

1

2

**The use and acceptability of preprints in health and social care settings: a scoping review**

3

4 Amanda Jane Blatch-Jones<sup>1\*</sup>, Alejandra Recio Saucedo<sup>1</sup> and Beth Giddins<sup>1</sup>

5

6 <sup>1</sup> National Institute for Health and Care Research (NIHR) Coordinating Centre, School of Healthcare Enterprise

7 and Innovation, University of Southampton, Hampshire, United Kingdom

8

9 \*Corresponding author

10 E-mail: [A.J.Blatch-Jones@southampton.ac.uk](mailto:A.J.Blatch-Jones@southampton.ac.uk) (ABJ)

11

12

## 13 **Abstract**

14 **Background:** Preprints are open and accessible scientific manuscript or report that is shared publicly,  
15 through a preprint server, before being submitted to a journal. The value and importance of preprints has grown  
16 since its contribution during the public health emergency of the COVID-19 pandemic. Funders and publishers  
17 are establishing their position on the use of preprints, in grant applications and publishing models. However,  
18 the evidence supporting the use and acceptability of preprints varies across funders, publishers, and  
19 researchers. The scoping review explored the current evidence on the use and acceptability of preprints in  
20 health and social care settings by publishers, funders, and the research community throughout the research  
21 lifecycle.

22  
23 **Methods:** A scoping review was undertaken with no study or language limits. The search strategy was  
24 limited to the last five years (2017-2022) to capture changes influenced by COVID-19 (e.g., accelerated use and  
25 role of preprints in research). The review included international literature, including grey literature, and two  
26 databases were searched: *Scopus and Web of Science (24 August 2022)*.

27  
28 **Results:** 379 titles and abstracts and 193 full text articles were assessed for eligibility. Ninety-eight articles  
29 met eligibility criteria and were included for full extraction. For barriers and challenges, 26 statements were  
30 grouped under four main themes (e.g., volume/growth of publications, quality assurance/trustworthiness, risks  
31 associated to credibility, and validation). For benefits and value, 34 statements were grouped under six themes  
32 (e.g., openness/transparency, increased visibility/credibility, open review process, open research, democratic  
33 process/systems, increased productivity/opportunities).

34

35 **Conclusions:** Preprints provide opportunities for rapid dissemination but there is a need for clear  
36 policies and guidance from journals, publishers, and funders. Cautionary measures are needed to maintain the  
37 quality and value of preprints, paying particular attention to how findings are translated to the public. More  
38 research is needed to address some of the uncertainties addressed in this review.

39

40 **Keywords:** Preprints, grant applications, funding organisations, open research, transparency, publishers

41

## 42 **Background**

43 The publication of research is slow, and accessibility of research outputs is often delayed due to manuscripts  
44 going through a lengthy process involving peer-review, revisions and getting published online.<sup>(1)</sup> Once published,  
45 the outputs of the research are not always widely accessible due to subscription charges, which ultimately places  
46 restrictions on who can access published manuscripts, especially those in resource-constrained countries or  
47 institutions, and the public. These barriers cause risk to the value of the research and its contribution to future  
48 scientific research and discovery being realised.<sup>(2-5)</sup> Preprints can offer a solution, and for some academic  
49 disciplines preprints have been part of the publication pathway for more than 20 years, providing instant open  
50 access to research via preprint servers (e.g., arXiv, bioRxiv, chemRxiv, and EarthArxiv).<sup>(1)</sup>

51  
52 The first preprint server known as arXiv came into practice in the physics community in 1991.<sup>(6)</sup> Posting a  
53 manuscript in a preprint server has its advantages particularly when it can take a long time to publish research  
54 findings in a peer review publication. Preprints allow researchers to post their research findings earlier and to  
55 allow for wider research community review that would otherwise only be afforded to a minimum number of  
56 peer reviewers (chosen by journal editors as part of the publication process).<sup>(2)</sup>

57  
58 However, the acceptability and role of preprints can vary not only by discipline (including whether the research  
59 is biomedical, preclinical or implementation research) but also among researchers, publishers, and funding  
60 organisations.

## 61 **What are preprints?**

62 Preprints are open and accessible scientific manuscripts that are shared publicly, through a preprint server,  
63 before being submitted to a journal (or a requirement of the journal policy to submit the manuscript to a  
64 preprint server as part of that process). Sharing a manuscript or report publicly prior to submission enables full  
65 access and, increases equity in the publication process (providing the ability to share research without paying

66 access charges). However, it is important to note that some proponents of preprinting may only publish their  
67 work as a preprint and not as an article in a peer reviewed journal (such as a report).

68

## 69 **Use and acceptability of preprints**

70 The role of preprints during the COVID-19 pandemic highlighted their importance in a public health emergency,  
71 and now with their continued use, it is important to understand how preprints contribute to the open research  
72 agenda.<sup>(7-10)</sup> However, the acceptability and use of preprints by some in the research community, can lead to  
73 hesitancy or resistance from researchers to submit their research to a preprint server.<sup>(11, 12)</sup> Concerns around  
74 the integrity and validity of submitting a manuscript to a preprint server, is also a challenge felt by those  
75 submitting a peer reviewed journal article to a publisher.<sup>(13, 14)</sup> Peer reviewed journal articles can also be  
76 retracted due to unreliable findings or errors in the published article. Funding organisations have different policy  
77 statements about how and where preprints are accepted as part of the application process. For example,  
78 whether preprints can be referenced as part of a grant application; included in an applicant's curriculum vitae  
79 (CV); or form part of the dissemination process and publication of findings.

80

81 Understanding the position of funding organisations on preprints has important implications for how the  
82 research community is willing to engage in, and accept the added value and benefit of, publishing their research  
83 in a timely fashion, and, contribute to advancing scientific knowledge.<sup>(12, 15, 16)</sup> Some funding organisations, such  
84 as Wellcome and UK Research and Innovation (UKRI) have already initiated policy guidance on their position of  
85 preprints in grant applications and some journal publishers (e.g., Springer Nature, Wiley and SAGE) are  
86 beginning to implement statements around their publishing models.

87 The purpose of this systematic scoping review was to explore the position of publishers, funding organisations  
88 and the research community in terms of the use and acceptability of preprints in health and social care settings  
89 at the grant application stage and publication of findings (e.g., the use of preprints in grant applications or as  
90 part of the publishing model). To our knowledge, a review of this topic or at this scale has not been previously

91 undertaken. The review was conducted to address the following question: *What does the evidence say about*  
92 *the role and acceptance of preprints (challenges, benefits, value, hesitancy, impact) throughout the research*  
93 *lifecycle (e.g., grant applications and publication of findings)?*

94

## 95 **Methods**

96 A previous non-systematic search identified several articles examining the role of preprints and how preprints  
97 contribute to the promotion of the open research agenda. This preliminary search was used to inform the design  
98 and conduct of this systematic scoping review (a proforma was written prior to conducting the review to ensure  
99 the rationale, objectives, design, and methodology were followed).

100 Due to the complexity, uncertainty, and nature of the available research (in terms of source, type, and audience)  
101 a scoping review methodology was undertaken. Scoping reviews are relevant to addressing research questions  
102 on priorities for research, clarification on concepts and definitions, and, providing research frameworks or  
103 background information in preparation for a systematic review. Scoping reviews typically identify evidence gaps  
104 or scope the body of literature rather than seeking to describe experiences or current practice.<sup>(17)</sup> Scoping  
105 reviews look to address ‘what has been done previously?’ and ‘what does the literature say?’ compared to  
106 systematic reviews that ask the question ‘does this intervention work for this particular group?’. Scoping review  
107 methodology does not judge the quality of the evidence but rather intends to map the evidence. Although  
108 scoping reviews present an overview of a broad research question or topic from a diverse body of evidence,  
109 they are conducted using methodological frameworks and guidance.<sup>(18, 19)</sup> The Joanna Briggs Institute (JBI)  
110 guidance was used to support the development, analysis and write up of the scoping review.<sup>(20, 21) (22)</sup>

## 111 **Eligibility criteria**

112 *Context:* The context included UK and international settings within the academic environment.

113

114 *Participants:* Publishers, research funding organisations and Higher Education Institutions (HEI's) use of  
115 preprints were included (e.g., academia or research management focused). The role of preprints from a  
116 researcher's perspective, placing emphasis on open science and open research, was also considered.

117

118 *Inclusion criteria:* Evidence from research disciplines that focused on health and social care and all phases of  
119 research, from the point of testing a new treatment or intervention through to implementation and service  
120 delivery research were included. This is not an exhaustive list but included health and social care disciplines such  
121 as sociology, biology, health economics, social work, nutrition, chemistry, pharmacology, and psychology.

122

123 *Exclusion criteria:* Evidence outside of the health and social care discipline, (e.g., engineering, physics,  
124 agriculture, arts, music) including industry and private businesses with no academic focus. The authors limited  
125 the review to only this discipline due to the variation of perspectives across other disciplines (including  
126 acceptability and how preprints are used to inform future scientific discovery) and to explore what challenges  
127 were specific to health and social care that may not be relevant to other fields of research. Non-English articles  
128 were excluded if no translation was available for the full article.

129

## 130 **Types of sources**

131 The scoping review considered all types of study designs for inclusion (e.g., randomised controlled trials, non-  
132 randomised controlled trials, before and after studies and interrupted time-series studies, analytical  
133 observational studies including prospective and retrospective cohort studies, case-control studies, analytical  
134 cross-sectional studies, descriptive observational study designs including case series, individual case reports and  
135 descriptive cross-sectional studies).

136

137 Qualitative studies that focused on, but not limited to, designs such as phenomenology, grounded theory,  
138 ethnography, qualitative description, action research and feminist research were also considered. In addition,  
139 systematic reviews, text, and opinion articles that met the inclusion criteria were also considered.

140  
141 The review included several types of published material such as academic outputs through journal articles,  
142 commentaries, editorials, and opinion letters. Grey literature of policies, guidance and reports from funding  
143 organisations and publishers were also included. It was important to capture all types of literature due to the  
144 nature of the research question and to determine whether there were any gaps in the evidence (is the evidence  
145 anecdotal or were there research studies on the role and acceptance of preprints?).

146

## 147 **Search strategy**

148 The search strategy aimed to locate both peer reviewed and non-peer reviewed studies (through the inclusion  
149 of conference abstracts). An initial limited search of PubMed, Mendeley and Google Scholar was undertaken to  
150 identify articles on the topic. The text contained in the titles and abstracts of relevant articles and reports, and  
151 the index terms used to describe the articles were used to develop a full search strategy. The search strategy,  
152 including all identified keywords and index terms, was adapted for each database (**See supporting materials S1**  
153 **Appendix: Search terms and keywords; S1 Table: Scopus and Web of Science searches**). The reference lists of  
154 included articles were also screened to identify additional literature material.

155

156 There were no study or language limits applied during the information retrieval process. However, the search  
157 strategy was limited to the last five years (2017-2022), which enabled us to determine whether the COVID-19  
158 pandemic accelerated the use and role of preprints in health and social care research. Two databases were  
159 searched: Scopus and Web of Science on 24 August 2022.

