SCIENTIFIC REVISION PROCEDURES FOR SUBMISSIONS TO THE RIVISTA GEOGRAFICA ITALIANA

From issue 3 (September) of 2007, written submissions (“Articles” and “Notes”) submitted to the Rivista geografica for publication are subjected to the revision procedure described below. All submissions are initially given a preliminary reading by a member of the journal’s Board. If the submission passes this preliminary reading, it is anonymized before being sent to the specialist reviewers. The text is anonymized not only by removing the author’s name and the institution where it was written but also by removing other elements that might make it possible to recognize the author, for example by removing as far as possible citations in the text and in the final bibliography of works by the author.

The text is then sent to the specialist reviewers (two for each text). The reviewers are members of the Advisors’ Committee or the Board of Referees. The Advisors are individuals with an established scientific reputation whose names are published on the inside cover of the Review (see attachment 1). At the time of writing (March 2008) there are 26 of them. The Advisors are chosen on the proposal of one of the members of the Board of the Society of Geographical Studies. The proposal has to be presented to the Board and is subject to its approval. The members of the “board of referees” are proposed by the Advisors. They do not appear on the inside cover of the Review and so their names are not made public. The complete list of their names is, however, kept by the Board of the Review, together with the name of the Advisor who proposed them and a brief CV. The Referees can be either established scholars or younger scholars whose suitability has been guaranteed by the Advisor. At the time of writing (March 2008) there are 46 Referees. This means that as of March 2008 the number of scholars able to undertake a scientific revision on behalf of the Italian Geographical Review are 72 in number (including both Advisors and Referees).

The anonymous article is sent to each reviewer together with a questionnaire (see attachment 2) in which the reviewer is asked to give:

- an analytical judgement on individual aspects of the article
- a judgement on the article as a whole, to be sent to the author
- a confidential comment on the article, to be seen only by the Board of the Review
- a judgement on the publication-worthiness of the article in terms of the following five possibilities:
  a) acceptable for publication as it stands
  b) acceptable but only after minor changes have been made
c) acceptable but with major changes and with the suggestion that it be resubmitted to the review and reviewed a second time (please give precise details in the report)

d) not acceptable but the authors are advised to submit the article to other publications

e) not acceptable

At this point the comment is sent to the author. In the case of b), once the author has implemented the changes requested by one or both reviewers, the paper is sent to the Board who make a judgement as to whether the changes are correct. In the case of a negative judgement the Board will ask for further changes to be made. In the case of c), once the author has implemented the changes requested by one or both reviewers, the paper is sent back to the Board who send it on to the reviewer or reviewers who made the judgement, to allow them to judge whether the changes are correct. In the case of a negative judgement the reviewer will request further changes until these are considered correct.

If one of the reviewers judges the work to be a), b) or c) and the other judges it to be d) or e), the paper will be sent to a third reviewer (who will not be told of the previous judgements). If their judgement is d) or e) the paper will be rejected. If it is a), b) or c) the paper will be accepted and will follow one of the paths outlined above.