In my opinion, I would divide the work into two papers:

**First Paper**

**Multiauthoring Paper:**

This paper should give the opportunity for all people involved as partners in the Plastic Pirates Go-Europe project to be recognized as co-authors.

**Descriptive Paper with Statistics:**

The focus would be on providing descriptive details and statistical data.

* Description of Plastic Pirates Go-Europe: Purpose, origin, scope, partners, etc.
* Methodology: Including the pilot phase, which serves as the starting point to develop a more useful methodology for the project and engage more countries.
* Participation Data: Number of regions involved in the Plastic Pirates sampling. Number of young people involved. Number of river samplings conducted, both overall and by campaign. Age of participants.
* Etc.

**Citizen Science Data Analysis:**

I think it’s very important to present the citizen science data collected. In this paper, I would provide some statistics for each group, including the reporter group.

a. For Groups A and B:

* Data could be presented in total and by country (but not in a comparative way, as it depends on the number of samplings conducted, so care must be taken).
* Commonly found types of single-use plastic.
* Common types of waste found.
* Kilograms of single-use plastic collected.
* Riverbank zones with the most plastic
* Etc

b. For Group C:

We could calculate the number of microplastics found per 1000L using the citizen data collected or simply report something like: "In the % of sampled rivers, groups found microplastics." The same could be done for floating waste.

c. For Group D:

This section contains information on factors that may influence the presence of waste on riverbanks. I would explore this data further and look for patterns.

This information could also be discussed in the discussion and open the door for further research. It would highlights the need for a second paper, where additional variables from public databases (e.g., meteorological services) could help explain the distribution of waste found by participants.

In the discussion, I think it’s important to address the challenges encountered when participants tried to identify and classify some types of plastics or waste (more common errors, for instance). Also, the effort put into creating a detailed protocol to validate the data by the scientific community should be highlighted.

**I believe this would be sufficient for the first paper and that we can starting working easily from now and maybe it could be finished and submitted this year.** Additionally, it will serve as a reference paper, so that we won’t have to repeat all the information when we want to publish more data from the project.

**Second Paper**

In this paper, we will focus on collecting specific variables to investigate the sources of waste found on the riverbanks by the Plastic Pirates participants. The variables we have discussed previously include: population, distance from the sampling point, meteorology, hydro-morphological conditions, river quality, local waste reduction policies (e.g., frequent cleanups, awareness campaigns), and others.

This is a significant effort, and selected co-authors must be committed to being involved.

In this paper, we can also try to develop a method that will allow us to compare between rivers and/or regions/countries. And dealing with the differences between sampling efforts.

**Further Work**

The group from Spain intends to publish the Spanish microplastic data. I’m unsure if it’s possible to compare this data with microplastic data from other countries to create a larger paper, because I don’t know if the methodology for identifying plastic types is consistent across all participating countries, for example. What do you think?