160

## 161 **Data extraction and evidence selection**



162 Following the search, all identified articles were collated and uploaded into EndNote version 20 (*Clarivate*  
163 *Analytics, PA, USA*) and duplicates removed. A pilot test of titles and abstracts were then screened for  
164 assessment against the inclusion criteria. Relevant articles were retrieved in full for screening. Ten articles were  
165 screened by all reviewers (ABJ, ARS, BG) to ensure continuity and agreement across the team. All articles were  
166 reviewed independently by two reviewers (ABJ reviewed all articles and BG and ARS reviewed 50% each) and  
167 notes were included in a separate Endnote library. Where the independent reviewer was unsure of the inclusion  
168 of the article, the record was annotated for discussion with the team and decisions for inclusion or exclusion  
169 were made by consensus. Disagreements between the reviewers at each stage of the selection process were  
170 also resolved through discussion.

171  
172 After the final screening, the list of included articles was exported to an Excel spreadsheet where labelling of  
173 articles matched the evidence to:

- 174 - the two processes of interest (funding application and/or publication of findings),
- 175 - specific areas of interest (challenges, barriers, benefits, solutions, recommendations).

176  
177 The results of the search and the study inclusion process are reported in full in a Preferred Reporting Items for  
178 Systematic Reviews and Meta-analyses extension for scoping review (PRISMA-ScR) flow diagram (see **Figure 1**).

179  
180 Data were extracted from the articles included in the scoping review by using a data extraction tool developed  
181 by the reviewers, based on the research question. The tool included specific details about the participants,  
182 concept, context, study methods and key findings. The extraction included direct export from the included  
183 articles into the spreadsheet to avoid having to return to the original source (and prevent subjective or  
184 evaluative accounts of the included articles). Extraction from each full text article was divided between the three  
185 reviewers and ABJ reviewed and verified all extraction. Due to using a scoping review methodology, no risk of

186 bias or assessment on quality was conducted. All the evidence was mapped and categorised to specific terms,  
187 which were discussed and agreed between team members at various stages throughout data extraction.  
188  
189 Funding organisations (e.g., Wellcome, UKRI, National Institute for Health and Care Research (NIHR), National  
190 Institutes of Health (NIH), Canadian Institutes of Health Research (CIHR), European Research Council)), including  
191 those organisations referenced in key articles, were explored as part of the grey literature search using Google.  
192 A search of publishers (e.g., Springer, Wiley, SAGE, PlosOne, F1000) were also conducted for additional  
193 information to understand the policy, position, and acceptability of preprints in their publication process. The  
194 policy, guidance and publications webpages were visited, and any preprint server details were recorded. The  
195 purposive sampling of funding organisations and publishers were drawn from discussions with NIHR  
196 Coordinating Centre staff to better understand the position of other funding organisations and publishers. A  
197 separate excel spreadsheet was used to capture the search results, specifically focusing on funding organisations  
198 and publishers preprint policies, guidance, and statements.

199

200

## 201 **Results**

202 A total of 587 articles were retrieved from the two databases. After deduplication (208 articles), 379 titles and  
203 abstracts and 193 full text articles were assessed for eligibility (12 articles were retrieved from references of  
204 those included articles). Of these 193, 98 articles met the eligibility criteria and were subsequently included in  
205 the review for full extraction. **Figure 1** provides a full account of the records of identification flow diagram,  
206 including the reasons for the excluded articles. **(See supporting materials S2 Table: Full details of the 98**  
207 **included articles).**

208

209 **Insert Figure 1 here**

210

## 211 Characteristics of the included studies

212 All articles were published after 2017. Most of the articles were published in a journal with a majority being  
213 perspective, editorial or commentaries (n=69). There were 24 original research articles that consisted of surveys  
214 with researchers, clinicians, and editors; analyses of preprint servers and policies; analyses of funding  
215 organisations and publishers preprint policies; and comparisons of preprints to peer reviewed publications.  
216 Characteristics of the 98 included articles are presented in **Table 1**.

217

218 **Table 1: Summary of the characteristics of the included articles (n=98)**

Characteristics	N (%)
<i>Area of focus:</i>	
Publications only	90 (91.8)
Grants only	0
Publications and Grants	8 (8.2)
<i>Year of publication:</i>	
2017	11 (11.2)
2018	10 (10.2)
2019	14 (14.3)
2020	19 (19.4)
2021	30 (30.6)
2022*	14 (14.3)
<i>Country by region:**</i>	
Africa	1 (1.0)
Asia	12 (12.3)
Europe	36 (36.7)
Americas	35 (35.7)
Australia	5 (5.1)
Unknown	9 (9.2)
<i>Article type:</i>	
Journal – Original research	24 (24.5)
Journal – Review	4 (4.1)
Journal – Perspective***	69 (70.4)
Conference proceeding	1 (1.0)

219 \*Jan-Aug inclusive, search was conducted on 24<sup>th</sup> August 2022

220 \*\* Americas (Brazil, Canada, Cuba, Mexico, USA)

221 \*\*\*Includes, editorial, commentaries, news features, correspondence, and perspective articles in journals.

222

223 As expected, much of the evidence focused on the publication stage of research with minimal evidence on the  
224 use of preprints at the grant application stage, apart from providing statements that some funding organisations  
225 accept preprints as part of a grant application. More than half of the evidence was published from 2020 onwards  
226 (n=63) and most of the articles (based on first authors country) were based in Europe (n=36) or Americas (n=35).

227

## 228 **Summarising the evidence**

229 To summarise the evidence found in the database searches, key statements were derived from the articles and  
230 labelled under generic categories. **Table 2** presents the statements, along with frequencies and source of  
231 evidence on the challenges and barriers associated to preprints. **Table 3** presents the statements, along with  
232 frequencies and source of evidence on the benefits and value associated with the use of preprints.

233

234 **Figure 2** provides an overview of the benefit and value, and challenges and barriers statements associated to  
235 the use, acceptability, and implementation of preprints.

236

237 **Insert Figure 2 here**

238

239 All the statements associated with the use of preprints varied considerably depending on what perspective was  
240 taken (publishers, funding organisations or researchers) and when the article was published. There was a steady  
241 increase in the number of publications on preprints since 2020, which could be associated to the COVID-19  
242 pandemic. However, any association between the effect of COVID-19 and the volume of preprints requires  
243 further research, which was out of remit for this scoping review (scoping methodology does not assess risk of  
244 bias or quality).

245

246 The remaining sections provide a summary of the evidence based on the research question: What does the  
247 evidence say about the role and acceptance of preprints throughout the research lifecycle, specifically in grant  
248 applications and publication of results?

249

## 250 **Barriers and challenges associated with preprints**

251 Although preprints have been established in some disciplines for more than 20 years, the COVID-19 pandemic  
 252 has revealed the rapid progress of preprints, both for their value and their shortcomings.<sup>(8, 10, 23-39)</sup> Preprints are  
 253 considered to lack scientific integrity, credibility and quality, and there is still reservation among editors,  
 254 publishers, journals and researchers about the role of preprints and their contribution to science.<sup>(6, 35, 40-44)</sup>

255  
 256 The evidence provided several process issues related to why preprints lack quality, screening, or quality checks  
 257 during the submission of a manuscript to a preprint server.<sup>(33, 45, 46)</sup> It was reported that only three preprint  
 258 servers (Research Square, bioRxiv and medRxiv) check if the content contains unfounded medical claims.<sup>(33, 45)</sup>  
 259 Several articles suggested that preprints represent incomplete scrutinised documents that have not been  
 260 validated by peer review<sup>(14)</sup>, there is higher risk of retractions<sup>(39)</sup>, and not all preprints end up getting published  
 261 in a peer reviewed publication.<sup>(6, 32)</sup>

262  
 263 The wider implications of preprints not having the same or similar quality checks or assurances means that  
 264 information is subject to interpretation and could be used by the public and social media inaccurately.<sup>(32)</sup> This  
 265 may result in the public reading a preprint as ‘established evidence’ when it has not been through any peer  
 266 review<sup>(2, 30, 47)</sup> and the media sensationalising the research before it is vetted as sound science.<sup>(32, 48)</sup> The lack of  
 267 understanding of the role of preprints in the research process could equate to potential harm and have  
 268 immediate impact on medical and clinical practice, including patients.<sup>(8, 26, 32, 33, 35, 46, 47, 49-51)</sup> Policy decisions may  
 269 also be based on research where flaws have not yet been corrected as they typically would be during the peer  
 270 review process.<sup>(31, 52)</sup> For researchers, the evidence suggested a high level of concern around the risks of  
 271 intellectual ‘scooping’<sup>(2, 12, 15, 48, 53-55)</sup> and for some disciplines or fields of research, rapid dissemination of results  
 272 should not be prioritised over quality or scrutiny.<sup>(4, 47)</sup> (See **Table 2** for a summary of statements associated to  
 273 the barriers and challenges of preprints)

274  
 275 **Table 2: Challenges and barriers associated to preprint publications, ranked by theme and numerical**  
 276 **frequency**

Key themes	No	For whom?	Statements	No. refs
Volume and growth of publications (replication crisis)	1	Researchers, Funders, Publishers	Increasing level of literature risks becoming a dumping ground for unreliable results, making it difficult to separate signal from noise (with speed comes errors). Scientific progress will slow and be put at risk as a result <sup>(23, 32, 37, 47, 48, 56)</sup>	6
	2	Researchers	Increases the volume of literature, resulting in increased time to review and discover quality evidence (mishmash of papers of various quality; information overload; information overlap) <sup>(6, 12, 29, 30, 37, 57)</sup>	6

Key themes	No	For whom?	Statements	No. refs
	3	Researchers and Publishers	A preprint platform may require authors to post the manuscript under a particular license that could conflict with the license / copyright transfer agreements required by a journal <sup>(2, 55, 58, 59)</sup>	4
	4	Researchers and Publishers	Not all preprints end up in a peer reviewed journal (posting of a preprint could forestall a publication in a peer reviewed journal) <sup>(6, 54, 56, 58)</sup>	4
	5	Researchers	Increased "junk science" in the public domain (including multiple versions) could affect benchmarking indices / metrics of scholarly achievements (e.g., h-index, altimetric) causing confusion for readers and potentially harming research teams <sup>(23, 30, 60, 61)</sup>	4
	6	Publishers	Preprints can be seen as a duplicate publication, namely "dual-use research of concern" (DURC) <sup>(30, 47, 49)</sup>	3
	7	Publishers	Preprints can be seen to be a threat to the multi-billion-dollar publishing oligopoly <sup>(13, 15)</sup>	2
	8	Researchers, Funders, Publishers	No scrutiny of preprints means no quality assurance of the content of articles (lack of quality control, threatening the quality) increase potential for misuse, misconduct, and fraud <sup>(6, 14, 24, 26, 33, 35, 37, 47, 62-64)</sup>	11
	9	Researchers, Funders, Publishers	Premature media coverage of preprints and public sharing of information prior to any scrutiny or peer review (public might not understand the role and limitations of preprints in knowledge dissemination) <sup>(4, 7, 25-27, 30, 32, 50, 52)</sup>	9
<b>Quality assurance and trustworthiness (including misuse)</b>	10	Researchers, Funders, Publishers	Preprints should not be used to guide clinical practice or health-related behavior and should not be reported in news media as established information <sup>(7, 8, 26, 51, 52, 65)</sup>	6
	11	Researchers, Funders, Publishers	Preprints can have a negative impact on credibility and public perception towards research (what if a preprint with a potential impact on public health is interpreted by some as established evidence?); preliminary findings being made available to the public in a way that appear credible <sup>(2, 4, 6, 30, 47, 65)</sup>	6
	12	Publishers	Needs to be clear, consistent and transparent policies on preprints (including policies in preprint servers), otherwise there will be distrust and the growth, acceptance of preprints will be minimal (requires integrity) and unclear preprint policies could hinder uptake of open research practices (disparity between disciplines results in unclear policies between publishers) <sup>(35, 40, 41, 43, 44, 58)</sup>	6
	13	Researchers, Funders, Publishers	Security and screening of preprints is lacking during the scientific process leading to the potential of disseminating misleading information (at pre and post study stages) mitigation of risk is required due to lack of validation (authors could inflate key findings as no checks) <sup>(6, 33, 36, 66, 67)</sup>	5
	14	Researchers and Publishers	Preprints provide limited protection and allows for the publication of poor-quality articles on preprint servers (including plagiarism) <sup>(4, 6, 15, 36, 39, 45, 48)</sup>	7
	15	Researchers	Intellectual 'scooping' is seen as a risk for researchers <sup>(2, 12, 15, 48, 53-55)</sup>	7
<b>Risks associated to credibility and reputation (including unscholarly behaviour)</b>	16	Researchers and Publishers	Peer review is a vital step in preserving the scrutiny and integrity of scientific information and is valued by authors (risk of reproducibility leading to significant differences between preprints and published versions) <sup>(25, 51, 52, 64, 68, 69)</sup>	6
	17	Researchers and Publishers	Peer-review and journal reputational cues are lacking from preprints. They are seen as important pre-conditions for researchers to engage with scholarly work (including significance of the work) but lacks credibility <sup>(9, 68)</sup>	2
	18	Publishers	Funding for preprint servers is from non-profit agencies and concerns have been raised regarding sustainability and archiving costs <sup>(41)</sup>	1

