



ILMI Publications: Guidelines

Last reviewed: 8 January 2019

1. NATURE OF ILMI PUBLICATIONS

- a. ILMI releases occasional published matter to disseminate content relevant to the research framework and other current and socially-relevant content related to it.
- b. ILMI releases material primarily through its 'Working Paper Series', which allows for the release work-in-progress from ILMI associates, colleagues at NUST and other universities locally and internationally; other releases include:
 - i. Document notes, which document ILMI-related activities and
 - ii. Special documents, which are occasional releases proposed by ILMI associates for specific purposes desirable to the objectives of ILMI's framework.
- c. Working papers are subject to the review process (see 3 and 5, below); other documents' release is moderated by the Chair of the Editorial Committee (see 2, below).
- d. ILMI's publications are managed by the Editorial Committee (see 2 below), who oversee the editorial process (see 3 below) and adherence to the guidelines for authors (4 below) and reviewers (see 5 below).

2. EDITORIAL COMMITTEE

- a. The editorial committee is composed of at least two members of the ILMI Board, one of which is the ILMI Coordinator.
- b. The ILMI Coordinator is the Chair of the editorial committee.
- c. The editorial committee is formed of a pool of subject-matter specialists and other reputable practitioners on the fields related to ILMI's framework.
- d. A member of the editorial committee cannot be the reviewer of a paper she/he submitted for review.

3. EDITORIAL PROCESS

a. Once a paper has been submitted

- i. Editor/coordinator screens the document and submits it to the board with preliminary comments.
- ii. Board members have one week to state whether they'd be able and willing to serve as reviewer of the paper.



- iii. There should be at least two referees for the paper to undergo the editorial process.
- iv. If after one week, no member has replied, the editor/coordinator will contact individually those board members that s/he deems suitable for the review.
- v. If these two decline, but agree that the submission is worthwhile, they should nominate a suitable candidate outside the editorial board to review the submission.
- vi. If this candidate is unable and/or unwilling to review the submission, the editor/coordinator may seek further for an alternative reviewer.
- vii. These last two steps also apply if, after one week, only one member of the board agree to review the process. The relevant editorial committee members would need to be informed about this.
- viii. If two weeks have lapsed after this process, the editor/coordinator will communicate to the author the reasons why the submission won't be released through ILMI's publications.

b. Review process

- i. Reviewers are encouraged to submit within 3-4 weeks their review of the submission.
- ii. However, the maximum time span for the two reviews to be submitted is 6 weeks.
- iii. The author(s) then have a similar period to assimilate the changes and/or reply comments to the reviewers.
- iv. The editor/coordinator must verify that the comments of the reviewers were taken into account. Should the review provide no meaningful contribution to the submission, the editor/coordinator may request a third reviewer to go through the document.
- v. Reviewers should clarify the nature of their comments in the review itself; whether these are errors or omissions to be addressed, general suggestions, or simply a commentary on the authors' work.
- vi. If there are significant differences between the reviews, the editor/coordinator may contact the author seeking clarity on the matter.
- vii. Depending on the nature of the reviewers' assessment and the response of the author(s), the editor/coordinator may mediate between the reviewers and the authors.



Faculty of Natural Resources and Spatial Sciences

Integrated Land Management Institute

- viii. If there are unreconcilable differences between the two parties (e.g. a recommendation not to release the work by one reviewer), the editor/coordinator may seek a third reviewer to resolve the matter.
- ix. Definitive action from either the reviewers or the author(s) may end the editorial process. These can entail:
 - 1. - the two reviewers recommend not to release the work
 - 2. - the author decides to withdraw their work
- x. In both cases, parties will be encouraged to substantiate their decision.

c. Special provisions

- i. The editor/coordinator reserves the right to make minor editorial modifications after the work has been accepted and reviewed.

