

Closing the reproducibility gap: 2D materials research

^{1*}Peter Bøggild, ¹Timothy John Booth, ¹Nolan Lassaline, ¹Bjarke Sørensen Jessen, ¹Abhay Shivayogimath, ²Stephan Hofmann, ³Kim Daasbjerg, ⁴Anders Smith, ⁵Kasper Nørgaard, ⁶Amaia Zurutuza, ⁷Inge Asselberghs, ⁸Terrance Barkan, ⁹Rafal Taboryski, ¹⁰Andrew J. Pollard

¹DTU Physics, Department of Physics, Technical University of Denmark, 2800 Kgs. Lyngby

² Engineering Department, Trumpington Street, Cambridge CB2 1PZ, University of Cambridge, United Kingdom

³ Novo Nordisk Foundation (NNF) CO₂ Research Center, Interdisciplinary Nanoscience Center, Department of Chemistry, Aarhus University, Gustav Wieds Vej 10C, 8000 Aarhus C, Denmark

⁴ Villum Foundation, Gladsaxevej 382, 2860 Søborg, Denmark

⁵ Novo Nordisk Foundation, Tuborg Havnevej 19, 2900 Hellerup, Denmark

⁶ Graphenea S.A., Paseo Mikeletegi 83, 20009 Donostia-San Sebastián, Spain

⁷ imec, Kapeldreef 75, 3001 Leuven, Belgium

⁸ The Graphene Council, Manchester, United Kingdom

⁹DTU Nanolab, National Centre for Nano Fabrication and Characterisation, Technical University of Denmark, 2800 Kgs. Lyngby

¹⁰National Physical Laboratory, Hampton Road, Teddington, TW11 0LW, UK

*pbog@dtu.dk

ABSTRACT

2D materials research has reached significant scientific milestones, accompanied by a rapidly growing industrial sector in the two decades since the field's inception. Such rapid progress requires pushing past the boundary of what is technically and scientifically feasible and carries the risk of disseminating irreproducible research results. This Expert Recommendation addresses the need for enhanced reproducibility in 2D materials science and physics. Through a comprehensive examination of the factors that affect reproducibility the authors present a set of concrete guidelines designed to improve the reliability of research results. The introduction of a Standardised Template for Experimental Procedures (STEP) offers a novel approach to documenting experimental details that are crucial for replication and troubleshooting. We emphasise the importance of involving stakeholders from research, industry, publishing, funding agencies, and policymaking to foster a culture of transparency, reliability, and trust without blind angles and critical oversights. By addressing systemic issues that hinder reproducibility and presenting actionable steps for improvement, we aim to pave the way for more robust research practices in 2D materials science, contributing to the field's scientific maturation and the subsequent development of beneficial technologies.

The reproducibility gap in 2D materials research

The systemic lack of reproducibility and replicability in a scientific field is often called a ‘reproducibility crisis’. In 2012, a pivotal study in Nature detailed attempts to replicate 53 landmark cancer studies, successfully replicating only 6, as discussed in Ref¹, and a recent follow-up study showed similar dismal results². In 2016, Nature conducted a poll with 1576 scientists and concluded that 70 % had failed to reproduce another scientist's experiment and 50 % had failed to reproduce their own³. Although physics and chemistry fared better than average, an alarming fraction of physicists and chemists were still frustrated by irreproducible studies. We argue that 2D materials research does indeed have a reproducibility gap, separating a significant part of scientific research from the impact it could and should have on science and society. We previously suggested that poor reproducibility indeed also plague graphene production and scientific research⁴. It was argued that the anticipated development towards a stable state of productivity is compromised by the reliability and quality of 2D materials and research not matching the level to realise the application potential, and that this constitutes a ‘reproducibility gap’.

Although the structure of graphite and the existence of graphene have been studied for over 70 years⁵, the field of graphene officially began with the seminal work by Geim and Novoselov⁶ in 2004. This groundbreaking research led to the Nobel Prize in 2010 and spurred the rapid development of a wide array of other 2D materials⁷, heterostructures⁸, and derivatives. As a result, there has been a rapid increase in commercial and public interest, as well as heightened expectations⁹.