Key themes	No	For whom?	Statements	No. refs
	19	Researchers, Funders, Publishers	Difficult to disseminate or promote preprints to broader research community without jeopardising anonymity (underrepresented racial, socioeconomic, gender, or sexual identity groups may experience negative bias from a lack of anonymity) <sup>(60)</sup>	1
Scientific validation / quality	20	Researchers, Funders, Publishers	Selective use of preprint servers and exercising caution for clinical investigators when the focus is on a study involving drugs, vaccines, or medical devices and results may directly affect treatment of patients (risk on human health) and public health and safety <sup>(8, 26, 32, 33, 35, 46, 47, 49-51)</sup>	10
	21	Researchers, Funders, Publishers	Many are not aware of corrections by retractions or errata leading to misuse of research, fraud, and misconduct (risk during pandemic periods) <sup>(6, 14, 29, 32, 35, 39, 47, 56)</sup>	8
	22	Researchers, Funders, Publishers	Preprints could influence policy and guideline decisions with practical ramifications / implications, including ethical dilemmas for medical professionals and government (research integrity) <sup>(6, 23, 24, 27, 46, 55, 68)</sup>	7
	23	Researchers and Publishers	Preprints are an initial step along the scientific dissemination and publication pathway - cautionary warnings are required (indicating that this is preliminary research that has not been peer reviewed, an interim research product) <sup>(25, 26, 33, 65)</sup>	4
	24	Researchers, Funders, Publishers	Readers assume the version in the preprint server is the final version (including causing confusion as to the version of record) and there could be factually incorrect information <sup>(6, 15, 60)</sup>	3
	25	Researchers and Publishers	Lack of clarity from journals and publishers can prevent researchers from using preprints as a source to disseminate their research findings (journals reject studies already posted as a preprint; low visibility) <sup>(12, 54, 66)</sup>	3
	26	Researchers and Publishers	Not all disciplines or fields require rapid sharing of results (pace should not be prioritised over quality and scrutiny) <sup>(4, 47)</sup>	2

277

278 Without the proper guidance or caveats on preprint platforms, stating what they are and what they are not,  
279 there is the potential for preprints to have a negative impact on the credibility and public perception towards  
280 research and scientific discovery.<sup>(2, 24, 27)</sup> This is in part due to the public interpreting the preprint as ‘established  
281 evidence’ when it has not been through any peer review, scrutiny or quality assurance process.<sup>(32)</sup> These  
282 cautionary measures also extend to the use of preprints by clinicians and policymakers, especially if the study  
283 involves medications, vaccines or medical devices. The results could have a negative impact on the treatment  
284 of patients (including public health and safety)<sup>(7, 8, 26, 32, 33, 35, 46, 47, 49-52, 65)</sup> and result in the spreading of  
285 disinformation and distrust of research.<sup>(24, 38)</sup>

286

## 287 **Benefits and value of preprints**

288 A general consensus by those supportive of preprints was the notion of how preprints should be celebrated for  
289 bringing research faster to the public.<sup>(2, 3, 8, 39, 70-74)</sup> There was also acceptance that preprints are not a substitute  
290 for peer-reviewed publications, they are one element of the wider publication process of scientific discovery  
291 and sharing of research findings.<sup>(3, 27, 75)</sup>

292  
293 Most preprints do not differ substantially from the published peer-reviewed article, although there may be  
294 variation, there was no evidence that key sections of articles, such as results, changed between preprints and  
295 published versions.<sup>(12, 24, 25, 36, 43, 76)</sup> Brierley *et al.* (2021) found minimal changes were requested to preprint  
296 conclusions, suggesting that the entire publication pipeline is having a minimal but beneficial effect upon  
297 preprints and this was supported in the evidence.<sup>(12, 24, 25, 36, 43, 76)</sup> Moreover, the conclusions of 7.2% of non-  
298 COVID-19 related and 17.2% of COVID-19 related abstracts underwent only a discrete change (e.g., additional  
299 details on the funding statement) by the time of publication, but the majority of these changes do not  
300 qualitatively change the conclusions of the paper.<sup>(10, 25)</sup>

301  
302 As mentioned by Kaiser and others, intellectual ‘scooping’ and plagiarising have been regarded as a barrier to  
303 preprints.<sup>(2, 12, 15, 48, 53-55)</sup> However, this is unlikely to happen as preprints provide a time-sensitive/time-stamp  
304 when submitted to a preprint server.<sup>(15, 48, 71)</sup> As explained by Tennant *et al.* (2019), most preprints have a  
305 permanent identifier, often a Digital Object Identifier (DOI) which makes it easy to cite, track and establish a  
306 proof of discovery.<sup>(48)</sup> There is virtually no evidence to suggest research scooping exists from preprint servers.<sup>(2,  
307 41, 48, 77-79)</sup>

308  
309 Key considerations found in the evidence suggested that preprints have the potential to offer free and  
310 immediate access to results, enabling the scientific community (including developed and emerging economies)  
311 to build upon research discovery.<sup>(6, 26, 41, 51, 71, 79-82)</sup> Preprints can facilitate feedback from a wider peer community  
312 than the traditional two to four reviewers needed to assess manuscripts submitted to journals.<sup>(60)</sup> This allows a



313 unique platform for scientific critique and feedback before the work is subjected to more lengthy review  
314 processes conducted by a journal.<sup>(62)</sup> It also enables research to be openly accessible, reducing research waste  
315 and speeding up opportunities for future funding (using preprints as part of the grant application).<sup>(59, 70)</sup> This not  
316 only has important implications for Early Career Researchers (ECRs)<sup>(54, 70)</sup> but also allows for negative findings to  
317 be published and openly accessible.<sup>(5, 15, 51, 59, 60, 70, 71)</sup> (See **Table 3** for a summary of statements associated to the  
318 benefits and value associated with the use of preprint publications)  
319

320 **Table 3: Benefits and value associated with the use of preprint publications, ranked by theme and numerical**  
321 **frequency**

Key themes	No	For whom?	Statements	No. Refs
<b>Openness and Transparency</b>	1	Publishers and Researchers	When results are needed quickly, preprints offer a solution (including greater visibility on search engines) for faster dissemination than traditional publication routes (aggregated time saving could make scientific discovery 5 times faster over 10 years) Preprints accelerate the dissemination of research and innovation <sup>(1-4, 6-8, 23, 26, 28, 29, 33, 41, 44, 45, 47, 56, 59, 60, 70-75, 77, 79, 82-86)</sup>	33
	2	Publishers, Funders and Researchers	Preprint servers can help mitigate positive-outcome bias and increase transparency and data sharing opportunities, including reproducibility (including generating new research questions, expanding results and usefulness) <sup>(5, 28, 29, 37, 47, 51, 56, 70, 87-89)</sup>	11
	3	Publishers	Open and transparent history of versions of an article; provides access to previous versions (being free to read) allowing for different versions to be accessible (including datasets and protocols) <sup>(6, 26, 41, 51, 71, 79-82)</sup>	9
	4	Publishers	Preprints allow for the promotion of replications, confirmatory, contradictory, or negative findings, which generally tend to be marginalised by traditional journals (including controversial results) including alternative platforms to present data <sup>(5, 15, 51, 59, 60, 70, 71)</sup>	7
<b>Increased visibility / credibility</b>	5	Funders and Researchers	Preprints can further inform grant review and academic advancement (attractive for researchers) <sup>(2, 23, 41, 71, 76, 77, 79, 90, 91)</sup>	9
	6	Researchers	Oversight earlier in research process, therefore greater visibility earlier on (and rapid reuse of research including data) offering new opportunities for an author's work to be used/cited and therefore demonstrating the impact of the research earlier on <sup>(1, 41, 59, 67, 71, 74, 92)</sup>	7
	7	Researchers	Encourages research behaviour for data sharing, code sharing, pre-registration early on at the preprint stage, signaling increased credibility of preprints (including scientific validation) <sup>(9, 47, 56)</sup>	3
	8	Researchers	Claim recognition over results immediately (in public domain and on the web) and to justify financial funds, for those scientific areas of high competition for development and of limited funding <sup>(4, 41)</sup>	2
	9	Funders and Researchers	Allows funders to observe the progress of a project in real time, allowing a more realistic opportunity to apply for, and obtain funding or promotions <sup>(15, 44)</sup>	2
<b>Independent and open review process</b>	10	Publishers and Researchers	Preprint repositories allow for feedback from a wider population (including the public) continuing to complement traditional journal	16

