



AIT Series

Trends in earth observation

The aim of Italian Society of Remote Sensing is the delivery of high quality, trusted content. We operate a robust and well regarded peer review process to ensure that content is always of the highest standard. We use some of the most popular tools to screen for unoriginal material. Authors submitting to **Trends in earth observation** (AIT Series) should be aware that their manuscript may be submitted to these tools at any point during the peer review or production processes.

Ethical guidelines for editors

We ask all the editors to make every reasonable effort to adhere to the following ethical guidelines for articles submitted for peer review in AIT series:

- Journal editors should give unbiased consideration to each manuscript submitted for publication. They should judge each on its merits, without regard to race, religion, nationality, sex, seniority, or institutional affiliation of the author(s).
- Journal editors must keep the peer-review process confidential. They must not share information about a manuscript with anyone outside of the peer-review process.
- If a journal editor receives a credible allegation of misconduct by an author, reviewer, or journal editor, then they have a duty to investigate the matter with AIT Editorial Office
- Journal editors may reject a submitted manuscript without formal peer review if they consider it to be inappropriate for the journal and outside its scope.

- Journal editors should make all reasonable effort to process submissions on time.
- Journal editors should delegate the peer review of any original self-authored research article to a member of the editorial or advisory board as appropriate.
- If a journal editor receives convincing evidence that the main substance or conclusions of an article published in the journal are incorrect, then, in consultation with AIT Editorial Office, the journal editor should ensure the publication of an appropriate notice of correction.
- Any data or analysis presented in a submitted manuscript should not be used in a journal editor's own research without the consent of the author.

Ethical guidelines for peer reviewers

We ask all the reviewers to follow the guideline brought in the Committee on Publication Ethics website (<https://publicationethics.org/files/Peer%20review%20guidelines.pdf>)

Here the Basic principles to which peer reviewers should adhere:

Peer reviewers should:

- only agree to review manuscripts for which they have the subject expertise required to carry out a proper assessment and which they can assess in a timely manner
- respect the confidentiality of peer review and not reveal any details of a manuscript or its review, during or after the peer-review process, beyond those that are released by the journal
- not use information obtained during the peer-review process for their own or any other person's or organization's advantage, or to disadvantage or discredit others
- declare all potential conflicting interests, seeking advice from the journal if they are unsure whether something constitutes a relevant interest
- not allow their reviews to be influenced by the origins of a manuscript, by the nationality, religious or political beliefs, gender or other characteristics of the authors, or by commercial considerations
- be objective and constructive in their reviews, refraining from being hostile or inflammatory and from making libellous or derogatory personal comments
- acknowledge that peer review is largely a reciprocal endeavour and undertake to carry out their fair share of reviewing and in a timely manner
- recognize that impersonation of another individual during the review process is considered serious misconduct

Ethical guidelines for authors

Here the Basic principles to which Authors should take care:

- **Authorship**

Listing authors' names on an article is an important mechanism to give credit to those who have significantly contributed to the work. It also ensures transparency for those who are responsible for the integrity of the content. All the Authors should agree to take responsibility and be accountable for the contents of the article and to share responsibility to resolve any questions raised about the accuracy or integrity of the published work.

Defining authorship: is the collective responsibility of all the individuals who have conducted the work to determine who should be listed as authors, and the order in which authors should be listed.

- **Citations**

Articles must cite relevant, timely, and verified literature to support any claims made in the article.

Authors must avoid excessive and inappropriate self-citation or prearrangements among author groups to inappropriately cite each other's work, as this can be considered a form of misconduct called citation manipulation. Read the [COPE guidance on citation manipulation](#).

If you're the author of a Review article you should ensure the references you cite are relevant and provide a fair and balanced overview of the current state of research or scholarly work on the topic. Your references should not be unfairly biased towards a particular research group, organization or journal.

- **Competing interest**

All the co-authors must declare any competing interests relevant to, or which can be perceived to be relevant to the article.

Competing interests can be financial or non-financial in nature. To ensure transparency, you must also declare any associations which can be perceived by others as a competing interest.

Peer review process

Articles published in **Trends in earth observation** undergo comprehensive **Single-anonymous review** (also called 'single-blind peer review'). The reviewer's name isn't disclosed to the author.

- The Editorial Office receives a paper.
- The journal editor checks the paper against the Series' aims and scope.
- The editor then selects reviewers (usually 2 of your peers) and sends the paper.
- The reviewers read the paper and provide comments, suggestions and a recommendation (reject, revise or accept).
- The editor checks the reviews and sends them to the author(s), with any extra guidance. If there are revisions, the author(s) decides whether to make these and re-submit.
- Authors make amendments and re-submit the paper.
- If the Editor accepts the paper, it moves into production and is published.

After the publication: Correction to an Article

Once published, the articles are permanently available on the AIT website.

Corrections (or Errata Corrige) are published to alert readers to errors in the article that became apparent following the publication of the final article.

After the publication: Retraction

Articles may be retracted for several reasons:

- honest errors reported by the authors
- research misconduct (data fabrication)
- duplicate or overlapping publication
- fraudulent use of data
- clear plagiarism

After the publication: Allegations of misconduct

AIT provides an ethical publishing framework in accordance with COPE's codes of conduct for editors and publishers.

If a case of suspected research or publication misconduct is brought to our attention, we will follow the guidance and workflows recommended by COPE. In the first instance this will usually involve contacting the person/persons about whom the allegations have been raised to request an explanation. We may also need to contact the involved party's research institution, an ethics committee or other third parties.

Research misconduct includes data fabrication or falsification. Publication misconduct includes duplicate publication of articles or clear plagiarism. Honest errors or differences of opinion are not considered 'misconduct'.

If someone suspect potential misconduct in an article published, please contact the Editorial office (trendsineo@aitonline.org) - a member of the editorial team will contact you to confirm the details that you have provided and ask any additional questions needed for us to investigate.

Appeals and complaints

If you wish to make an appeal about an editorial decision or make a complaint you should contact the editorial office (trendsineo@aitonline.org).