By the end of graphene’s adolescence in 2024, 2D materials research has demonstrated mindboggling scientific progress, as well as intense efforts within application development and industrial progress. The scientific progress is astounding, and focused initiatives such as the

a) Healthy value chain



a) Gapped value chain




Figure 1 Illustration of the negative impact of poor reproducibility. a) In a healthy value chain, the main risk is in the research stage, where the outcome is inherently uncertain. b) In the ‘gapped’ value chain, poor validation and documentation of the research constitutes a ‘reproducibility gap’ that makes the transition to technology and impact on the scientific community weak, diffuse and prone to failure. Unsuccessful attempts to reproduce results may even be repurposed and published as new methods or data.

Graphene Flagship and the Chinese 12th to 14th (2010–2025) 5-year plans have pushed strongly towards setting the foundations of commercialisation¹⁰. The industrial progress and use of 2D materials in real applications is rapidly accelerating across a broad horizon including sensors, electronics, coatings, construction materials, energy storage devices, plastics, and composites, to name just some of the many commercial application markets that have emerged¹¹. Beyond graphene, 2D semiconductors are now an established part of the roadmap for most leading-edge semiconductor foundries¹².

Although there are similar problems in many other areas of science, as evidenced by numerous articles and studies^{13,14} and editorials¹⁵, the issue might be particularly relevant for 2D materials and graphene research. This field has for the past two decades been characterised by mixing of fundamental and applied research as well as of a broad range of scientific disciplines, a rapid increase of experimental options and equipment as well as a generous amount of hype^{16,17} and a certain degree of sensationalism. It may also be a factor that turn-key instrumentation is becoming available to more research teams, requiring less effort and expertise to produce measurements, albeit with an insufficient understanding of equipment, analysis and interpretation.

We believe that this situation, to some extent, has led researchers to prioritise novelty over quality, focus on competitiveness over the sharing of results, and jump from topic to topic rather than taking the time to establish a solid foundation for the field. This may lead to a scenario as depicted in Figure 1 where a healthy ‘value chain’ leads from an initial idea or problem to societal, economical, technical or scientific impact, while poor reproducibility disrupts the chain at the validation stage. While the ‘reseeding’ of ideas is an important mechanism in science, it must be balanced with maturation of viable projects and just to infinitely initialisation of ‘novel’ research projects.

Numerous studies on 2D materials emphasise the significance of reproducibility^{18–22} and collaborative initiatives to produce reliable and transparent knowledge²³. After the discovery of twisted bilayer superconductivity in graphene²⁴, many groups faced challenges in creating high-quality moiré interfaces. In 2024, the MIT team behind the discovery organised a highly successful workshop to teach this method openly to many researchers. Such model efforts are sparse compared to the sheer volume of published scientific literature in the field.

BOX 1: Summary of recommendations for primary stakeholders (researchers)

Funding stage

- Plan for reproducibility tasks and activities in proposals
- Seek out collaborators for validation

Planning stage

- Create clear research goals
- Align expectations in team

Execution stage

- Use established methods
- Systematic documentation and data logging
- Control environmental factors

Reporting stage

- Report all results, including negative
- Provide detailed methodology and conditions in SI
- Reporting checklists, like STEP
- Submit data and metadata to repositories

Peer review stage

- Evaluate reproducibility aspects
- Encourage authors to disclose experimental details
- Advocate for independent validation

Citation stage

- Assess reproducibility efforts before citing
- Cite studies with most robust methods and validation

Follow-up stage

- Engage in replication studies
- Participate in post-print peer-review
- Offer support and share methods

BOX 2: Summary of recommendations for other stakeholders

LEVEL 2 STAKEHOLDERS: Gatekeepers of funding and publication of study

Funding bodies:

- Endorse Codes of Conduct for good scientific practice, including reproducibility
- Encourage reproducibility activities in funding proposals.
- Offer specific grant instruments dedicated to reproducibility studies
- Provide additional funding for validation and data sharing in later stages of projects.

Publishers and editors:

- Require detailed methodologies and both raw data and metadata.
- Provide platforms for replication study publications
- Implement platforms for sharing of replication experiences, with link back to original work

Peer reviewers:

- Evaluate the robustness and completeness of methodologies.
- Advocate for comprehensive documentation and raw data sharing.

LEVEL 3 STAKEHOLDERS: Assess reproducibility and impact of study's usage

Research teams:

- Publish validation articles and share replication experiences openly at conferences.
- Advocate for instruments that support the sharing of negative or positive reproduced results.

Industry:

- Collaborate with academia to validate research findings.
- Promote standardised methodologies in academic collaborations.

LEVEL 4 STAKEHOLDERS: Define boundary conditions and regulate scale of impact

Communicators and media:

- Emphasise studies with verified and reproducible results.
- Improve own understanding of scientific nuances and literacy through training.