Key themes	No	For whom?	Statements	No. Refs
			publishing, adding speed, openness and faster feedback for researchers <sup>(3, 4, 6, 41, 44, 47, 54-56, 59, 66, 77, 79, 82, 92, 93)</sup>	
	11	Publishers and Researchers	Preprints allow authors to widen their opportunities for receiving comments on their work by other researchers (and general public) with the goal of an improved final peer-reviewed publication / publication of record (including critical methodological review) <sup>(1, 26, 39, 44, 47, 51, 59, 60, 62, 65, 71, 72, 74, 77, 92, 94)</sup>	16
	12	Publishers and Researchers	Freely accessible and freely reproducible preprints mean the value (e.g., quality) of scientific articles no longer needs peer review but is open to the evaluation and use of the whole scientific community <sup>(3, 12, 23, 29, 54, 60, 63, 70, 79, 82, 88, 91, 95)</sup>	12
	13	Publishers and Researchers	Community response may not only improve manuscripts in development but also increase the efficiency and effectiveness of subsequent peer review by addressing inadequacies upstream (soliciting community feedback; verify quality of manuscripts, including plagiarism detection; scrutinises and critiques data, reducing the negative impact of problematic reports) <sup>(1, 3, 7, 29, 33, 51, 59, 70, 72, 74, 95)</sup>	11
	14	Publishers	Preprints should be viewed as a working in progress, made open to the public for open feedback to improve the preprint (not to be confused with open peer review) <sup>(15, 23, 74)</sup>	3
	15	Publishers and Researchers	Opportunities to accelerate discovery in ways not offered by traditional publishers to the contributing authors (early insight) but not to take the place of rigorous scientific evaluation <sup>(28, 31, 71)</sup>	3
<b>Open research</b>	16	Publishers	Published under open access licenses enabling greater visibility and accessibility with no restriction or barriers (and no submission charges, lower cost, or at reduced cost, delays associated with peer review); virtually all preprint services offer 'green open access' <sup>(3, 4, 6, 9, 12, 45, 47, 64, 83, 87, 96)</sup>	11
	17	Publishers and Researchers	Preprint model brings agility, free, unrestricted, and open access; assurance of originality, ensuring the priority of the discovery of research topic to the author, institution and research groups (allowing research to advance) <sup>(3, 70, 79, 87, 91)</sup>	5
	18	Publishers and Researchers	Open science practices such as preregistration, open data, open materials, and preprints can help improve the rigor of research, and increase access to important materials, which can help disseminate quality work (and optimize research design and quality); researchers often careful to disclose their best work that reflects their scientific abilities and expertise, so work of low quality would not be expected <sup>(7, 23, 54, 60, 71)</sup>	5
	19	Publishers, Funders and Researchers	Preprints offer a way of sharing important scholarly output that would otherwise disappear after much researcher time and funder expense (researchers are funded by and accountable to governments, the public, and funding organisations - research findings should remain accessible) <sup>(52, 71, 76)</sup>	3
	20	Publishers	Avoid weeks/months for peer review and makes early results citable from the outset; a response to the replication crisis, an expression of the failure of traditional biomedical publishing <sup>(44, 77, 82)</sup>	3
<b>Democratic process and systems</b>	21	Publishers and Researchers	The risk of scooping intellectual ideas such as methods from a preprint is unlikely because a preprint server offers time-sensitive evidence of an intellectual claim (un-editable timestamp within 24 hours of submission, providing a public record) <sup>(12, 15, 41, 54, 71, 77-79)</sup>	8

Key themes	No	For whom?	Statements	No. Refs
	22	Publishers	Preprints are less biased as not subject to selectivity regarding which articles are published and preprints are 'unbranded' helping to refocus attention where it should be – not on the name of the journal where it is eventually published, but on its contents (addressing publication bias) <sup>(6, 39, 51, 57, 66, 74, 82)</sup>	7
	23	Publishers and Researchers	Preprints can be cited, through the use of a Digital Object Identifier (DOI), so issue of responsible citation and use of preprints lies in the hands of authors and editors who choose to use and publish reference to preprint work (preprint permanently citable) <sup>(2, 3, 15, 23, 54, 77)</sup>	6
	24	Publishers and Researchers	Feedback from a larger community compared to a typical peer-review that involves comments from two or three experts in the field reduces bias and increases diversity (including ECRs developing reviewer skills) <sup>(33, 54, 60, 74, 82)</sup>	5
	25	Publishers and Researchers	Provide alternatives to underreporting, incomplete or misleading reporting by providing open access to the first finished compilation of the protocol–summary results–final dataset–preprint–paper series of prepublication events (enabling revision and improvements) <sup>(4, 29, 54, 70, 81)</sup>	5
	26	Publishers	Greater democratic publishing process and preprints do not typically preclude publication (greater control over when work is made public); removing gatekeeper role that journals may play <sup>(6, 67, 71, 97)</sup>	4
<b>Increased productivity and opportunities</b>	27	Researchers	Preprints could facilitate interactions between researchers working on similar areas/projects, and help foster new collaborations and foster professional networking (including rapidity can help a researcher maintain enthusiasm and establish priority; ECRs connect with peers) <sup>(2, 3, 5, 12, 31, 32, 44, 51, 54, 59, 63, 65, 66, 69, 70, 77-79, 90)</sup>	19
	28	Funders and Researchers	Providing early career researchers/scientists opportunities to showcase their work early to the public, offering positive effect on job opportunities or funding <sup>(5, 16, 44, 54, 63, 66, 76, 77, 79, 83, 90)</sup>	11
	29	Funders and Researchers	Some funders allow inclusion of preprints in grant applications helping applicants and authors to provide evidence of research productivity (including communication and dissemination and for ECRs) <sup>(2, 23, 30, 41, 54, 77, 90, 91, 98)</sup>	9
	30	Publishers and Researchers	Dissemination of healthcare research will facilitate better healthcare especially during a pandemic (offering priority to discoveries and ideas) <sup>(5, 7, 8, 23)</sup>	4
	31	Publishers	Preprint platforms could provide opportunities to publishers/journal editors by scouting upcoming work and invite the submission of suitable manuscripts to their journal (special issues) <sup>(2, 12, 96)</sup>	3
	32	Publishers	Preprint servers may offer a way to support living research documents and offer of results in real time <sup>(29, 52, 70)</sup>	3
	33	Publishers and Researchers	Increase sharing and uptake of research from LMICs and use of preprint servers (no publishing cost) and open access (with waivers) publishing will increase accessibility of research; raise awareness in developing nations with limited institutional funds <sup>(23, 54, 85)</sup>	3
	34	Funders and Researchers	Avoid spending time and resource on redundant research, therefore increasing efficiency, and reducing research waste <sup>(59, 70)</sup>	2

322

323 The general consensus of those in support of preprints suggest that the focus has shifted to 'how preprints

324 should be cited' rather than 'whether preprints should be cited'.<sup>(35)</sup> Furthermore, many of the potential risks

325 associated with preprints reported not only from academia but also from publishers and funding organisations,  
326 exist within the traditional peer review publication system.<sup>(99)</sup> The COVID-19 pandemic may have initiated a  
327 cultural shift in the use of preprints by academia, publishers, funding organisations, the public and policymakers  
328 as a whole.<sup>(10, 25, 29, 30, 82)</sup>

329

## 330 **Academic community acceptability of preprints**

331 One of the key challenges for the academic community is the lack of or no clear policies on the citation of  
332 preprints, from publishers and journals but also funding organisations. Klebel *et al.* (2020) found approximately  
333 75% of journals do not have clear policies on co-reviewing, citation of preprints and publication of reviewers'  
334 identities for preprints.<sup>(58)</sup> As the evidence suggested there were several competing interests for academics, and  
335 these were more relevant in some disciplines than others and not all research needs to implement all open  
336 science practices due to the nature of the research.<sup>(4, 60)</sup>

337

338 A survey conducted by Soderberg *et al.* (2020) found that of 3759 researchers (with 13.25% non-completion)  
339 69.73% felt slightly to strongly favourable towards preprints, 15.16% felt opposed to preprints and 14.95% felt  
340 neutral, although there was variation between disciplines and academic career stages.<sup>(9)</sup> However, assessing the  
341 credibility of preprints is an important factor to researchers, such as the transparency of research content,  
342 accessibility to the data (information on the open research content) and an independent review and validation  
343 of the research claims.<sup>(61)</sup>

344

345 For many investigators, preprints may be considered an initial step along the scientific dissemination and  
346 publication pathway, just as an abstract or poster have a role in the early sharing and dissemination of research  
347 among specialist communities before submission to a peer reviewed journal.<sup>(26, 65)</sup> However, preprints do not  
348 come without their challenges that can sometimes be in direct conflict with the pressures of research findings  
349 having to be accessed openly and transparently as early as possible.<sup>(30)</sup> These initiatives unintentionally place

350 greater responsibility onto the scientific community and raise concerns that preprints are substandard work.<sup>(12,</sup>  
351 <sup>77)</sup> However, there was no evidence to support such claims in the literature reviewed. Researchers will only  
352 publish their best work as it reflects their abilities and expertise, and often their reputation.<sup>(71)</sup> So, the notion of  
353 low quality would not be expected from those using preprints to disseminate their research findings.<sup>(7, 23, 54, 60,</sup>  
354 <sup>71)</sup> Existing evidence from Brierley *et al.* (2021) and Watson (2022) for example have highlighted how preprints  
355 do not differ substantially from peer reviewed journal articles and since the COVID-19 pandemic, different  
356 approaches to peer reviewing, preprints are starting to be increasingly considered by publishers along with  
357 funding organisations.<sup>(24, 25)</sup>  
358

## 359 **Addressing the challenges of publication models**

360 *“Despite the drawbacks and deadly consequences, there is little doubt that preprint publishing is here to stay.*  
361 *The question is how science will handle it. We are down a pathway of open science, and that pathway is going*  
362 *to accelerate. Our choice is not whether it occurs or not; our choice is whether it occurs responsibly.” (Watson,*  
363 *2022)<sup>(24)</sup>*

364  
365 The evidence strongly indicated that the COVID-19 pandemic has changed the viewpoint and acceptance of  
366 preprints, at a time when rapid communication was needed and a greater visibility of effectively communicating  
367 the scientific advancements for healthcare.<sup>(6, 8, 10, 100)</sup> With more than half of the evidence being published during  
368 the pandemic suggests that in times of national emergency, initiatives such as open research and open access  
369 become even more under the spotlight.<sup>(46)</sup> In the first four months of the COVID-19 pandemic, 19,389 articles  
370 were available, with a third of these being preprints.<sup>(24)</sup> In fact, the media and government quoted from preprints  
371 as the traditional peer review system was proving to be too slow.<sup>(3, 27)</sup> There was a surge of data insights during  
372 the pandemic that have ultimately accelerated the pace and speed of research, and having direct influence on  
373 policy and practice.<sup>(10, 24)</sup> However, as discussed by Raynaud *et al.* (2021) fast tracking peer review at a time of  
374 crisis can have implications to the quality of the assessment and overall results.<sup>(32)</sup> Rapid publication and

375 potential risk of unverified (not being through a peer reviewed process) findings in health related research for  
376 example, can result in misinformation and misrepresentation of findings.<sup>(15)</sup> Teixeira da Silva noted several  
377 concerns around retractions and the threat preprints can impose on the validity of scientific discovery, especially  
378 at the height of the COVID-19 pandemic.<sup>(34, 35)</sup> Ethical guidance and disclaimers are needed to indicate where  
379 results from a preprint have not been peer reviewed or quality assured. Informing the reader of these caveats,  
380 may help members of the public to stay informed of the status of the evidence, which is particularly relevant  
381 for clinical trials and experimental research (**Box 1** provides an overview of the key considerations for best  
382 practice as summarised from the evidence).

