

## **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 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 Editorial Board assess whether the paper should be rejected, or sent to a third reviewer (who will not be told of the previous judgements). If his / her judgement is a), b) or c) the paper will be accepted and will follow one of the paths outlined above.