Governmental bodies and policymakers:

- Integrate reproducibility criteria into funding requirements.
- Encourage standardised methodologies and open data practices.
- Collaborate with other stakeholders to create cohesive policies that emphasise reproducibility.

Technology transfer offices (TTOs):

- Require validation of research findings before commercialisation.

LEVEL 5 STAKEHOLDERS: Influence standards, norms, best practice and rewards

Educators/study leaders:

- Include reproducibility-focused modules in educational programs.
- Emphasise documentation, rigorous methodology and data sharing.

Open science advocates:

- Create recognition and funding for open science practices.
- Support the use of open-access data repositories.

Standardisation organisations:

- Create detailed standards for experimental procedures and data reporting.
- Offer workshops for development and adoption of standards.


Bibliometric databases:

- Include metrics highlighting reproducibility efforts.
- Improve search capabilities to find reproducible research.
- Work with researchers, funding bodies and publishers to develop standard reproducibility metrics.

Data management (indirect stakeholder):

- Create comprehensive data management plans and infrastructure.
- Provide training on best practices for data management and sharing.

BOX 3: Repeatability, reproducibility and replicability



Reproducibility and Stakeholders

So, who else cares if the 2D material field is inhibited or derailed by poor reproducibility? First and foremost, the primary stakeholders are the researchers. Competitive scientific research and publication may be thought of as a game that researchers play to win.⁴ In this analogy, it is possible that the rules of this game has drifted the past 50 years, as the quantity of researchers, journals and articles have exploded, while not necessarily the quality of the research²⁵²⁶. Unsurprisingly, researchers are increasingly overwhelmed by the ‘peer-review treadmill’ after the pandemic²⁹, which unfortunately feeds back to the quality and usefulness of published literature.

The issue extends to many important domains: resource management, innovation, technology transfer, investments, research careers, and trust, engaging numerous stakeholders beyond authors and core readership. The reproducibility landscape comprises stakeholders—organisations and individuals—with vested interests in the reproducibility of research results and methods, and influence on definition of relevant rules and norms. This landscape includes not only researchers but also outreach/communication agencies, funding bodies, scientific publishers, open science advocates, patent and tech transfer offices, standard development (SDOs), and companies in application development and emerging 2D material foundries like 2D-EPL⁴. Research investments from government on behalf of the public that fail to generate scientific or societal impact are ultimately wasted.

While obviously not good for science nor society, this situation will only improve through collaborations between groups and organisations influencing or influenced by poor reproducibility. Our work seeks to provide a pragmatic approach that considers different stakeholder perspectives and boundary conditions is crucial, which is the purpose of our work to communicate.

The recommendations are divided into four parts.

- **Recommendations for researchers.** Tailored recommendations for each of 7 stages of a research study from planning to follow-up, intended for an individual researcher or team.
- **ReChart – The Reproducibility Charter** is a structured checklist that can be used to declare reproducibility efforts in proposing, reporting or reviewing a research study.

- **STEP – Standardised Template for Experimental Procedures** is a tool for methodological reporting of experimental procedures.
- **Stakeholder-oriented recommendations and future directions** for publishers, funding bodies, communicators, open science advocates, educators, and industry.

Recommendations for researchers

We categorise common reproducibility challenges in 2D materials research into seven stages of producing a research result: funding, planning, execution, reporting, peer review, citation, and follow-up, and add for each stage recommended guidelines and actions that the individual researcher or research teams can undertake to support the reproducibility of their research.

Applying for funding

Funding agencies generally recognise the crucial importance of reproducibility for the impact and value that their research funding generates. However, funding success is skewed towards headline novelty and discovery of new effects. Solid method development, replication, process discovery and the science of scale-up are not widely considered “breakthroughs”, but incremental research results at best. In already-funded projects, budget and time constraints combined with pressure to deliver on overoptimistic goals may inhibit researchers from conducting experiments with the necessary rigor, leading to shortcuts that compromise reproducibility. In competitive funding proposals, this may lead to hyperbole¹⁷, unrealistic expectations, and wastage of resources because the focus is shifted away from quality and real impact.

Recommendations: Researchers should explicitly include plans and budget allocations to enhance or implement reproducible and scalable methodologies, allowing results to be replicated and method details and process data (including negative outcomes) to be effectively shared. This could involve support letters or direct participation from other laboratories committed to independent testing and validation. Validation participants could be rewarded by inclusion in co-authorship or by monetary reimbursements through the allocated budget for reproducibility. Such proactive measures are likely to be positively received by most reviewers and funding agencies. While reproducibility is vital for all research, the necessity of dedicated funding for reproducibility may depend on how creative and exploratory the research is, and the technological readiness level (TRL) of the technology.

Planning a research study

Ambiguous and poorly defined research goals can result in unclear methodologies, making replication unnecessarily challenging. Although goals and planning are usually focused on research results rather than the methodology to achieve them, resources to ensure sufficiently baselined experimentation and standardised experimental conditions and relevant materials are not necessarily allocated; such methods are often underdeveloped or do not exist, and ignoring this at the planning stage can lead to severe underperformance. Additionally, failing to thoroughly review the existing literature for methods and metrology can lead to the use of flawed or outdated methodology.

Recommendations. Establishing clear research goals and appropriate methodologies in most cases provides a solid foundation for a study that produces reproducible outcomes. The ReChart scheme aids in prioritising reproducibility efforts principles and partnerships, while the STEP template is a technical tool to predict parameter ranges and concerns. Allocate time and resources for validation and replication, and timely contact of participants for reproducibility and round-robin studies²³. Using standardised or stable methods is obviously important, as much as these exist and are available. Data management plans should detail data collection, storage, and sharing, including metadata, standards and documentation, which is particularly important for large collaborative

projects. During recruitment, consider that short-term researchers may focus on immediate career goals; aligning expectations early can prevent conflicts of interest. Research leaders need to emphasize the need for reproducibility to junior researchers. These recommendations are vital for established researchers and leaders, but early-stage researchers and Ph.D. students can also enhance their long-term research impact by ensuring that their research results are designed to be useful for others.

Execution of study

During the execution phase, reproducibility issues can arise owing to inconsistencies in experimental materials, procedures and setups. Research results can be significantly affected by the precise conditions of 2D material synthesis, processing, and characterisation. Reproducibility can be difficult due to variations in experimental factors such as temperature, pressure and inadequate documentation. The parameter space can be vast, and there can be many hidden parameters especially for initially improvised set-ups. Limited or unknown material stability further complicates reproducibility with ill-controlled or ill-documented exposure to environmental conditions such as humidity, air, exposure to light and contamination.

Recommendations. In addition to using standardised and established methods when relevant, research execution demands thorough and systematic baselines and documentation (see the ReChart reproducibility charter, Table 2). Although this is a basic expectation of any research, implementing comprehensive experiment and data logging systems that automatically record an extensive set of primary (measurement parameters) and secondary parameters³⁰ (temperature, humidity, vibration level, etc.) can enhance long-term reproducibility, help identify systematic errors, optimise experimental parameters, and uncover underlying mechanisms. Documentation should be organised to allow easy sharing, evaluation, and retrieval by other researchers from repositories. This step, however, may present challenges, including potential conflicts with the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) and patent regulations.

Reporting results

Incomplete or selective reporting of results and methodologies in the reporting stage poses a significant reproducibility challenge. Researchers may omit negative results, sample heterogeneities, experimental failures, or details of the experimental setup, either unintentionally or intentionally. Requiring all data related to a study would be absurd and dramatically increase the volume of published information, but the present status is that negative results and failure modes rarely gets mentioned. This selective reporting biases the study's findings and methods, making it difficult for others to understand the real scope of the research or replicate it accurately. For instance, if a paper on the electrical properties of a new 2D material omits the specific ambient conditions for measurements, replication attempts may yield different results under various conditions. This can lead to confusion and doubts about the original study's validity, even if its core method was sound. In early-stage research, it is not always clear which parameters are most impactful, such as the often-overlooked time between subsequent process steps.

Recommendations. Research reporting is a key factor in reproducibility. If the research itself has been carried out carefully, systematically, and is well-documented, but this does not transfer to the research article, the research community is reduced to the role of the audience, second-guessing the tricks of stage magicians. Reporting all results, including those that do not support the hypothesis or demonstrate a negative outcome, will often strengthen the impact and visibility of a published article unless the work is of questionable quality in the first place. Researchers can use supplementary information to detail their methodologies and experimental conditions and also

highlight negative results or challenges. Inspired by reporting checklists such as CONSORT specifically aimed at randomised clinical trials³¹, we introduce and recommend using the STEP scheme.

Peer review of articles and proposals

One major reproducibility flaw in the peer review process is the potential for reviewers to focus primarily on novelty, potentially overlooking rigorous methodological evaluations. This can lead to the publication of studies with groundbreaking claims but insufficient validation of experimental setups or methodologies. Additionally, the lack of access to complete datasets and detailed experimental procedures during the review process makes it even more difficult for reviewers to fully assess the quality of the work and its reproducibility.

Recommendations. Researchers serve a critical role as gatekeepers through participation in peer review, providing the most important and detailed feedback that many studies and reports ever receive. This educational aspect is vital for young authors, underscoring the responsibility of peer reviewers. Reviewers should meticulously assess methodologies and reproducibility, including datasets and experimental procedures. They should encourage authors to fully disclose their research processes with comprehensive documentation, such as raw data and detailed protocols, even when not explicitly required by journals. Feedback should aim to enhance reproducibility by suggesting robust experimental designs, additional control experiments, and clearer documentation, for instance of experimental conditions. Reviewers can also advocate for independent replication studies and statistical validation to be integrated in review criteria. Here, the role of Editors as moderators is important to avoid imposing unreasonable demands on authors. Balance is key.

Citation practices

Citations significantly influence the behaviour and strategies of researchers, research groups, institutions, and funding bodies. However, current citation practices are flawed, unfortunately leading to reproducibility issues. Irreproducible articles may still be cited even after their validity is questioned, accumulating far more attention and citations than the articles that question them³². Studies with spectacular topics, claims or scope are often cited regardless of reproducibility, creating a biased view of research findings, misleading the scientific community and obscuring the identification of genuinely reliable results.

Recommendations. Researchers must adopt responsible and critical citation practices. When citing previous work, it is crucial to rigorously evaluate and confirm the reproducibility and reliability of referenced studies. In graphene research, there are instances of high-profile articles being disputed shortly after publication, yet still cited in new studies decades later. With an ever-increasing number of references in the scientific literature³³, researchers should aim to cite studies with clearly outlined methodologies and independently confirmed results. Avoiding citation bias by not just favouring striking findings but also considering the robustness of methods and results is crucial. Careful citation practices contribute to a more reliable and verifiable scientific literature, essential for advancing 2D materials and their technological applications. We anticipate that artificial intelligence tools, including those implemented by bibliographic databases, will play an increasingly important role in supporting researchers in healthy citation practices.

Follow-up studies and support

The follow-up phase is essential for ensuring long-term reproducibility and replicability of research findings but is frequently overlooked. A common issue is the lack of **ongoing** validation and verification of published results. Researchers have little incentive to revisit their findings or for other groups to conduct replication studies due to the emphasis on novelty and innovation in scientific research. This focus on novelty leads researchers to shift topics frequently, which, while encouraging

bold new directions, can result in incomplete and weak studies being abandoned. These could have been developed into impactful results with proper follow-up. Insufficient infrastructure and funding for such studies exacerbate the problem.

Recommendations. Current mechanisms for reporting flawed, incomplete, and irreproducible research, such as comments and errata, are infrequently and inadequately used. However, the authors themselves can actively participate in replication studies. This includes making their data, materials and/or methodologies openly available to the research community through data repositories or open access platforms, facilitating ease of access for those interested in replication efforts, or carry out follow-up studies that refine or modify previously published results. Data management plans have been mandatory in European projects since Horizon 2020, providing clear support for follow-up efforts. Researchers can advocate for and engage in post-publication peer review (PPPR) processes, which continually assess and verify published results, albeit increasing researchers' workload³⁴ – here, reward systems could contribute to mainstreaming PPPR, due to the pressure on the peer-reviewers mentioned before^{29,35}. Researchers should review their previous work for possible improvements or corrections. Though time-consuming, responding to queries and inviting researchers to their laboratories can validate research, enhance reproducibility and provides an excellent way of improving the reach and impact, as we discovered for our work on the hot-pickup dry transfer method^{4,36}. Follow-up articles by other researchers can strengthen the primary publication and provide details for easier reproduction.

Table 1. The STEP framework for step-wise breaking down methods into detailed protocols and recipes, including steps with parameters, materials, issues and expected outcomes.

