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### For Theoretical/Philosophical Papers, please go to the second version of this form, below.

RETURN BY E-MAIL as soon as possible, but no later than *22nd October 2012*

TO: (group leader) …………………………………………………

Thematic Working Group Number and Title:……..……………………………………………………

Title of the paper proposal:…………………………………………………………………………………..

Name of the reviewer:……………………………………………….. E-mail address: ……………………….

YOUR REVIEW

Please comment in each of the following sections. In each section use as much space as required.

1. Focus and rationale of the paper

2. Theoretical framework and related literature

3. Methodology

3. Statement and discussion of results

4. Clarity

5. Relevance to this CERME8 WG audience

## My *recommendations* are as follows

A: Recommendation for *presentation at CERME8* (**mark one**):

1. ACCEPT for presentation without further modification
2. ACCEPT for presentation subject to modification as detailed below
3. REJECT
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1. ACCEPT the paper without further modification
2. ACCEPT the paper subject to modification as detailed below
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