

Appendix B: Summary of findings

Table B1 summarizes the main pattern in the review. Professional and community-based fact-checking do not perform equally across trust, scalability, and impact. Professional fact-checking tends to perform somewhat better on trust but is more limited in speed and reach. Community-based fact-checking performs better on scalability, but impact is constrained by note visibility, consensus thresholds, and uneven user acceptance. Both models therefore show clear strengths, but neither performs strongly across all three dimensions at once. The table should not be read as showing that one model is better overall. Rather, it shows that current fact-checking systems solve different parts of the misinformation problem while remaining limited in others.

Table B1. Comparative performance of professional and community-based fact-checking across three dimensions (N = 21).

Dimension	Professional fact-checking	Community-based fact-checking
Trust	Moderate — credibility depends on institutional reputation and prior media trust; perceived as biased by politically disaffected audiences	Moderate — participatory transparency builds some trust, but ideological skew and inconsistent note quality create scepticism
Scalability	Low–Moderate — manual workflows, limited staff, ~100 verified claims per day; slow to respond to viral content	High — distributed labor enables near real-time annotation; up to 10× faster response than professional checkers
Impact	Moderate — reduces false beliefs, especially among high-trust users, but limited organic reach constrains population-level effects	Moderate — reduces retweet volume and encourages content deletion, but consensus thresholds and low note visibility limit broader corrective effects