383

384 **Insert Box 1 here**

385

## 386 **Evidence from journals and publishers**

387 There is growing acceptance from publishers recognising the value and necessity of preprints towards more  
388 open and transparent publication models.<sup>(101)</sup> Several articles included editorials or commentaries from journal  
389 publishers stating their position on preprints including changes to policy, and in the broader context of open  
390 access and open research.<sup>(50, 72, 101-103)</sup> Evidence from the articles included in the review have shown that  
391 preprints are becoming recognised as part of the dissemination publication process in the wider open research  
392 initiative, but to varying degrees based on clinical relevance.<sup>(7, 32, 46)</sup>

393

394 Teixeira da Silva and Dobránszki (2019) conducted a review of preprint policies from 14 publishers and found  
395 that in 2017 64% of publishers had a preprint policy in place but by February 2018 this had increased to 78%.<sup>(44)</sup>  
396 Further advancements have been seen by eLife, showing that preprints can work alongside peer reviewed  
397 publications by adopting a 'publish, then review' model replacing the traditional 'review, then publish' model.<sup>(3)</sup>  
398 Approximately 70% of the papers reviewed by eLife during May, June and July 2020 had already been posted as

399 preprints indicating that their model was already being implemented into practice.<sup>(46)</sup> **(See supporting materials**  
400 **S3 Table: Publishers and Journals preprints policy or guidance).**

401

402 There is a clear indication that publishers are reviewing their policies and amplifying the preprints model<sup>(3, 46)</sup>  
403 and these changes were also evident in the grey literature of publishers and journals. Several publishers are  
404 actively encouraging the research community to use preprints to publish their manuscripts (e.g., Lancet, BMC,  
405 Thorax and eLife); offering to upload the manuscript to a preprint server on their behalf following submission  
406 (e.g., PLOS); developing and introducing their own preprint server for specific research (e.g., Nature for COVID  
407 research); reviewing tools to reduce information overload (e.g., simultaneous multi-preprint server retrieval  
408 tools to aggregate preprints); and publishing the preprint version alongside the peer reviewed journal article on  
409 the website (e.g., PeerJ and F1000Research).<sup>(4, 6, 23, 50, 75, 84, 99, 102)</sup>

410

411 Publishers such as the Lancet and eLife are also disseminating their own preprint policies and guidance in  
412 editorials and commentaries on how the model of publishing is changing.<sup>(65)</sup> The PubMed database is also taking  
413 steps to index preprints from journals such as F1000 and PeerJ. However, despite these developments, the  
414 evidence suggests that preprint policies vary between publishing companies and in some instances within the  
415 same publishing company and across research disciplines, which could hinder the progress and integrity of  
416 preprints.<sup>(35, 40, 41, 43, 44, 58, 60)</sup> **Box 2** provides a summary of the key considerations for publishers and journals as  
417 summarised from the evidence.

418

419 **Insert Box 2 here**

420

## 421 **Evidence from funding organisations**

422 Over the last five years several funding organisations have endorsed the use of preprints, encouraging  
423 researchers to use preprints as an interim to speed up the dissemination of the research.<sup>(1)</sup> There are also several

424 funding organisations that allow the inclusion of preprints as part of a grant application, which are starting to  
425 be disseminated in published literature.<sup>(71, 98)</sup> However, the evidence was sparse, with most focusing on the  
426 publication aspect of research findings. **(See supporting materials S4 Table: Funding organisations position on  
427 preprints for grant applications and publications)**

428  
429 Some funding organisations have taken the initiative to develop their own exclusive platform to host preprints  
430 and other non-peer reviewed publications such as the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation (platform to present  
431 findings as a future preprint server (Gates Open Research), using the F1000 Research technical platform that is  
432 leased for a fee<sup>(15)</sup>); Wellcome Trust (preprint server since 2016 (Wellcome Open Research))<sup>5</sup>; and the National  
433 Institute for Health and Care Research (NIHR) (an Open Research platform for its researchers to publish, using  
434 prepublication checks and open peer review).<sup>(104)</sup>

435  
436 The evidence also showed that many funding organisations are also assessing their policies and guidance or  
437 implementing new policies that take account of preprints in varying situations. A useful source to track funding  
438 organisations progress on these preprint policies is via the ASAPbio website.<sup>(105, 106)</sup> (see **Box 3** for a summary of  
439 the key considerations for funding organisations based on the available evidence).<sup>(91)</sup>

440

441 **Insert Box 3 here**

442

443 *Grant applications:* There was limited evidence on the use of preprints in grant applications and most of the  
444 evidence was either in the grey literature or on the funding organisations webpages.<sup>(15, 30, 71, 91)</sup>

445 Preprints can provide a funding organisation with evidence to substantiate recent productivity. However, there  
446 is wide variation in how funding organisations accept preprints, including in what circumstances they are  
447 acceptable in a grant proposal (e.g., researchers own preprints to demonstrate productivity or using preprints



448 as part of the research proposal itself).<sup>(52, 71, 76)</sup> Preprints are therefore said to have varying impact for  
449 researchers, grantees or applicants.<sup>(2, 23, 41, 71, 76, 77, 79, 90, 91)</sup>

450  
451 Several funding organisations (e.g., Wellcome Trust, NIH) now endorse the use of preprint servers for grant  
452 applications.<sup>(107, 108)</sup> Including preprints in the grant application process provides reviewers the opportunity to  
453 access and gain early insight to the research and data in its full format (i.e., not restricted by word limitation in  
454 the funding application).<sup>(3)</sup>

455  
456 However, there have been concerns over the misuse of metrics, particularly with funding organisations using  
457 preprint citations.<sup>(11, 61)</sup> With the growing number of preprints there is a risk of author affiliation-based citation  
458 bias for those who use citations for scientific impact quantification (e.g., funding organisations, institutional  
459 promotion). This is particularly relevant to funding organisations who make recommendations to fund research  
460 based on citations. Although, we have seen a move away from this, with initiatives such as the Declaration on  
461 Research Assessment (DORA)<sup>(109)</sup>, Contributor Roles Taxonomy (CRediT)<sup>(110)</sup> and Plan S/cOAlition S<sup>(111)</sup> this is not  
462 a global phenomenon<sup>(30, 61)</sup> and has important implications for diversity, equity and inclusion (including ECRs and  
463 Low-and-Middle Income Countries (LMICs)).<sup>(23, 30, 54, 60, 61)</sup>

464

465

## 466 **Discussion**

467 It was clear from the evidence that there was a general acceptance and understanding that preprints are not a  
468 substitution or replacement for a peer reviewed publication. Preprints complement and act as a mechanism  
469 within the publication process to disseminate the research findings faster, through openly accessible routes.<sup>(23,  
470 56, 93)</sup>

471

472 The distinction between a preprint and a peer reviewed publication becomes imperative when you consider the  
473 unintended consequences of their use on not only clinical practice but also on researchers to judge research  
474 performance, quality or productivity.<sup>(2, 29, 65, 71, 92)</sup> Whilst preprints can be part of the process to promote open  
475 research, by applying the principles of transparency and integrity, we also need to appreciate and acknowledge  
476 the associated caveats and limitations of their use.<sup>(25, 26, 33, 65)</sup>

477

478 Although the COVID-19 pandemic has informed a greater appreciation for the scholarly landscape on the use  
479 and acceptability of preprints, the absence of peer review of manuscripts or reports submitted to a preprint  
480 server has led to the withdrawal of several preprints.<sup>(3)</sup> However, it is important to note that peer reviewed  
481 journal articles can also be withdrawn or retracted due to oversight during the peer review process conducted  
482 by the journal itself (editors choosing the peer reviewers). These challenges are not exclusive to preprints,  
483 however with careful consideration and acceptance of these challenges, alongside the limitations, preprints can  
484 become an integral part of scientific discovery if all journals support publishing on preprint servers as part of  
485 their process (not all publishers stipulate processing your manuscript on a preprint server prior to, or as part of  
486 the submission process to a journal).<sup>(6)</sup> Evidence comparing preprints to peer reviewed journal articles have  
487 found that the quality is similar for both, and the types of discrepancies are common between both preprints  
488 and a peer reviewed journal article.<sup>(10, 100, 112-115)</sup> Opportunities for rapid dissemination using preprints means  
489 that best practices through policies and guidance are required, from journals, publishers, and funding  
490 organisations, to ensure that preprints become embedded into practice albeit with caveats and cautionary  
491 measures to maintain quality, credibility, transparency and openness (as with peer reviewed articles submitted  
492 to journals). Initiatives such as Plan S (open access publishing) and cOAlition S (funders and stakeholders)  
493 advocate for immediate and open access to research publications without embargo<sup>(111)</sup>, which over time may  
494 ultimately reassure the research community of the value and benefit of publishing on a preprint server prior to  
495 the submission of the manuscript to a journal.

496 The increasing demands and challenges to allow for the immediacy of results being made public places pressure  
497 on the open access agenda for not only publishers but also the research community.<sup>(88)</sup> Delays to the publication  
498 of manuscripts can also have far reaching implications for ECRs in terms of job opportunities and grant  
499 funding.<sup>(54, 61, 62, 81)</sup> Understanding the complexities that surround the use, acceptability, challenges and benefits  
500 of preprints goes far beyond the world of publishing research: policies and practices of funding organisations  
501 and university institutions have a direct impact on the longer-term impact of how research enhancement and  
502 discovery takes place.<sup>(7, 23, 52, 60, 71)</sup>

503

## 504 **Study strengths and limitations**

505 The main strength of the review was the combination of a systematic database literature search with an  
506 extensive grey literature search of publishers and funding organisations position, policies, and guidance.  
507 However, as scoping reviews map the evidence rather than assess quality or risk of bias, this was a limitation to  
508 the current review. Restricting the evidence to only a health and social care discipline meant that articles from  
509 other disciplines were not included in the review, with the majority of evidence focused on publishing models  
510 and minimal evidence looking at the role of preprints in grant applications. Although, there were some articles  
511 from Asia (12.3%), most of the articles were from Europe and Americas (72.4%), which could have introduced  
512 regional biases (e.g., Western science). However, this could be due to a lack of evidence from these regions  
513 rather than missing literature from the systematic searches. Only searching in two databases could have meant  
514 we missed some articles (including preprints) on this subject matter. However, the role of scoping reviews are  
515 an overview of a broad topic or subject (identifying key concepts, gaps in the evidence and sources of evidence),  
516 rather than to evaluate or synthesize data on a focused research question or topic.<sup>(18)</sup>

517

518 Due to the limited evidence found in the review on the acceptability and use of preprints in grant applications,  
519 research is needed to clearly understand what position funding organisations are taking and how it is perceived  
520 and accepted by the research community. There was a lack of evidence to clearly explain in what circumstances

521 preprints are acceptable to cite in the grant application process. For example, to inform the research application  
522 or as part of an applicant's CV, at what stage is it acceptable to include and what version of record, and how is  
523 it tracked when published or otherwise as a peer reviewed journal article (particularly for funding organisations).

524

525

## 526 **Future recommendations**

527 The recommendations arising from the review mainly focused on what measures are needed for preprints to  
528 become embedded in open research practices. These recommendations are important for publishers, funding  
529 organisations and researchers, by considering the role of preprints and where and in what circumstances  
530 preprints may not be feasible, such as

- 531 - Accessibility and feasibility to submit and upload to preprint servers on behalf of the researcher  
532 (therefore ensuring continuity)<sup>(79)</sup>
- 533 - Adopting the use of preprints in grant applications requires clear and ethical guidance
- 534 - Applying a badge or signal to show whether the article complying with open data, data sharing, pre-  
535 registrations etc could also be adopted by preprint services (with clear guidance) similar to the Center  
536 for Open Science (COS) (a badge system has led to over 60 journals adopting this approach on  
537 published articles to indicate open data, data sharing, materials, and/or pre-registrations)<sup>(9, 33)</sup>
- 538 - Preprint servers must have clear ethical and retraction policies in place, and these must be enforced  
539 and considered in publishers and funding organisations preprint policies<sup>(15, 34, 116)</sup>
- 540 - Preprint policies should include ethical guidance in the event of misconduct and consider whether this  
541 should be the same process as peer-reviewed journal articles<sup>(34)</sup>
- 542 - Preprints should not be posted when the reported information could be misapplied or misused,  
543 causing significant consequences to the health and safety of the public<sup>(117)</sup>

544 **(See supporting materials S5 Table: Future considerations and recommendations for publishers, funding**  
545 **organisations and the research community)**

546  
547 Clear, explicit, and transparent guidance by publishers, journals, and funding organisations (working  
548 collaboratively) are required to articulate to academia the role and purpose of preprints compared to a peer  
549 reviewed journal publication. There is also a need for publishers and journals to acknowledge how preprints fit  
550 into their publication model, ensuring that policies are aligned with preprints servers and are transparent about  
551 their use of preprints.

552  
553 Methodologically, it would be important to consider preprints in other disciplines other than health and social  
554 care (using other platforms such as Dimensions), to understand whether there are differences between  
555 disciplines and whether those that submit and have used preprint servers for several years, approach preprints  
556 with the same level of caution or not.

557

## 558 **Conclusions**

559 Further research is needed to address several key areas associated with preprints that may help to clarify the  
560 respective opportunities that preprints can offer to the publication process. It will be important to consider the  
561 views, opinions and expectations of researchers, funding organisations and publishers, to ensure that global  
562 challenges regarding access to research findings (e.g., budgetary constraints) does not inhibit ECRs or LMICs.<sup>(23,</sup>  
563 <sup>54, 85)</sup> The lack of evidence on preprints at the grant application stage requires more research with funding  
564 organisations and the research community, such as screening of preprints submissions used in grant applications  
565 as part of the evidence to support the need of the research and as part of the applicants' publications listing.<sup>(15,</sup>  
566 <sup>44, 71)</sup>

567

568 The question of quality, peer review, and integrity are paramount to the acceptability of preprints if they are to  
569 contribute to improving the reproducibility of research and further advance scientific discovery.<sup>(51)</sup> It is clear  
570 from the evidence that a clearer understanding of the role of preprints in the process of publishing research

571 findings is needed.<sup>(56)</sup> Possible coordination among preprint servers for screening research and opportunities to  
572 work with funding organisations and researchers to increase their longer-term functionality.<sup>(23, 67)</sup> There is  
573 acceptance that preprints offer a way to present early findings of research into the public domain, openly and  
574 transparently, which can therefore help to foster awareness and reduce misinformation of health and social  
575 care research findings to the general public.<sup>(113, 118)</sup> The role of preprints is merely part of the process to reaching  
576 a peer reviewed publication. Preprints are therefore not a substitute for peer reviewed journal publications but  
577 part of the overall system and process of disseminating research rapidly using openly accessible routes to  
578 advance scientific discovery.<sup>(12, 23)</sup>

579  
580 Any changes to the processes and mechanisms of publishing research needs to ensure it meets current  
581 expectations of different audiences, and that research communities embrace the principles of quality,  
582 transparency and openness for the provision of innovation and new knowledge.<sup>(31)</sup>

583

## 584 **Supporting information**

585 **S1 Appendix.** Search terms and keywords (docx)

586 **S2 Appendix.** PRISMA checklist (PDF)

587 **S1 Table.** Scopus and Web of science searches (docx)

588 **S2 Table.** Full details of the 98 included studies (docx)

589 **S3 Table.** Publishers and Journals preprints policy or guidance (docx)

590 **S4 Table.** Funding organisations position on preprints for grant applications and publications (docx)

591 **S5 Table.** Future considerations and recommendations for publishers, funding organisations and the research  
592 community (docx)

593

## 594 **Acknowledgements**

595 We would like to thank the NIHR Journals Library centre staff and those members of the NIHR Open Research  
596 Oversight Group for their support during the development of the scoping review and throughout the write up  
597 of the article. We would also like to thank the NIHR Research on Research team for reviewing early draft versions  
598 of the article.

599

## 600 **Availability of data and material**

601 All relevant data are provided in the article and the supporting material files. These can be found on the  
602 preprint server at: <https://osf.io/tkg52/> and <https://osf.io/preprints/socarxiv/nug4p/>

603

## 604 **Competing interests**

605 The authors declare no competing interests exist.

606

## 607 **Funding**

608 This research was funded by the National Institute for Health and Care Research Coordinating Centre (NIHRCC),  
609 based at the University of Southampton, through its Research-on-Research Programme. The views and opinions  
610 expressed in the discussion are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect those of the Department of  
611 Health and Social Care. The funders had no role in the study design, data collection and analysis, decision to  
612 publish, or preparation of the manuscript.

613

614

## 615 **Author contributions**

616 **Conceptualization:** Amanda Blatch-Jones, Alejandra Recio Saucedo

617 **Data curation:** Amanda Blatch-Jones, Alejandra Recio Saucedo, Beth Giddins

618 **Formal analysis:** Amanda Blatch-Jones, Alejandra Recio Saucedo, Beth Giddins

619 **Investigation:** Amanda Blatch-Jones, Alejandra Recio Saucedo, Beth Giddins

620 **Methodology:** Amanda Blatch-Jones, Alejandra Recio Saucedo

621 **Project administration:** Amanda Blatch-Jones

622 **Supervision:** Amanda Blatch-Jones

623 **Writing – original draft:** Amanda Blatch-Jones

624 **Writing – review and editing:** Amanda Blatch-Jones, Alejandra Recio Saucedo, Beth Giddins

625

## 626 **Abbreviations**

627 APC Article Processing Charges

628 ATOPP Attitudes Towards Open data sharing, Preprinting and Peer-review

629 CIHR Canadian Institutes of Health Research



630	COI	Conflict of Interest
631	CONSORT	Consolidated Standards of Reporting Trials
632	COVID-19	Coronavirus Disease 2019
633	COS	Center for Open Science
634	CRedit	Contributor Role Taxonomy
635	CV	Curriculum Vitae
636	DOI	Digital Object Identifier
637	DORA	Declaration on Research Assessment
638	DURC	Dual Use Research of Concern
639	ECR	Early Career Researchers
640	HEI	Higher Education Institution
641	JBI	Joanna Briggs Institute
642	LMICs	Low-and-Middle Income Countries
643	NIH	National Institutes of Health
644	NIHR	National Institute for Health and Care Research
645	OA	Open Access
646	ORCID	Open Researcher and Contributor Identifier
647	PRISMA-ScR	Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-analyses extension for
648		Scoping Reviews
649	UK	United Kingdom
650	UKRI	UK Research and Innovation

652 **References**

- 653 1. Sever R, Eisen M, Inglis J. Plan u: Universal access to scientific and medical research via funder preprint  
654 mandates. *PLoS Biol.* 2019;17(6).
- 655 2. COPE Council. COPE Discussion document: Preprints. March 2018.
- 656 3. Pearse RM, Ackland GL, Asai T, Hemmings HC, Jr. Preprints in perioperative medicine: immediacy for  
657 the greater good. *Br J Anaesth.* 2021;126(5):915-8.
- 658 4. Rodríguez EG. Preprints and preprint servers as academic communication tools. *Revista Cubana de*  
659 *Informacion en Ciencias de la Salud.* 2019;30(1).
- 660 5. Kaiser DE, Oliveira Crossetti MdG. Open Science and the emergence of preprints. *Rev Gaucha Enferm.*  
661 2021;42:e20210030.
- 662 6. Smart P. The Evolution, Benefits, and Challenges Of Preprints and their Interaction with Journals. *Sci*  
663 *Ed.* 2022;9(1):79-84.
- 664 7. Grant S, Wendt KE, Leadbeater BJ, Supplee LH, Mayo-Wilson E, Gardner F, et al. Transparent, Open,  
665 and Reproducible Prevention Science. *Prev Sci.* 2022;23(5):701-22.
- 666 8. Koerber A. Is It Fake News or Is It Open Science? Science Communication in the COVID-19 Pandemic. *J*  
667 *Bus Tech Commun.* 2021;35(1):22-7.
- 668 9. Soderberg CK, Errington TM, Nosek BA. Credibility of preprints: an interdisciplinary survey of  
669 researchers. *Royal Society Open Science.* 2020;7(10).
- 670 10. Fraser N, Brierley L, Dey G, Polka JK, Pálffy M, Nanni F, et al. The evolving role of preprints in the  
671 dissemination of COVID-19 research and their impact on the science communication landscape. *PLoS Biol.*  
672 2021;19(4):e3000959.
- 673 11. Teixeira da Silva JA. Preprints: Ethical hazard or academic liberation? *Kome.* 2017;5(2):73-80.
- 674 12. Kaiser J. The preprint dilemma. *Science.* 2017;357(6358):1344-9.
- 675 13. Baffy G, Burns MM, Hoffmann B, Ramani S, Sabharwal S, Borus JF, et al. Scientific Authors in a  
676 Changing World of Scholarly Communication: What Does the Future Hold? *Am J Med.* 2020;133(1):26-31.
- 677 14. Teixeira da Silva JA. A Synthesis of the Formats for Correcting Erroneous and Fraudulent Academic  
678 Literature, and Associated Challenges. *J General Philos Sci.* 2022.
- 679 15. Teixeira da Silva JA. The preprint debate: What are the issues? *Medical journal, Armed Forces India.*  
680 2018;74(2):162-4.
- 681 16. Callaway E. Heavyweight funders back central site for life-sciences preprints. *Nature.*  
682 2017;542(7641):283-4.
- 683 17. Pollock D, Davies EL, Peters MDJ, Tricco AC, Alexander L, McInerney P, et al. Undertaking a scoping  
684 review: A practical guide for nursing and midwifery students, clinicians, researchers, and academics. *Journal of*  
685 *Advanced Nursing.* 2021;77(4):2102-13.
- 686 18. Arksey H, O'Malley L. Scoping studies: towards a methodological framework. *International journal of*  
687 *social research methodology.* 2005;8(1):19-32.
- 688 19. Tricco AC, Lillie E, Zarin W, O'Brien KK, Colquhoun H, Levac D, et al. PRISMA Extension for Scoping  
689 Reviews (PRISMA-ScR): Checklist and Explanation. *Ann Intern Med.* 2018;169(7):467-73.
- 690 20. JBI. Scoping Review Network: <https://jbi.global/scoping-review-network> Last accessed 17/02/2023 [  
691 21. Peters MDJ, Marnie C, Tricco AC, Pollock D, Munn Z, Alexander L, et al. Updated methodological  
692 guidance for the conduct of scoping reviews. *JBIEvidence Implementation.* 2021;19(1):3-10.
- 693 22. Munn Z, Pollock D, Khalil H, Alexander L, McInerney P, Godfrey CM, et al. What are scoping reviews?  
694 Providing a formal definition of scoping reviews as a type of evidence synthesis. *JBIEvidence Synthesis.*  
695 2022;20(4):950-2.

- 696 23. Subramanian K, Nalli A, Senthil V, Bhat A. Pharmaceutical industry—authored preprints: scientific and  
697 social media impact. *Curr Med Res Opin.* 2021;37(2):269-73.
- 698 24. Watson C. Rise of the preprint: how rapid data sharing during COVID-19 has changed science forever.  
699 *Nature Medicine.* 2022;28(1):2-5.
- 700 25. Brierley L, Nanni F, Polka JK, Dey G, Pálffy M, Fraser N, et al. Preprints in motion: tracking changes  
701 between preprint posting and journal publication during a pandemic. *bioRxiv.* 2021:2021.02.20.432090.
- 702 26. Flanagan A, Fontanarosa PB, Bauchner H. Preprints Involving Medical Research—Do the Benefits  
703 Outweigh the Challenges? *JAMA.* 2020;324(18):1840-3.
- 704 27. Hurst P, Greaves S. COVID-19 Rapid Review cross-publisher initiative: What we have learned and what  
705 we are going to do next. *Learn Publ.* 2021;34(3):450-3.
- 706 28. Lee AYS, Lin MW. Rapid publishing in the era of coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19). *Medical Journal  
707 of Australia.* 2020;212(11).
- 708 29. Machin-Mastromatteo JD, Tarango J, Romo-González JR. Impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on  
709 scientific production. *Libraries, Digital Information, and COVID: Practical Applications and Approaches to  
710 Challenge and Change: Elsevier; 2021. p. 183-98.*
- 711 30. Jui-An Pan S. The Publication Ethics of Preprints and Preprints' Influence on Knowledge Dissemination  
712 during the COVID-19 Pandemic. *J Educ Media Libr Sci.* 2022;59(1):35-71.
- 713 31. Peretz F, Bonini-Vuillod J, Grivaux M, Duracinsky M, Chassany O. COVID-19 and medical publications:  
714 How three articles have influenced the media and public decisions in France. *Revue De Medecine Interne.*  
715 2021;42(8):583-90.
- 716 32. Raynaud M, Zhang H, Louis K, Goutaudier V, Wang J, Dubourg Q, et al. COVID-19-related medical  
717 research: a meta-research and critical appraisal. *Bmc Medical Research Methodology.* 2021;21(1).
- 718 33. Strcic J, Civljak A, Gloznic T, Pacheco RL, Brkovic T, Puljak L. Open data and data sharing in articles  
719 about COVID-19 published in preprint servers medRxiv and bioRxiv. *Scientometrics.* 2022;127(5):2791-802.
- 720 34. Teixeira da Silva JA. Silently withdrawn or retracted preprints related to Covid-19 are a scholarly threat  
721 and a potential public health risk: theoretical arguments and suggested recommendations. *Online Info Rev.*  
722 2020;45(4):751-7.
- 723 35. Teixeira da Silva JA. Adjusting the use of preprints to accommodate the 'quality' factor in response to  
724 COVID-19. *Journal of Taibah University Medical Sciences.* 2021;16(4):477-81.
- 725 36. Wang Y, Cao Z, Zeng DD, Zhang Q, Luo T. The collective wisdom in the COVID-19 research: Comparison  
726 and synthesis of epidemiological parameter estimates in preprints and peer-reviewed articles. *International  
727 Journal of Infectious Diseases.* 2021;104:1-6.
- 728 37. Weissgerber T, Riedel N, Kilicoglu H, Labbe C, Eckmann P, ter Riet G, et al. Automated screening of  
729 COVID-19 preprints: can we help authors to improve transparency and reproducibility? *Nature Medicine.*  
730 2021;27(1):6-7.
- 731 38. Gupta L, Gasparyan AY, Misra DP, Agarwal V, Zimba O, Yessirkepov M. Information and misinformation  
732 on COVID-19: A cross-sectional survey study. *J Korean Med Sci.* 2020a;35(27).
- 733 39. Gupta L, Gasparyan AY, Zimba O, Misra DP. Scholarly publishing and journal targeting in the time of  
734 the Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) pandemic: a cross-sectional survey of rheumatologists and other  
735 specialists. *Rheumatol Int.* 2020;40(12):2023-30.
- 736 40. Barbour V. Openness, Integrity, Inclusion, and Innovation in Scholarly Communication: Competing or  
737 Complementary Forces? *Frontiers in research metrics and analytics.* 2021;6:767869-.
- 738 41. Fry NK, Marshall H, Mellins-Cohen T. In praise of preprints. *Microbial Genomics.* 2019;5(4).
- 739 42. Galbán Rodríguez E. Preprints and preprint servers as academic communication tools. *Revista Cubana  
740 de Información en Ciencias de la Salud.* 2019:e1324-e.
- 741 43. Itani D, Lababidi G, Itani R, El Ghouli T, Hamade L, Hijazi ARA, et al. Reporting of funding and conflicts of  
742 interest improved from preprints to peer-reviewed publications of biomedical research. *J Clin Epidemiol.*  
743 2022;149:146-53.
- 744 44. Teixeira da Silva JA, Dobránszki J. Preprint policies among 14 academic publishers. *The Journal of  
745 Academic Librarianship.* 2019;45(2):162-70.

- 746 45. Kirkham J, Moher D. Who and why do researchers opt to publish in post-publication peer review  
747 platforms? - findings from a review and survey of F1000 Research [version 1; referees: 2 approved, 1 approved  
748 with reservations]. *F1000Research*. 2018;7.
- 749 46. Kwon D. Open-access journal eLife announces 'preprint first' publishing model. *Nature*. 2020.
- 750 47. Leopold SS, Haddad FS, Sandell LJ, Swiontkowski M. Clinical Orthopaedics and Related Research, The  
751 Bone & Joint Journal, The Journal of Orthopaedic Research, and The Journal of Bone and Joint Surgery will not  
752 accept clinical research manuscripts previously posted to preprint servers. *J Orthop Res*. 2019;37(1):8-11.
- 753 48. Tennant JP, Crane H, Crick T, Davila J, Enkhbayar A, Havemann J, et al. Ten hot topics around scholarly  
754 publishing. *Publ*. 2019;7(2).
- 755 49. Musunuri S, Sandbrink JB, Monrad JT, Palmer MJ, Koblentz GD. Rapid Proliferation of Pandemic  
756 Research: Implications for Dual-Use Risks. *mBio*. 2021;12(5).
- 757 50. Smyth AR, Rawlinson C, Jenkins G. Preprint servers: a 'rush to publish' or 'just in time delivery' for  
758 science? *Thorax*. 2020;75(7):532-3.
- 759 51. Verma AA, Detsky AS. Preprints: a Timely Counterbalance for Big Data-Driven Research. *J Gen Intern  
760 Med*. 2020;35(7):2179-81.
- 761 52. Sopinka NM, Cristine LE, DeRosa MC, Rochman CM, Owens BL, Cooke SJ. Envisioning the scientific  
762 paper of the future. *Facet*. 2020;5(1):1-16.
- 763 53. Bozzato V, Gnoato M, Vilia A, Apostolico M. Intellectual property protection for scholarly publishing in  
764 the Italian framework: a globally open approach for medical and life sciences authors. *Italian Journal of  
765 Medicine*. 2021;15(2):77-84.
- 766 54. Sarabipour S, Debat HJ, Emmott E, Burgess SJ, Schwessinger B, Hensel Z. On the value of preprints: An  
767 early career researcher perspective. *PLoS Biol*. 2019;17(2).
- 768 55. Yi HJ, Huh S. Korean editors' and researchers' experiences with preprints and attitudes towards  
769 preprint policies. *Sci Ed*. 2021;8(1):4-9.
- 770 56. Lombardi S, editor Every document is born "grey"-Some documents can become "open. 22nd  
771 International Conference on Grey Literature: Applications of Grey Literature for Science and Society, GL 2020;  
772 2020: TextRelease.
- 773 57. Bernard R, Weissgerber TL, Bobrov E, Winham SJ, Dirnagl U, Riedel N. fiddle: a tool to combat  
774 publication bias by getting research out of the file drawer and into the scientific community. *Clinical Science*.  
775 2020;134(20):2729-39.
- 776 58. Klebel T, Reichmann S, Polka J, McDowell G, Penfold N, Hindle S, et al. Peer review and preprint  
777 policies are unclear at most major journals. *PLoS ONE*. 2020;15(10 October).
- 778 59. Verma IM. Preprint servers facilitate scientific discourse. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*.  
779 2017;114(48):12630.
- 780 60. McBee MT, Makel MC, Peters SJ, Matthews MS. A Call for Open Science in Giftedness Research. *Gifted  
781 Child Q*. 2018;62(4):374-88.
- 782 61. Nishioka C, Färber M, Saier T, editors. How does author affiliation affect preprint citation count?  
783 Analyzing citation bias at the institution and country level. 22nd ACM/IEEE Joint Conference on Digital  
784 Libraries, JCDL 2022; 2022: Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers Inc.
- 785 62. Bell SC, Flume PA, Castellani C. Seven P's of publication practices. *Journal of Cystic Fibrosis*.  
786 2020;19(3):333-5.
- 787 63. Chiarelli A, Johnson R, Pinfield S, Richens E. Preprints and scholarly communication: An exploratory  
788 qualitative study of adoption, practices, drivers and barriers. *F1000Research*. 2019;8.
- 789 64. Vuong QH. Plan S, self-publishing, and addressing unreasonable risks of society publishing. *Learn Publ*.  
790 2020;33(1):64-8.
- 791 65. Kleinert S, Horton R, Editors of the Lancet family of journals. Preprints with The Lancet: joining online  
792 research discussion platforms. *Lancet*. 2018;391(10139):2482-3.
- 793 66. Fleming JI, Cook BG. Open Access in Special Education: A Review of Journal and Publisher Policies.  
794 *Remedial Spec Educ*. 2022;43(1):3-14.
- 795 67. Smith JA, Sandbrink JB. Biosecurity in an age of open science. *PLoS Biol*. 2022;20(4).