Checkpoint	Description	Example	Importance
ME - Materials and equipment	Specify all materials and equipment used, including alternatives if primary options are not available. Include details about manufacturers, models, and modifications.	For exfoliating graphene, specify the brand and grade of adhesive tape, the type of mechanical exfoliator, and the properties of graphite flakes. If high-quality CVD graphene is not available, advice is given on where or how to obtain suitable alternatives.	Detailed documentation and alternatives enhance adaptability and prevent variability in replication attempts, ensuring that experiments can be accurately reproduced using equivalent tools and materials.
PR - Parameters and ranges	List and record all controlled and uncontrolled parameters. Provide a range of values tested for each critical parameter.	In the growth of MoS ₂ layers via CVD, controlled parameters might include temperature, pressure, and precursor flow rate. Uncontrolled parameters could involve laboratory relative humidity and ambient temperature. Recommend a plasma power range of 50 to 200 W for PECVD.	Ensures a comprehensive understanding of all factors influencing the experiment, allowing others to replicate conditions accurately. Setting parameter boundaries reduces the risk of failure and increases the likelihood of replicating the results.
IWTD - Issues, warnings, troubleshooting and difficulties	Identify potential safety hazards, operational issues, and provide troubleshooting tips. Point out if and how a step is difficult, and how the experimenter can reduce the difficulty to increase the chance of success.	High-temperature CVD synthesis of MoTe ₂ with tellurium can lead to the formation of toxic tellurium oxide (TeO ₂), which is hazardous. For uneven layer thickness in spin coating, adjust the spin speed and solvent viscosity for uniform coatings.	Warning about potential pitfalls and the offer of practical advice improve safety and experimental success rates, helping researchers anticipate and mitigate common challenges, and improving the robustness of methodologies.
VEO - validation / expected outcome	Describe the expected results or outputs clearly, including any specific observations or measurements that indicate that the process/characterisation step was successful.	After nitrogen doping of graphene via CVD, expect a noticeable increase in the I _D /I _G ratio in Raman spectroscopy, indicating nitrogen incorporation. XPS should reveal a nitrogen (N 1s) peak around 400 eV, confirming nitrogen's integration into the graphene structure.	The outline of expected outcomes provides a reference for researchers to verify each step of their experiment, ensuring that the results align with theoretical predictions and empirical evidence.

Standardised Template for Experimental Procedures (STEP)

Researchers can increase the chances that others reproduce their results by using standardised protocols, providing detailed descriptions of their sample fabrication protocol, experimental procedures, and analysis. These could be linked with any used or relevant standardised measurement methods.

To facilitate this, we recommend using a Standardised Template for Experimental Procedures (STEP), a framework that provides a structured format for documenting parameters, equipment, and other important details. The intention of STEP is that researchers using this can ensure that their work is well documented and easily understood by their peers while increasing the impact and reducing any waste of resources. We suggest that use of the STEP framework could be part of formal review criteria or independently requested by peer-reviewers, depending on the journal, as well as type and scope of study. STEP is mainly aimed at materials and physical sciences, yet it should immediately apply to other natural science and technological research fields.









STEP is a breakdown of the procedure, where for each step, the following checkpoints are declared when possible and relevant: (1) parameters and ranges, (2) materials and equipment, (3) issues, warnings, and troubleshooting, and (4) validation/expected outcome. These four points are illustrated and described in Table 1, with examples mainly linked to the process of chemical vapour

deposition (CVD), a common method for synthesizing graphene and other 2D materials such as molybdenum disulfide (MoS_2). Additionally, We have included a detailed example of the STEP template used for describing the process of producing a van der Waals heterostructure with a monolayer of graphene encapsulated by hexagonal boron nitride flakes in Supplementary Information. Since PhD theses are documents that are typically extended versions of the research described in published literature, these could also provide a suitable opportunity for meticulous documentation of the used procedures, in addition to be valuable learning experiences for the PhD students.

We anticipate that the STEP framework could be integrated with digital lab/logbook software, and eventually also with data management software and databases. We have included a detailed example of the STEP template used for describing the process of producing a van der Waals heterostructure with a monolayer of graphene encapsulated by hexagonal boron nitride flakes in Supplementary Information. Since PhD theses are documents that are typically extended versions of the research described in published literature, these could also provide a suitable opportunity for meticulous documentation of the used procedures, in addition to be valuable learning experiences for the PhD students.

A systematic approach to reproducibility reporting will enhance trust and encourage the commercial adoption of new technologies, potentially initiating research on often-overlooked experimental conditions and leading to improved setup design and more controlled scale-ups. Postdoctoral researchers or Ph.D. students are unlikely to overlook a STEP recipe before committing to a year-long replication effort. Detailed documentation for each process or characterisation step increases publication workload, potentially resulting in extensive records for complex processes. However, the time saved for researchers attempting replication significantly outweighs the additional documentation effort³⁷. Omitting details by an author can lead to significant wasted time for numerous research groups trying to replicate the study, which might then be considered to have a net negative impact. With the present level of competitiveness in the field as well as the existing reward structures, it is possible to progress a research career through inhibiting others, which is counterproductive.

