Prof. Dr. Matthias Gehrke

Von: Karsten Luebke <karsten.luebke@fom.de>
Gesendet: Mittwoch, 15. Juni 2022 11:23
An: Prof. Dr. Matthias Gehrke
Betreff: Fwd: ICOTS11: Referee Reports

Lieber Matthias,

hast Du das auch bekommen?

Viele Grüße,

Karsten

-------- Weitergeleitete Nachricht --------
Betreff:ICOTS11: Referee Reports
Datum:Wed, 15 Jun 2022 13:15:03 +1200
Von:ICOTS11 Editor of Proceedings <editor@icots.info>
Antwort an:ICOTS11 Editor of Proceedings <editor@icots.info>
An:Karsten Lübke <karsten.luebke@fom.de>

11th International Conference on Teaching Statistics
"Bridging the Gap: Empowering and Educating Today's Learners in Statistics"
Rosario, Argentina, 11–16 September 2022 Website: icots.info/11

Dear Author(s),

Thank you very much for submitting your paper ("*Causal Diagrams for Descriptive Statistics*") to the ICOTS11 refereeing process. We greatly appreciate your contribution through writing this paper and also your interest in participating in this international conference. We have received 2 referee reports for your paper, as part of the blind-review process.

Each referee was asked to provide ratings of the paper (low/medium/high) on five criteria, and to write a short report. They also wrote suggestions to help you revise and improve the paper and its presentation — and these suggestions have been taken into consideration by the Editorial team in making its decision.

Based on the referees' responses your paper has been accepted as 'Conditional Refereed' — after you attend to the issues raised in the Editor's Comments below, your paper will be designated in the Proceedings as 'Refereed'. You should resubmit your revised paper by 20 July 2022 using the following link:

https://icots.info/11/?submit_paperR=148_LBKE

Note that if we do not receive a suitably revised paper by that date then your paper will be designated as 'Not Refereed'.

Thank you again for your participation in ICOTS11. We look forward to receiving your final paper and to seeing your presentation in September.

Sincerely yours,

Susan Peters and Lucía Zapata
Editors of Proceedings
ICOTS11

Editor's Comments
Please revise and re-submit your paper in accordance with these comments.
The referee reports, particularly that from Referee 2, offer several suggestions regarding how to improve your manuscript. We ask that you address the concerns described in the reports and attend to the referees' suggestions. In particular, as Referee 2 indicates, the manuscript would benefit from a description of existing research related to causal diagrams and students' understanding of causality and confounding. The manuscript also would benefit from additional detail such as how many students were enrolled in the classes that participated in the study for readers to gain a sense of the degree of nonresponse. Additionally, it would help readers to know what type of "statistics-related courses" were used for the study, specifically the statistics content/level of the courses. Please note that Figure 3 presents five possible response, but the key only lists four.

The authors are clear in stating that the study has severe limitations. The study would have benefitted from not only the suggestions made by the authors but also by collecting qualitative data, as suggested by Referee 2. Analyses of class sessions also could have provided insights into possible learning effects of the causal diagrams. The authors should expand their discussion of class activities and discussions to allow readers to draw some inferences as well as their consideration of the limitations of the study, which are plentiful.

There are some formatting issues to which you also should attend. Please be sure to consult the Guidelines in general (https://icots.info/11/?notices) and also attend to the following issues.
- Under the author information, provide the affiliation of the author(s) but not the address of the institution.
- Please make sure that all citations are in proper APA form, such as by listing multiple works alphabetically.
- In APA, please be sure to use an em dash to set off an element added to amplify or to digress from the main clause (e.g., Studies—published and unpublished—are included). An em dash is longer than a hyphen or en dash. Use no space before or after an em dash.
-Please note that figures as well as their titles should be in APA style or in the style used in International Statistical Review. You appear to be using APA style, so figures and their titles (and reference to them in the text) should be consistent with APA.
- Please follow the spacing as described in the guidelines: Single spacing throughout, including the title, author information and abstract. Exactly one blank line before the author(s)' name(s), the abstract, section titles, the subtitles, acknowledgements, notes, references, and appendices. There should not be spaces between any two paragraphs.
- Please make sure that all references are in proper APA form, particularly with respect to articles titles in journal publications and book chapters.

Referee 1

- Contribution to statistics education: High
- Understanding of the content and relevance of the statistical issues: High
- Adequate review of, or reference to, related work: High
- Technical, methodological and scholarly standard of work: High
- Quality of writing, organisation, clarity, style: High

Report:
It seems to me that the idea behind this article is very interesting, very pertinent and, besides that, I appreciated the way the article was structured.

Recommendation: Accept as refereed paper

Referee 2

- Contribution to statistics education: Medium
- Understanding of the content and relevance of the statistical issues: High
- Adequate review of, or reference to, related work: Low
- Technical, methodological and scholarly standard of work: Medium
- Quality of writing, organisation, clarity, style: High

Report:
The study is on an issue that is important in statistics education. THough the study is short and concise it does potentially provide a new approach in teaching causality in statistics which seems, to not have been studies much previously. I do have a couple of comments for the authors to consider in revising.

The authors provide a description of the motivation behind their study but what is missing is what do we know from the literature about using causality diagrams in teaching statistics or about teaching causality and sample or experimental design in statistics or data science classes? The review does not have to be exhaustive for this type of publication, however there should be some review of the literature to help situate this work in the field and literature base.

I am also curious why you did not collect any data using open ended questions such as, “How did the causal diagrams help you understand the claims you could make?” This type of data would help you better understand how the intervention (I.e. the causal diagrams) for influencing student's learning. That said the authors are careful not to overstate their claims

Recommendation: Accept as refereed after minor changes

Suggestions: