Resources for journalists and science writers to aid the responsible reporting of research posted as preprints
In addition to the NIH Making Effective Use of Preprints: Tips for Communicators consider these points:

1. Full explanation
   Consider including a full explanation of the terms ‘preprint’ and ‘peer review’ so that the reader understands the level of expert scrutiny the research has undergone and that the findings may be subject to change.

2. References
   Preprints are available from a number of preprint servers (see ASAPbio preprint server directory) and indexing services beyond PubMed Central (PMC) and PubMed, such as Google Scholar, EuropePMC etc. When covering research reported in a preprint, include a reference to the preprint server or online platform where the paper is hosted and a link to the preprint itself.

3. Published
   Do not refer to a preprint as ‘published’.

4. Labelling
   Consider the use of labelling to describe the study design as described by the UK Academy of Medical Sciences.

5. Complete information
   Include information on the limitations, generalizability and relevance or applicability of the work. Start by asking the authors and expand by consulting others with independent expertise in the field.
Resources for journalists and science writers to aid the responsible reporting of research posted as preprints

Potential resources to help journalists and science writers evaluate research.

These resources provide expert evaluation of research posted as preprints.

**PREreview**: A web platform for hosting preprint reviews and sharing them openly with everyone.

**CrowdTangle**: CrowdTangle is used by investigative journalists globally to discover stories and report on the spread of public content across social platforms.

**Outbreak Science Rapid PREreview**: This is a platform designed to facilitate rapid, open review of preprints related to outbreaks.

**Sciety**: A growing network where the latest biomedical and life science preprints are transparently evaluated and curated by communities of experts in one convenient place.

**Preprint Review**: Currently, this initiative from eLife allows submitting authors to opt in to have their manuscript reviewed on bioRxiv while considered for publication in the journal.

**Review Commons**: A platform that coordinates peer review of manuscripts before they are posted as preprints or submitted to a journal.

**preLights**: A service run by the biological community where a team of scientists regularly review, highlight and comment on preprints they feel are of interest to the biological community.

**Early Evidence Base/EMBO**: An experimental platform that combines artificial intelligence with human curation and expert peer-review to highlight results posted in preprints.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Preprint</strong></th>
<th><strong>Preprint server</strong></th>
<th><strong>Peer review</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A form of scholarly communication that has been made publicly available by its authors. Most preprints are deposited on preprint servers and are generally permanently available. They are accompanied by metadata such as a list of authors and date of posting. Many preprint servers allow preprints to be versioned and some offer more advanced functions, like commenting, community endorsement, and direct submission of preprints to scholarly journals.</td>
<td>A digital archive for preprints. Most preprint servers screen preprints for adherence to straightforward criteria before they are posted. While meeting these criteria is not an indication of scientific validity, posting a preprint on a preprint server can facilitate its scrutiny by the scientific community. The level of such scrutiny for a given preprint can vary from none at all to extensive impartial evaluation by a number of experts in the field; it can vary between preprints on the same server.</td>
<td>The formal invited assessment of the scientific validity of a piece of research by independent experts in the field.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community review</strong></td>
<td><strong>Published</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public feedback on a preprint.</td>
<td>In this document, ‘published’ refers to a version of work that is made publicly available in a journal after it has undergone peer review.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The full document is available to download at [asapbio.org/public](asapbio.org/public)