Table 2. The ReChart list of reproducibility targets, with a breakdown of the different types and levels of commitment.

ReChart - Reproducibility Charter		
	Replication: The results have been reproduced by another group using the same methodology (or different methodology) independently verifying the outcomes and demonstrating the reliability of the findings.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Repeated by same person b. Repeated by different persons c. Reproduced by another team (same method/materials) d. Replicated by another team (other method/materials)
	Detailed methodology: The experimental methods, techniques, and equipment used in the study are comprehensively described, or previously validated methods are used. This could be achieved with STEP - Standardised Template for Experimental Procedures.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Description of methods and equipment used b. Comprehensive description of all steps c. Extended protocol with all parameters, settings, ranges and comments (i.e. STEP) d. Supplementary materials with video demonstrations
	Transparent data sharing: Raw data, metadata, and processed data are shared in well-organised and accessible repositories, with clear documentation on how the data were obtained, processed, and analysed.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Raw data shared in supplementary information b. Raw data shared in accessible repositories c. Metadata and processed data included in raw data d. Detailed instructions on data processing and analysis
	Error and uncertainty analysis: A thorough error analysis is included in the research, accounting for uncertainties in measurements, equipment or other aspects of the experimental setup, as well as in data analysis.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Basic error analysis included b. Detailed error analysis with uncertainty ranges c. Comprehensive analysis including potential error sources d. Independent verification of error and uncertainty analysis
	Standardised protocols and techniques: Standardised protocols and best practices were used in the study when possible and relevant.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Use of some standardised protocols b. Majority of methods follow standardised protocols c. All deviations from standardised protocols documented d. Full adherence to standardised protocols and best practices
	Negative results reporting: Negative results and findings that contradict or challenge the initial hypothesis are published with the main result (i.e. in the same article)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Acknowledgement of negative results in discussion or SI b. Negative results are reported in detail in article c. Any findings that challenge the hypothesis are analysed d. Publication of a separate study focused on negative results (should be documented, i.e. posted on article repositories)
	Robustness and sensitivity assessment: Information on the robustness and sensitivity of the results is provided, including details on process windows, tolerances, and yield.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Basic assessment of method and result robustness b. Detailed process windows, tolerances and yield c. Sensitivity of results to changes in key parameters assessed d. Comparative studies demonstrating the robustness and sensitivity across setups and conditions are included
	Open lab policy: We commit to assisting others in fault-finding attempts to reproduce our results. We maintain an open-door policy, welcoming researchers to visit our laboratory to learn the methodology, observe experimental procedures, and collaborate.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Open to email inquiries for fault-finding b. Participation in virtual meetings to discuss methodologies and troubleshooting c. Welcoming researchers for in-lab visits and demonstrations d. Active collaboration to reproduce results (All upon reasonable request)

ReChart: A simple system for declaring reproducibility efforts

We present a reproducibility charter, ReChart, consisting of a list of individual targets to which a study may partially or fully adhere (see Table 2). This charter could serve as a template for a 'reproducibility' declaration, similar to the mandatory data availability statements in many top journals or be added in extended form in the supplementary information of the article. It could also offer a clear starting point for specifying adherence to reproducibility efforts in funding proposals. Additionally, it would provide a consistent reference for reviewing manuscripts and proposals, simplifying communication and declarations of reproducibility efforts for both authors and reviewers.

ReChart features 8 targets: replication, detailed methodology, transparent data sharing, error and uncertainty analysis, standardised protocols and techniques, negative results reporting, robustness and sensitivity, and open lab policy. While many of these targets seem obvious and should naturally be part of every study or project, we believe that structured ReChart declarations would enhance the transparency and quality of both published and planned research, potentially extending beyond 2D material research. Additionally, a ReChart declaration in any significant study would likely attract interest from researchers, graduate students, industry development engineers, reviewers, and

funding bodies. Such practices could gradually steer the research field toward better and more sustainable research and publication practices.

