Acknowledgement to reviewers

The quality of the articles in *Pythagoras* and the credibility and reputation of our journal crucially depend on the expertise and commitment of our peer reviewers.

Reviewing is an important part of scholarly work, making a substantial contribution to the field. Reviewers' comments serve two purposes, guided by two inter-dependent objectives:

- *Pythagoras wishes to publish only original papers of the highest possible quality, making a meaningful contribution to the field.* Reviewers advise the Editor on the scholarly merits of the manuscript to help him evaluate the manuscript and to decide whether or not to publish it. Reviewers are encouraged to reject a manuscript if it is scientifically flawed, merely sets out observations with no analysis, provides no new insights, or is of insufficient interest to warrant publication.
- *Pythagoras is committed to support authors in the mathematics education community.* Reviewers help the author to improve the quality of their manuscript. Reviewers are encouraged to write their comments in a constructive and supportive manner and to be sufficiently detailed to enable the author to improve the paper and make the changes that may eventually lead to acceptance.

The following summary of outcomes of the reviewing process in 2016 shows that our reviewers do well in achieving both objectives:

No. manuscripts processed in 2016 (outcome complete)	25
Accepted *without changes*	0 (0%)
Accepted with *minor changes* (to the satisfaction of the Editor)[1]	6 (24%)
Accepted after *major revisions* (re-submit, then re-review)[2]	1 (4%)
Rejected after review - not acceptable to be published in Pythagoras[3]	5 (20%)
Rejected without review - not acceptable to be published in Pythagoras[4]	13 (52%)
No. articles currently in review	17

We sincerely thank the following people who have reviewed these manuscripts for *Pythagoras* in 2016. We very much appreciate their time, expertise and support of *Pythagoras* amidst pressures of work.

Ajayagosh Narayanan
Andile Mji
Andrew Maffessanti
Anita Campbell
Anna Posthuma
Ansie Harding
Anthony Essien
Belinda Huntley
Bruce Brown
Calisto Munongi
Caroline Long
Colin Foster
Craig Pournara
David Andrich
Dirk Wessels

Duncan Mhakure
Ednei Becher
Erica Spangenberg
Erna Lampen
Eunice Moru
Faaiz Gierdien
Hamsa Venkat
Helen Sidiropoulos
Ingrid Mostert
Johan Hugo
Joseph Dhlamini
Joseph Furner
Kaashief Hassan
Kakoma Luneta
Katy Harries

1. Accepted after one round of review, with 'minor' changes as specified by reviewers and Editor.

2. Accepted after two or more rounds of review, with 'major' changes specified by reviewers and Editor.

3. Includes two cases where authors did not resubmit after required to make major changes.

4. All submissions undergo a preliminary review by the Editor (and Associate Editors) to ascertain if it falls within the aims and scope of Pythagoras and is of an acceptable standard. Includes two cases where authors did not resubmit after extensive feedback prior to reviewing. For ethical reasons, we rejected a flood of articles from a Russian agency submitting manuscripts on behalf of researchers.

If you would like to become a reviewer, please visit the *Pythagoras* website and register as a reviewer.

Reviewers (Continued):

L.M. Kaino
Leila Goosen
Lyn Webb
Lynn Bowie
Marc North
Margot Berger
Marie Joubert
Mark Jacobs
Mdutshekelwa Ndlovu
Michael de Villiers
Michael Mhlolo
Michael Murray
Nick Taylor
Nyna Amin
Pam Lloyd
Patisizwe Mahlabela

Patrick Barmby
Paul Mokilane
Piera Biccard
Rajendran Govender
Renuka Vithal
Sarah Bansilal
Satsope Maoto
Stanley Adendorff
Temesgen Zewotir
Tim Dunne
Toni Beardon
Tracy Craig
Vanessa Scherman
Vera Frith
Verona Leendertz
Willy Mwakapenda