



In an effort to facilitate the selection of appropriate peer reviewers for *Pythagoras*, we ask that you take a moment to update your electronic portfolio on <https://pythagoras.org.za> for our files, allowing us better access to your areas of interest and expertise, in order to match reviewers with submitted manuscripts.

If you would like to become a reviewer, please visit the journal website and register as a reviewer.

To access your details on the website, you will need to follow these steps:

1. Log into the online journal at <https://pythagoras.org.za>

2. In your 'user home' [<https://pythagoras.org.za/index.php/pythagoras/user>] select 'edit my profile' under the heading 'my account' and insert all relevant details, bio statement and reviewing interest(s).

3. It is good practice as a reviewer to update your personal details regularly to ensure contact with you throughout your professional term as reviewer to *Pythagoras*.

Please do not hesitate to contact us if you require assistance in performing this task.

Publisher:
publishing@aosis.co.za
Tel: +27 21 975 2602
Tel: 086 1000 381

Acknowledgement to reviewers

The quality of the articles in *Pythagoras* and the credibility and reputation of our journal crucially depend on the expertise and commitment of our peer reviewers.

Reviewing is an important part of scholarly work, making a substantial contribution to the field. Reviewers' comments serve two purposes, guided by two inter-dependent objectives:

- *Pythagoras* wishes to publish only original manuscripts of the highest possible quality, making a meaningful contribution to the field. Reviewers advise the Editor on the scholarly merits of the manuscript to help evaluate the manuscript and to decide whether or not to publish it. Reviewers are encouraged to reject a manuscript if it is scientifically flawed, merely sets out observations with no analysis, provides no new insights, or is of insufficient interest to warrant publication.
- *Pythagoras* is committed to support authors in the mathematics education community. Reviewers help the authors to improve the quality of their manuscript. Reviewers are encouraged to write their comments in a constructive and supportive manner and to be sufficiently detailed to enable the authors to improve the manuscript and make the changes that may eventually lead to acceptance.

The following summary of outcomes of the reviewing process in 2019 shows that our reviewers do well in achieving both objectives:

No. of manuscripts processed in 2019 (outcome complete)	49
Accepted without changes	0 (0%)
Accepted with minor changes (to the satisfaction of the Editor) ¹	7 (14.3%)
Accepted after major revisions (re-submit, then re-review) ²	4 (8.2%)
Rejected after review – not acceptable to be published in <i>Pythagoras</i> ³	8 (16.3%)
Rejected without review – not acceptable to be published in <i>Pythagoras</i> ⁴	30 (61.2%)
No. of manuscripts currently in review	7

We sincerely thank the following people who have reviewed these manuscripts for *Pythagoras* in 2019. We very much appreciate their time, expertise and support of *Pythagoras* amidst pressures of work.

Anita Campbell	Iben Christiansen	Michael Murray
Belinda Huntley	Ifunanya Ubah	Million Chauraya
Benita Nel	Ingrid Mostert	Neil Eddy
Bhekumusa Khuzwayo	Jacques du Plessis	Odette Umugiraneza
Bruce Brown	Jayaluxmi Naidoo	Patrick Barmby
Caroline Long	Jill Adler	Paul Mokilane
Cerenus Pfeiffer	Jogy Alex	Piet Human
David Andrich	Joseph Baidoo	Rajen Govender
David Mogari	Judah Makonye	Rina Durandt
Deonarain Brijlall	Karin Brodie	Sarah Bansilal
Dirk Wessels	Kathryn Mellor	Satsope Maoto
Divan Jagals	Kenneth Ngcoza	Shaheeda Jaffer
Duan van der Westhuizen	Lynn Bowie	Sibawu Siyepu
Erlina Ronda	Marc North	Suela Kacerja
Eunice Moru	Marie Joubert	Tracy Craig
Faaz Gierdien	Marthie van der Walt	Vanessa Scherman
Hamsa Venkatakrisnan	Mdutshekelwa Ndlovu	Vera Frith
Hannah Barnes	Mellony Graven	Vimolan Mudaly
Helen Sidiropoulos	Michael de Villiers	Willy Mwakapenda
Helena Miranda	Michael Mhlole	Yip-Cheung Chan

1. Accepted after one round of review, with 'minor' changes as specified by reviewers and Editor.

2. Accepted after two or more rounds of review, with 'major' changes specified by reviewers and Editor.

3. Includes two cases where the authors did not resubmit after required to make major changes.

4. All submissions undergo a preliminary review by the editorial team to ascertain if it falls within the aims and scope of *Pythagoras*, is of sufficient interest to our readers, offers substantially new knowledge, and is of sufficient quality to be sent for review, and is not in any way scientifically flawed. We rejected 11 manuscripts because they were mainly about mathematics and not mathematics education, nine manuscripts because they were scientifically flawed (mostly using inappropriate statistical methods), and six manuscripts, mostly from Eastern countries, because the authors' English language constructs simply could not carry the mathematics education concepts they were trying to communicate and fixing them seemed impossible, despite our commitment to support authors and despite our professional language editing services.