Reviews for Academic Stream - Extended Abstracts (Poster Presentation)

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://codex.immersivelrn.org/books/instructions-for-authors/page/academic-stream-submissions

Extended abstract

- 4-7 pages, incl. references
- iLRN Conference Proceedings template
- for poster presentation

This includes but is not limited to submissions of work that is **still in progress**, describing **early-stage research** with theoretical background, methodology, and, if applicable, **first data collections** and a **description of next steps**, or completed work, condensed research concepts that **may be read and understood within an hour**. All poster presentations will also include the publication and distribution of a pre-recorded video through the iLRN YouTube channel.

Extended Abstracts can thus be at an early stage or a work in progress. Please consider this in your review.

What to Evaluate

In the EasyChair form, please provide ratings on the aspects listed below - in your evaluation, please keep in mind that the paper **might involve in-progress work**:

- **Contribution to Immersive Learning Research (weight: 1)**
  - When evaluating the project at its current phase of development: 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 track that it was submitted to. Otherwise please suggest a better fitting topic (https://codex.immersivelrn.org/books/instructions-for-authors/page/academic-stream-submissions)
    - *Justify your review by providing constructive feedback to the authors to improve their contribution in the field below.*
- **Originality and innovation (weight: 1)**
    - 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 below.*
- **Methodological/theoretical rigor (weight: 2)**
    - Depending on the type of contribution (empirical or theoretical) and when evaluating the project at its current phase of development: How sound, comprehensive and robust is the (proposed) research methodology or theoretical contribution of this submission?
    - For empirical work: are the experimental design, data collection methods, and analysis appropriate and well-planned or executed?
    - For theoretical work: are theoretical framework or conclusions solidly grounded and logically coherent?
    - *Justify your review by providing constructive feedback to the authors to improve their contribution in the field below.*
- **Claims/Conclusions, Limitations, and/or Expected Outcomes (weight: 1)**
    - Depending on the type of contribution (empirical or theoretical) and when evaluating the project at its current phase of development: How sound, comprehensive and robust is the (proposed) research methodology or theoretical contribution of this submission?
    - For empirical work: are the experimental design, data collection methods, and analysis appropriate and well-planned or executed?
    - For theoretical work: are theoretical framework or conclusions solidly grounded and logically coherent?
    - *Justify your review by providing constructive feedback to the authors to improve their contribution in the field below.*
- **Language and academic writing style (weight: 1)**
    - Is the text error free (spelling, syntax, grammar)? Is the text comprehensible to the academic community?
    - *Optional: If you want, you can add explanations in the text box.*
- **Anchoring in relevant and current literature (weight: 1)**
    - How well is the paper anchored in relevant immersive learning research literature?
    - Does it provide appropriate citation of related work in the field?

    - *Optional: If you want, you can add explanations in the text box.*
- **Compliance with style/formatting and referencing guidelines, including use of the respective template**
    - Does the paper comply with the templates and guidelines as described here https://codex.immersivelrn.org/books/instructions-for-authors/page/academic-stream-submissions?
    - *Optional: If you want, you can add explanations in the text box.*
- **Appropriate Category**
    - 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 (weight: 3)**
    - Please provide the overall evaluation for the submission. Should it be accepted for presentation at iLRN2027 and publication in the conference proceedings?
    - For all categories, revisions of papers based on the reviewers' comments should be made.
    - Justify your overall evaluation by providing constructive feedback to the authors to improve their contribution in the field "Comments for the Authors" below.
    - **Comments for authors:**
        - Please summarize your ratings and how you got to the overall evaluation.
        - Point out the strengths and weaknesses of the submission and provide constructive suggestions for improvement.
        - Clear and detailed feedback should be provided, even if you are of the view the submission should not be accepted for the conference.
        - You can refer back to comments that you already made above.

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 #8
Created 6 November 2025 14:47:01 by Jule Krüger
Updated 9 November 2026 20:05:30 by Jule Krüger