandably sensitive. However, a positive stance is to recognize that such a review is a call for greater clarity of expression, not a cause for hurt feelings.

The increased number of manuscript submissions has resulted in Springer's permission for us to add an editor to our team, and to increase the size of the Editorial Board, from 35 members to 45. Accordingly, we are delighted that Merrilyn Goos of Australia, who was on the EB, will join us as an editor in January. We are also glad to welcome the following new Editorial Board members.

Ferdinando Arzarello, Italy
Chien Chin, Taiwan
Elizabeth de Freitas, USA
Laurie Edwards, USA
Nuria Gorgorio, Spain
Frederick Leung, Hong Kong
Claire Margolinas, France
Tamsin Meaney, Australia
Vilma Mesa, USA
Andreas Ryve, Sweden
Keith Weber, USA

We are particularly glad to have two new EB members from Asia, where the readership of the journal has increased considerably. The Asian-Pacific download requests to the online versions of articles now constitute 31% of the total, which is more than that of any other geographical region. However, the submission of new manuscripts from Asia has not kept pace with this increased readership, possibly because of a language barrier in writing in English. I want to emphasize that we welcome manuscripts from non-native speakers of English (and we receive many such submissions). However, my ardent plea to scholars in that case is that a native speaker of English be asked to read and annotate the paper before it is submitted. Further, writers who are not familiar with the *American Psychological Association* style used by the journal should please consult the relevant Manual and conform their writing to this style—particularly in citing references and making sure that all citations are reflected in the reference list.

As always, "*Educational Studies in Mathematics* presents new ideas and developments [that] are considered to be of major importance to those working in the field of mathematics education" (statement on the second page of each issue of the journal). Thus, the journal continues to welcome both theoretical and empirical manuscripts that describe significant developments or insights in mathematics education, dealing with "didactical, methodological, and pedagogical subjects rather than with specific programmes for teaching mathematics." In addition to being open to innovative manuscripts, this year we have published a number of book reviews, thanks to the diligence of book review editor, Gail FitzSimons. This area of service continues to evolve. We are now open to full-length book reviews (i.e., of about 8,000 words) that bring the field up to date with a whole area of mathematics education research addressed by the publication of a particular book. An example of such a book review is that by Luis Radford in this issue of the journal. Another innovation is that we shall occasionally publish in the same issue more than one review of the same book: two such reviews will appear in the second issue of volume 76 in February.

My ongoing wish for all readers and contributors is that 2011 may bring stimulating and useful ideas, and products of their fulfillment, to our field of mathematics education, for the advancement of the teaching and learning of mathematics for all.