The review process is a one of the most important elements that ensures the quality of a conference and its proceedings. These guidelines are developed to support you as a reviewer such that you feel confident and comfortable during the review process. The quality of your **feedback** is important, so that authors can truly improve their manuscripts if necessary.

INTRODUCTION

There are three different **submission types**, each with their review criteria:

Research papers present original quantitative or qualitative research following the standard practices for engineering education research. It is expected they present theoretical background and literature review, as well as methods, analysis and interpretations of the work, and their contribution to engineering education research and practice. The length of the research paper is 6-8 pages (excluding references). There are four review criteria for research papers: (1) Value of the contribution, (2) Relating to appropriate prior work, (3) Research design and (4) Presentation.

Practice papers present ongoing projects and completed studies of practice in engineering education. Authors may present their work on how they practice engineering education, or how they have applied concepts within engineering education, or their review of literature and its application within engineering education. The length of the practice paper is 6-8 pages (excluding references). There are four review criteria for practice papers: (1) Value of the contribution, (2) Relating to appropriate prior work, (3) Adaptability and impact and (4) Presentation.

Workshops are an engaging and interactive session with a sound theoretical foundation and an attractive translation to the practice of engineering education. The length of the workshop proposal is 4-6 pages (excluding references). The proposal will include a clear learning goal, a description of the theoretical foundations of the work, and a plan for facilitating the workshop in a way that ensures that the majority of the workshop will be spent with participants engaged in active learning experiences. There are four review criteria for workshops: (1) Relevance, (2) Workshop objectives, (3) Interactivity and (4) Presentation.

Each review criterion has to be evaluated on a **3-level evaluation scale**:

GOOD: your feedback is very valuable and treated as suggestions for improvement

ADJUSTMENTS NEEDED: your feedback is essential since it's treated as requirements for improvement. So, please make your feedback actionable such that the authors can truly improve their manuscript, keeping the length limit of the submission in mind.

INSUFFICIENT: based on your feedback it should be clear for the author(s) that the quality of the submission needs improvement and that you estimate that this cannot happen within the limited time slot. By consequence the manuscript will be rejected. Remark: in case you only give 'insufficient' for the review criterion 'presentation', the submission is not rejected since a strong improvement might still be possible.

STEP-BY-STEP THROUGH CONFTOOL (https://www.conftool.com/sefi2025/)

1. **INFORMATION ON THE CONTRIBUTION, submission type**
   Check the submission type you are reviewing such that you can apply the right review criteria while reviewing the manuscript.

2. **INFORMATION ON THE CONTRIBUTION, Contribution of the Submission**
   Outline briefly the main contribution of this submission to the SEFI community (a kind of summary).

3. **APPRECIATION OF EVALUATION CRITERIA**

- **Evaluate** the submission on each of the four review criteria on a 3-level evaluation scale: good, adjustment needed or insufficient.
- **Give feedback** to the authors in the 'comments' field. The authors will be grateful to you.

4. **CONFERENCE TRACK & ADDITIONAL INFORMATION FOR THE PROGRAM COMMITTEE**

- **Click the check-box** 'Best Paper Award' if you recommend this submission as a candidate for one of the best paper awards.
- **Provide a rationale for your recommendation** in case you clicked the check-box 'best paper award'. Please justify your choice based on the review criteria.
- **Click the check-box** 'Meta review recommended' if you advice the Local organizing committee (LOC) to review also the final version of this submission. Selecting this box will add the submission to the pool from which a certain percentage will go to a meta-review phase upon submission of the final version. This is not communicated to the authors. If you have selected 'adjustment needed' for any review criterion, a meta-review should be recommended in the case that you judge the adjustments needed as strong and/or profound and thus needing to be verified by means of a meta-review.
- **Give feedback** to the LOC. These are internal comments that will not be seen by the authors.
- **Submit your review.**

OUTCOME OF THE REVIEW PROCESS

Each paper will be reviewed by two reviewers.

- All papers with 'good' on all criteria by all reviewers will be directly accepted.
- All papers that were evaluated as 'insufficient' for any criterion by any of the reviewers will be directly rejected. Exception: All papers with only the presentation criterion evaluated as 'insufficient' by any of the reviewers are conditionally accepted.
- All papers with any criterion evaluated as 'adjustment needed' by any of the reviewers are conditionally accepted.
  From all 'conditionally accepted' submissions, the final revised versions of a certain percentage will be sent for meta-review according to the availability of meta-reviewers in order to decide about acceptance. The pooling for meta-review will be informed by the reviewer recommendation for meta-review, the number of criteria evaluated as 'adjustment needed', and the feedback on these criteria.

Remark: The LOC reserves the right to do an additional check in case of divergence between the two reviewers or in case no substantial feedback is given.