796 68. Alwine JC, Enquist LW, Dermody TS, Goodrum F. What is the price of science? *mBio*. 2021;12(2):1-3.  
797 69. Kullmann DM. Editorial. *Brain*. 2017;140(7):1817.  
798 70. Schapira M, The Open Lab Notebook Consortium, Harding RJ. Open laboratory notebooks: good for  
799 science, good for society, good for scientists. *F1000Research*. 2019;8:87-  
800 71. Bourne PE, Polka JK, Vale RD, Kiley R. Ten simple rules to consider regarding preprint submission.  
801 Public Library of Science San Francisco, CA USA; 2017. p. e1005473.  
802 72. Nature Communications. Preprints under peer review. *Nature Communications*. 2017;8.  
803 73. Eglén SJ, Mounce R, Gatto L, Currie AM, Nobis Y. Recent developments in scholarly publishing to  
804 improve research practices in the life sciences. *Emerg Topics Life Sci*. 2018;2(6):775-8.  
805 74. Poremski D, Falissard B, Fegert J, Witt A, Ordóñez AE, Martin A, et al. Moving from 'personal  
806 communication' to 'available online at': preprint servers enhance the timeliness of scientific exchange. *Child  
807 and Adolescent Psychiatry and Mental Health*. 2019;13(1):42.  
808 75. Choi YJ, Choi HW, Kim S. Preprint acceptance policies of Asian academic society journals in 2020. *Sci  
809 Ed*. 2021;8(1):10-7.  
810 76. Brainard J. Do preprints improve with peer review? A little, one study suggests. *Science*. 2020.  
811 77. Ferreira CM, Serpa S. The importance of preprint in scientific publication: Perspectives and challenges.  
812 *J Soc Sci Res*. 2018;4(12):642-7.  
813 78. Carà PD, Ciriminna R, Pagliaro M. Has the Time Come for Preprints in Chemistry? *ACS Omega*.  
814 2017;2(11):7923-8.  
815 79. Polka J. Preprints as a complement to the journal system in biology. *Inf Serv Use*. 2017;37(3):277-80.  
816 80. Howat AM, Clark J. Converting Access Microbiology to an open research platform: community survey  
817 results. *Access microbiology*. 2021;3(9):000272-  
818 81. Kowalczyk OS, Lautarescu A, Blok E, Dall'Aglio L, Westwood SJ. What senior academics can do to  
819 support reproducible and open research: a short, three-step guide. *BMC Research Notes*. 2022;15(1):116.  
820 82. Vlasschaert C, Topf JM, Hiremath S. Proliferation of Papers and Preprints During the Coronavirus  
821 Disease 2019 Pandemic: Progress or Problems With Peer Review? *Adv Chron Kidney Dis*. 2020;27(5):418-26.  
822 83. Berg J. Preprint ecosystems. *Science*. 2017;357(6358):1331.  
823 84. Clayson PE, Baldwin SA, Larson MJ. The open access advantage for studies of human  
824 electrophysiology: Impact on citations and Altmetrics. *Int J Psychophysiol*. 2021;164:103-11.  
825 85. Mwangi KW, Mainye N, Ouso DO, Esoh K, Muraya AW, Mwangi CK, et al. Open Science in Kenya:  
826 Where Are We? *Frontiers in research metrics and analytics*. 2021;6:669675-  
827 86. Price R, Ozkan Y. Characteristics of Imperial College London's COVID-19 research outputs. *Learn Publ*.  
828 2021;34(3):358-69.  
829 87. Avissar-Whiting M, Bakker C, Heckner H, Massip S, Schneider J, Townsend R, et al. Addressing disorder  
830 in scholarly communication: Strategies from NISO plus 2021. *Inf Serv Use*. 2021;41(1-2):107-21.  
831 88. Serpa S, Sá MJ, Santos AI, Ferreira CM. Challenges for the academic editor in the scientific publication.  
832 *Acad J Interdiscip Stud*. 2020;9(3):12-6.  
833 89. McGuinness LA, Sheppard AL. A descriptive analysis of the data availability statements accompanying  
834 medRxiv preprints and a comparison with their published counterparts. *PLoS ONE*. 2021;16(5).  
835 90. Ettinger CL, Sadanandappa MK, Görgülü K, Coghlan KL, Hallenbeck KK, Puebla I. A guide to preprinting  
836 for early-career researchers. *Biol Open*. 2022;11(7).  
837 91. Heyard R, Hottenrott H. The value of research funding for knowledge creation and dissemination: A  
838 study of SNSF Research Grants. *Hum Soc Sci Comm*. 2021;8(1).  
839 92. Moshontz H, Binion G, Walton H, Brown BT, Syed M. A Guide to Posting and Managing Preprints. *Adv  
840 Method Pract Psychol Sci*. 2021;4(2).  
841 93. Triggler CR, MacDonald R, Triggler DJ, Grierson D. Requiem for impact factors and high publication  
842 charges. *Account Res*. 2022;29(3):133-64.  
843 94. Chaleplioglou A, Koulouris A. Preprint paper platforms in the academic scholarly communication  
844 environment. *J Librariansh Inf Sci*. 2021.

845 95. Staines H, Martone ME. Community feedback on scholarly content: why it is important and why it  
846 should be preserved. *Insights-the Uksg Journal*. 2018;31.

847 96. Green T. Is open access affordable? Why current models do not work and why we need internet-era  
848 transformation of scholarly communications. *Learn Publ*. 2019;32(1):13-25.

849 97. Schloss PD. Preprinting microbiology. *mBio*. 2017;8(3).

850 98. Bosman J, de Jonge H, Kramer B, Sondervan J. Advancing open access in the Netherlands after 2020:  
851 From quantity to quality. *Insights UKSG J*. 2021;34.

852 99. Ibragimova I, Phagava H. Editorial: Preprints and peer-reviewed journals. *International Journal of*  
853 *Health Governance*. 2022;27(3):237-9.

854 100. L B, R L, L L, K C, S M, M P, et al. Cross-sectional study of preprints and final journal publications from  
855 COVID-19 studies: discrepancies in results reporting and spin in interpretation. *BMJ Open*.  
856 2021;11(7):e051821.

857 101. Abbasi K. A giant step for science: JRSM welcomes preprints in medical science. *J R Soc Med*.  
858 2018;111(8):263.

859 102. Eysenbach G. Celebrating 20 years of open access and innovation at JMIR publications. *J Med Internet*  
860 *Res*. 2019;21(12).

861 103. George CH, Alexander SPH, Cirino G, Insel PA, Izzo AA, Ji Y, et al. Editorial policy regarding the citation  
862 of preprints in the *British Journal of Pharmacology (BJP)*. *Br J Pharmacol*. 2021;178(18):3605-10.

863 104. National Institute for Health and Care Research. NIHR Open Research:  
864 <https://openresearch.nihr.ac.uk/about> Last accessed 17/02/2023 [

865 105. ASAPbio. Preprint resource center: <https://asapbio.org/preprint-info> Last accessed 17/02/2023 [

866 106. ASAPbio. Preprint authors optimistic about benefits: preliminary results from the #bioPreprints2020  
867 survey: <https://asapbio.org/biopreprints2020-survey-initial-results> Last accessed 17/02/2023 [

868 107. Wellcome. We now accept preprints in grant applications: [https://wellcome.org/news/we-now-](https://wellcome.org/news/we-now-accept-preprints-grant-applications)  
869 [accept-preprints-grant-applications](https://wellcome.org/news/we-now-accept-preprints-grant-applications) Last accessed 17/02/2023 [

870 108. Kaiser J. NIH enables investigators to include draft preprints in grant proposals *Science*. 2017.

871 109. DORA. Declaration on Research Assessment (DORA): <https://sfdora.org/> Last accessed 17/02/2023 [

872 110. Contributor Roles Taxonomy. CRediT: <https://credit.niso.org/> Last accessed 17/02/2023 [

873 111. PlanS. What is cOAlition S?: <https://www.coalition-s.org/about/>  
874 Last accessed 11/07/2023 [

875 112. Carneiro CFD, Queiroz VGS, Moulin TC, Carvalho CAM, Haas CB, Rayêe D, et al. Comparing quality of  
876 reporting between preprints and peer-reviewed articles in the biomedical literature. *Research Integrity and*  
877 *Peer Review*. 2020;5(1):16.

878 113. Fleerackers A, Riedlinger M, Moorhead L, Ahmed R, Alperin JP. Communicating Scientific Uncertainty  
879 in an Age of COVID-19: An Investigation into the Use of Preprints by Digital Media Outlets. *Health*  
880 *Communication*. 2022;37(6):726-38.

881 114. Klein M, Broadwell P, Farb SE, Grappone T. Comparing published scientific journal articles to their pre-  
882 print versions. *International Journal on Digital Libraries*. 2019;20(4):335-50.

883 115. Nicholson DN, Rubineti V, Hu D, Thielk M, Hunter LE, Greene CS. Examining linguistic shifts between  
884 preprints and publications. *PLoS Biol*. 2022;20(2):e3001470.

885 116. El-Menyar A, Mekkodathil A, Asim M, Consunji R, Rizoli S, Abdel-Aziz Bahey A, et al. Publications and  
886 retracted articles of COVID-19 pharmacotherapy-related research: A systematic review. *Science progress*.  
887 2021;104(2):00368504211016936.

888 117. Peiperl L, on behalf of the Plos Medicine Editors. Preprints in medical research: Progress and  
889 principles. *PLoS Med*. 2018;15(4).

890 118. Sumner P, Vivian-Griffiths S, Boivin J, Williams A, Venetis CA, Davies A, et al. The association between  
891 exaggeration in health related science news and academic press releases: retrospective observational study.  
892 *BMJ : British Medical Journal*. 2014;349:g7015.

893

**Box 1: Considerations for best practice**

- **Quality:** Preprints have quality controls including requirements for ethics approvals, consents, appropriate institutional archiving, and appropriate research reporting checklists
- **Communications:** Multiple forms of communication are required at the right time, at the right stage and are translational to the wider public. Communicating in diverse ways and to diverse audiences requires implementing several straightforward ideas that includes the use of multimedia and digital media platforms
- **Publishing:** Greater consistency and scrutiny across different journals or publishing platforms for medical scientific articles or manuscripts is needed to ensure quality and control are maintained even if different publishing models are used. Compatibility and appropriate checks on publication policies. Potential to reduce publication bias as not subject to publication selectivity
- **Open review:** Open assessment from a larger community enables diverse groups to contribute, offers a democratic process and opportunities to accelerate research discovery, priority, and dissemination
- **Open access and inclusivity:** Open access of preprints immediately provides everyone with access to the research, including developing nations who often have limited funds (institutional or funding organisations) to publish, read, and subscribe to many publishing journals. Adopting preprints allows for enhancements to academic publishing and peer assessment to enhance scientific discovery and establish priority
- **Diversifies Early Career Researchers:** Preprints can accelerate training, enable ECRs to publish through open access routes
- **Ethics:** There is a need for principle-based regulations to achieve publication ethics for preprints. Gaining optimum accountability and transparency of research findings requires effort from both authors and preprint servers: (e.g., transparency in the time sequence of publication between preprints and subsequent peer-reviewed journal articles)
- **Standards:** Stricter common standards for preprints are required that cover issues such as screening submissions and retracting those that turn out to be seriously flawed or fraudulent

**Box 2: Summary of the key considerations for publishers**

- Operating principles and mechanisms to enhance the publishing process and manuscript version control
- Enhanced cooperation between scholarly publishers and preprint servers
- Consider a peer review procedure for preprints
- When preprints are cited in peer-reviewed journals, they must be clearly indicated as such and remain under press embargo until published
- Formulate principles of publication ethics for conduct (e.g., release and use of preprints to serve as references)
- A balance between immediacy and quality control is required to ensure research findings and new discoveries are not compromised due to process driven inefficiencies
- Opportunities to develop alternative publishing models whereby a two-step approach could ensure open access is truly promoted and credible

**Box 3: Summary of the key considerations for funding organisations**

- To develop coherent guidance for the performance evaluation of preprints
- To consider responsible use of metrics and deter from affiliation-based citation bias, including metrics of scholarly achievements
- Ensure that reviewers (both grant and publication reviewers) adhere to guidance on preprints, ensuring fairness and impartiality in the review process when evaluating performance of research
- Citation bias exists more with preprints; therefore, funding organisations need to deter from using these measures when making decisions about funding recommendations
- Implement policies to promote openness and ensure researchers are transparent about their procedures and share all aspects of their funded research (going beyond just publications), following the Declaration On Research Assessment (DORA)
- Regulating the use of preprints through the Plan U approach, mandating that funding organisations request that all grant applicants post their research first on preprints servers