

Reviews for Academic Stream - Doctoral Colloquium Paper (Oral Presentation in DC session)

Thank you for supporting iLRN's peer review process. Your careful and ethical evaluation ensures a high standard of research in immersive learning. Please review each submission **fairly, confidentially, and professionally**, using the criteria provided in the **review form** while following established international ethical guidelines listed below. The review form is embedded in EasyChair (have a look at [this page](#) to see how to add your review).

Paper Type

Please consider the paper type when reviewing. You can find more information on the Academic Stream on this website: <https://www.immersivelrn.org/ilrn2026/academic-stream/>

Doctoral Colloquium

- 4-7 pages, incl. references
- *iLRN Conference Proceedings template*
- for **oral presentation in the DC session**

Both doctoral level as well as master's by research students/candidates are eligible to submit to the doctoral colloquium (DC). The DC will be held as a session in addition to the regular paper sessions, with students presenting their research to each other (in English). You can find more information on the Doctoral Colloquium here: <https://www.immersivelrn.org/ilrn2026/doctoral-colloquium-dc/>

Doctoral Colloquium submissions are thus contributions by (Doctoral) Students, usually about their doctoral project or a specific study from it. Please consider this in your review.

What to Evaluate

In the EasyChair form, please provide ratings on:

- **Potential Contribution to Immersive Learning Research**
How much does the submission (potentially) contribute to research on learning, instruction, teaching or education with immersive technologies? Please keep in mind that the scope of the conference includes research on learning (education/teaching/training/instruction/...) WITH immersive technology

(VR/AR/XR/MR/games/360°...), so both components should be clearly included in the submission. Please also check if the submission fits well to the topic that it was submitted to. Otherwise please suggest a better fitting topic (<https://www.immersivelrn.org/ilrn2026/call-for-papers/#program-tracks>). Justify your review in the field "Comments for the Authors" below.

- **Originality and innovation**

How original and innovative is this contribution? How novel and unique are the proposed approach, methods, or ideas? Justify your review by providing constructive feedback to the authors to improve their contribution in the field "Comments for the Authors" below.

- **Proposed Methodological/theoretical design**

When evaluating the project at its current phase of development, how comprehensive and robust is the proposed methodological or theoretical design of this submission, whether it's an initial concept or a fully realized study? For empirical research, consider if the experimental design, data collection methods, and analysis plans are thoughtfully constructed and feasibly actionable, showing a deep grasp of the research challenge. For theoretical research, examine whether the framework or conclusions are solidly grounded, logically coherent, and poised for a meaningful contribution to the field. Justify your review by providing constructive feedback to the proposal submitters to improve their contribution in the field "Comments for the Authors" below.

- **Conclusions, Limitations, and/or Expected Outcomes**

Assessing the current development stage of the project, how well-defined and promising are the conclusions and recommendations or next steps and future directions as outlined by the authors, whether it's an initial concept or a fully realized study? Evaluate whether the authors have effectively communicated the potential advancements and broader implications stemming from their initial empirical findings or theoretical developments, while also acknowledging and planning for any limitations. Justify your review by providing constructive feedback to the proposal submitters to improve their contribution in the field "Comments for the Authors" below.

- **Quality of writing and academic style**

Is the text error free (spelling, syntax, grammar)? Is the text comprehensible to the academic community? Justify your review by providing constructive feedback to the authors to improve their contribution in the field "Comments for the Authors" below.

- **Anchoring in relevant and current literature**

How well is the paper anchored in relevant immersive learning research literature? Does it provide appropriate citation of related work in the field? Justify your review by providing constructive feedback to the authors to improve their contribution in the field "Comments for the Authors" below.

- **Compliance with iLRN Proceedings style/formatting and referencing guidelines, including use of the respective template**

Does the paper comply with the iLRN template and guidelines (<https://publications.immersivelrn.org/index.php/academic/templates>)? Justify your review by providing constructive feedback to the authors to improve their contribution in the field "Comments for the Authors" below.

- **If helpful, recommend a more appropriate paper category to support the authors.**

Which category would be most appropriate for this paper? Would you recommend the author/s to submit a revised version of the paper to another category? The author/s will be required to revise their paper as necessary to comply with the relevant page limits, and the paper will be reviewed again. Optional: If you want, you can add explanations in the text box.

- **Overall Evaluation**

Please provide the overall evaluation for the submission. Should it be accepted for publication in the conference proceedings and presentation at iLRN2025? For all categories, revisions of papers based on the reviewers' comments should be made. Justify your review by providing constructive feedback to the authors to improve their contribution in the field "Comments for the Authors" below.

Constructive, Ethical & Objective Review

iLRN adheres to recognized peer-review ethics. Reviewers are expected to follow:

- **COPE Ethical Guidelines for Peer Reviewers**

<https://publicationethics.org/resources/guidelines-new/cope-ethical-guidelines-peer-reviewers>

- **iLRN Publications Ethics & Malpractice Statement** (*Reviewers' Responsibilities*)

<https://www.immersivelrn.org/about/publications-ethics-and-malpractice-statement/>

- **Springer Nature Reviewer Guidelines** <https://www.springer.com/gp/editorial-policies/peer-review-policy-process>

Your comments to authors should:

- **Explain and justify all ratings**
- Identify **strengths and weaknesses**
- Offer **specific, actionable suggestions**
- Use a **respectful, unbiased, and professional** tone

--> *Do not include personal judgments or assumptions about author identity, background, location, or intent.*

--> *Maintain confidentiality - do not share, store externally, or reuse content.*

--> *Do not upload manuscripts into generative AI tools, per COPE and Springer Nature policies.*

Evidence-Based Evaluation

For **empirical** contributions:

- Clear research questions and rationale
- Appropriate methodology and execution
- Transparent reporting of **results, limitations, and implications**

For **theoretical/conceptual** contributions:

- Logical and coherent argumentation
- Grounding in recognized scholarly literature
- Clear advancement of conceptual understanding in the field

Evaluate **only what is presented** in the manuscript.

Literature & Research Integrity

Assess whether:

- Prior work in immersive learning research (i.e. prior ILRN conference proceedings) is **properly cited**
- The contribution is **clearly contextualized** within the field
- Citation practices meet **academic integrity** norms

If you suspect **plagiarism, fabricated data, or ethical issues**:

→ Report concerns via *Confidential feedback to the program committee only*.

Overall Recommendation

When rating acceptance suitability:

- Consider both the **importance of the contribution** and the **feasibility of revisions**
- Ensure alignment between **ratings, recommendation, and review narrative**
- *Even when recommending rejection*, include **constructive feedback** to help the authors improve

Reviewer Confidence & Confidential Notes

- Indicate your **true level of expertise** in the confidence field
- Use confidential notes only for **communication with Program Committee Chairs** (*not to authors*)

Award Nominations

Nominate a paper only if it demonstrates:

- **Outstanding rigor, originality, clarity, and impact**
- Clear potential to **advance immersive learning research**

Thank You!

Your thoughtful review contributes to:

- **Excellence** in scholarly publication
- A **fair and supportive** academic review culture

- Growth and **advancement** of the immersive learning community

For any questions related to ethics or review standards, please reach out to the [iLRN2026 Program Chairs](#) or the [iLRN Scientific Quality Assurance Team](#).

Revision #6

Created 6 November 2025 14:51:33 by Jule Krüger

Updated 7 January 2026 21:44:50 by Jule Krüger