4. GUIDELINES FOR AUTHORS

a. General terms

- i. By submitting, authors agree on the general principles of shared property rights based on the Creative Commons platform (see <https://creativecommons.org/>).
- ii. After submitting the work, the author(s) will not be able to make modifications until the review process has been concluded.
- iii. After the author has re-submitted the work for final release, it won't be possible to withdraw the work. This is beyond the control of ILMI, as the Institute abides by the rules of the Institutional Repository of Libraries at NUST.

b. Specific requirements

- i. The paper should be submitted in word processing format (e.g. Word, Open Office).
- ii. Employ British spelling.
- iii. The text should have no more than three levels of headings.
- iv. All figures must be referenced.
- v. Numbers larger than three digits should include a comma separating the lower three digits.
- vi. The text should include a short abstract of about 200 words
- vii. The authors, affiliation and email address should be included; the author may include a short biography that may be included.
- viii. Referencing style should be APA; please note that this kind of reference discourages the use of footnotes. If necessary, please employ endnotes.
- ix. The maximum length for a Working Paper is 9,000 words; excluding references.



c. General requirements

- i. When an acronym is used for the first time, write it in full.
- ii. Provide a description of concepts that may be specialized for a general academic audience.
- iii. In the reference list, and where available, include URLs of references provided.
- iv. As a reference, authors can follow the following structure:
 1. Title
 2. Abstract
 3. Keywords
 4. Introduction
 5. Methodology
 6. Background
 7. Results
 8. Discussion
 9. Conclusion
 10. References
 11. Acknowledgements
 12. Appendices

5. GUIDELINES FOR REVIEWERS

a. For the Chair of the Editorial Committee

i. General

1. Confirm that the language is set to UK English, except quotations or titles of literature in American English.
2. Run spelling and grammar check, including the references
3. Make sure that all the references in the text are included in the reference list, and vice versa.
4. Check that the document conforms to APA style.
5. Check that the cover has the correct information of the publication (e.g. title, author, dates).
6. Check that the header (AUTHOR/Title) and footer (Document kind and number/Page number) are correct.
7. Make sure that the ISBN (if applicable) corresponds to the online and/or printed document.



8. Tables and figures are marked in bold, same size as the body of text. The source should be at least one point lower.
9. Make sure that all the tables/figures mentioned in the document coincide with those that are appearing in the document.
10. Make sure to update the table of contents (if applicable).

ii. For online documents

1. Use the following styles:
 - a. Heading 1: Calibri, 16p, Bold
 - b. Heading 2: Calibri, 14p, Bold italics
 - c. Heading 3: Calibri, 13p, Bold
 - d. Normal: Calibri, 11p
2. Preferably, make sure that the document remains in multiples of two

iii. For printed documents

1. Use the following styles:
 - a. Heading 1: Calibri, 20p, Bold
 - b. Heading 2: Calibri, 16p, Bold italics
 - c. Heading 3: Calibri, 14p, Bold
 - d. Normal: Calibri, 13.5p
2. Preferably, make sure that the document remains in multiples of four

b. For reviewers of content

- i. Ensure that the content makes a useful contribution to the debates it claims to be engaging.
- ii. Ensure that the document is adequately structured and communicates well its content.
- iii. If necessary, suggest changes and or send questions to the author via the Chair of the Editorial Committee.
- iv. If necessary, reviewers can recommend the paper to be rejected for publication.

6. POLICY

- a. By submitting a contribution to ILMI, authors acknowledge that the work does not contain anything that would infringe copyright if published.
- b. The ILMI editorial board reserves the right to edit the document for spelling and grammar errors and/or adaptation to the UK English language used at NUST. The editorial board may suggest changes to the content, but these will only be effected in agreement with the



authors. The editorial board reserves the right to refuse publication to submissions deemed defamatory, unlawful, and/or infringing constitutional rights.

- c. Authors agree to indemnify ILMI against any claim derived from the publication.
- d. Articles may be reproduced in the media and other sources as long as full credit is given to the authors and ILMI. Shorter versions appearing in the media or other sources are also allowed, provided also that full credit is given to the authors and ILMI.
- e. Publications are strictly not for commercial use.
- f. Other uses not mentioned above will require consent by the ILMI editorial board.

7. DISCLAIMER

- a. The disclaimer in each publication will read as follows:

© 20XX ILMI – Integrated Land Management Institute

ISBN: XXX

ILMI is a research centre at the Namibia University of Science and Technology (NUST).

Views expressed by the authors are not to be attributed to any of these institutions.

Please visit our website for details on ILMI's publications policy.

W: ilmi.nust.na