Copernicus FRM4SOC FICE 2025

**Training on
In Situ Ocean Colour Radiometry**

On publishing scientific articles and data sharing

Authors

giuseppe.zibordi@eoscience.eu

PROGRAMME OF THE EUROPEAN UNION

Copernicus
Europe's eyes on Earth

IMPLEMENTED BY
EUMETSAT

FRM4SOC Phase-2

fiducial reference measurements for satellite ocean colour

CNR ISMAR
ISTITUTO DI SCIENZE MARINE

7-19 July 2025
Venice, Italy

Content of a scientific paper

Papers should be written when advances suggest a new story to tell.

➢ Any scientific publication should be organized following basic elements: *Title, Authorship, Abstract, Introduction, Materials and Methods, Results, Discussion, Conclusions, Acknowledgments and References*.

➢ Any good *Title* should be composed with the fewest words defining the content of the work.

➢ The *Authorship* should include those contributors who should take intellectual property of some content and the order of the Authors should ideally reflect the level of contribution.

➢ The *Abstract* should allow the reader to identify content and findings in less than 250 words.

➢ The *Introduction* should present the nature of the work, a review of the relevant literature (background), anticipate the method and the relevant results.

➢ …

➢ The *Discussion* is essential to look into findings referring to previous works, or to discuss results with respect to theoretical and experimental implications.

➢ *Acknowledgments* should recognize any technical, scientific and data contribution, in addition to funding.

➢ *References* should be comprehensive, but not vastly excessive. Definitively, they should not become a self-citation section.

Steps to publish

Any manuscript should benefit of the largest efforts to ensure the highest quality to the manuscript: once published, a paper is forever.

➢ The *Text* must be accurate in terms of language and technical/scientific content.

➢ *Tables, Figures and related Captions* must be comprehensive with appropriate symbols and characters (easy to read).

➢ Successive *Revisions* of the manuscript by authors and colleagues are essential to distil the content and remove mistakes.

➢ Once ready, the manuscript must be submitted to a *Journal* appropriate for the topic, and possibly exhibiting a good *Impact Factor* for the discipline, but also offering *Editing Support* for accepted papers.

➢ The submission should be accompanied by a *Letter* briefly anticipating the relevance of the manuscript. This may help the editor to focus the matter and envisage reviewers.

➢ Suggested *Reviewers* should be actual experts in the discipline and not simply 'friends'. Comprehensive, fair and objective reviews are essential to consolidate contents and findings.

The Revision

The manuscript must put forward your story. But qualified Reviewers often help to improve it.

➢ *Reviewers* spend a reasonable amount of time to read and comment your manuscript. This often contributes to the best and fully independent evaluation of your work before its publication.

➢ Any request for *Revision* must be considered relevant. Please, always consider that some comments might have been simply suggested by a poor language.

➢ While Replying to reviewers always keep a balanced and positive attitude and make an attempt to reply to any request for clarification or change. Never accuse a Reviewer of incompetence (even when it would be easy to state).

➢ The manuscript presents your *Story*. Sometime, the reviewers may provide requests conflicting with your story. It is appropriate disagree with reviewers, but the reasons should be well and comprehensively stated.

➢ Do not dump your story, if *Rejected*. Reviewers' comments would always help to improve the story and facilitate its re-submission to the same journal or to another one more appropriate

You are responsible for the content of your publication.

➢ Publications provide evidence of your *Impact* (for instance through the *h-index*). Because of this, citations will give evidence of the impact of your work over time.

➢ Always assist any *Reader* that may have questions on your publication.

➢ Sometimes, *Errors* in your publication are identified after the publication. Errors not impacting results, are commonly accepted and generally do not lead to consequences. But errors may diminish the interest of readers and affect the potential number of citations.

➢ Major errors may solicit a '*Comment*'. This may lead to stressful situations for those receiving the comment, but also for those writing it. These events should be always faced in the respect of *Science Ethics*.

Data sharing

Scientific data are the basis for any publication, but also for successive investigations

➢ The generation of novel and relevant *Scientific Data*, either theoretical or experimental, is always the result of a major personal and funding effort.

➢ In the case of *Field Measurements*, timely and open data access is fundamental for any validation program.

➢ Fair *Data Policies* should facilitate access to novel and relevant data, as wells as grant *Recognition* to data providers.

➢ Well organized and maintained *Data Repositories* should be considered the natural way to preserve scientific data.

End