Stakeholder-oriented recommendations and future directions

Relying on the conscience and ethos of individual researchers alone is insufficient. Publishers, funding agencies, and educators must actively support these recommendations and discuss why and how this could be a win-win situation for all stakeholders. We also briefly consider the economic, cultural, and 'inertial' obstacles (resistance to change) of the community.

In the following, we provide targeted recommendations to key stakeholders beyond researchers to promote a reproducible and transparent research culture and discuss how the impact of this work can be monitored, assessed, and ensured. These recommendations are grouped into six levels based on their influence on the conduct of research and, consequently, reproducibility.

- **Level 1 stakeholders conducting research:** senior and early-stage researchers, including the research organisations behind them.
- **Level 2 stakeholders that are the gatekeepers of the funding and publication of a study:** funding bodies, publishers, peer-reviewers, tech-transfer offices (TTOs).
- **Level 3 stakeholders that determine to which degree the study will be actualised:** research teams (other than authors), industry/companies and investors
- **Level 4 stakeholders defining the boundaries and regulate scale of impact:** media, policy makers/governmental
- **Level 5 stakeholders influencing standards, norms, best practices and rewards:** Standardisation development organisations (SDOs), bibliometric databases, open science advocates and curriculum creators/educators
- **Level 6 stakeholders having low, indirect influence:** the public

Level 1 stakeholders: recommendations

As the recommendations for individual researchers are discussed in detail in the previous sections and in Box 1, we focus here on how the situation differs for experienced and early-stage researchers.

Experienced researchers

Experienced researchers drive innovation and research progress in 2D materials, educate students, lead large-scale projects with academic and industrial partners, and are key players in setting the direction, pace and targets of the research field. They are also crucial in influencing policymakers and communicators/media. As discussed above, research leaders have a range of options to influence the reproducibility of their work.

Early-stage researchers

Ph.D. students and early-stage researchers are hands-on workforce driving theoretical and experimental work. They are often heavily focused on their careers because of a highly competitive environment for recognition and academic positions. They frequently face pressure to publish quickly, which can lead to shortcuts, insufficient documentation, and irreproducible research. Sometimes, they may feel that their hard-earned know-how is risky to share in detail. However, their longer-term progress and success often depend on the reproducibility of the published literature.

Early-career researchers, as primary science creators and future leaders, bear significant responsibilities, shared with their mentors. Establishing internal guidelines for proposal writing and publication to discourage rapid, superficial, and potentially misleading publications is crucial to harnessing this group's potential. Emphasising benefits such as personal branding, scientific

integrity, and career advancement through recognition as serious researchers is vital. This approach can lead to field-changing protocols that not only garner citations and recognition but also enhance research quality. To achieve a lasting impact, the reward system must be updated, as early-stage researchers face more competition and pressure to succeed than their established counterparts. Introducing new means of career assessment apart from traditional bibliometric indices (see Bibliometric databases) that measure partaking in validation of research works or in other ways given back to the community, would go a long way to bolster their involvement. This group is pivotal in shaping research culture and determining the adoption of structured, systematic reproducibility approaches like STEP and ReChart.

Level 2 stakeholders: recommendations

Funding bodies

Funding bodies support scientific research by providing financial resources and they influence research priorities and standards through their funding criteria. Their role in allocating research resources and defining research topics, focus (e.g. fundamental versus applied) and timescale makes them a very important stakeholder for academic and industrial research organisations as well as society. This makes it essential that funding bodies recognise the importance of good scientific practice, including reproducibility. Funding bodies may choose to endorse national or international codes of conduct for research integrity³⁸. Such codes provide high level frameworks for data management and reproducibility and may be supplemented by open science and open access initiatives.

It is important that funding bodies respect the autonomy of the scientific community while working closely with universities and other research institutions as well as other funders to ensure a common understanding of the questions involved. It should be recognised that different fields have different standards and traditions; funding bodies should not try to enforce specific codes across the board without regard to the differences between, e.g., experimental and observational sciences. Funding bodies should counteract any tendencies to overly optimistic or unrealistic impact statements by having clear and open proposal requirements and assessment criteria.

Alongside this, funding bodies should be encouraged to explore further initiatives. First, they could provide flexibility in their grants to include reproducibility activities, either planned beforehand (e.g. declared using ReChart, Table 2) or as needed during the project. Second, they could offer specific grant instruments dedicated to reproducibility studies or offer additional funding to existing proposals that focus on validation and sharing, which could be applied for in the last part of the project when most of the research has been carried out. Third, funding agencies could support training programs for junior researchers emphasising reproducibility and best practices in research and education. Finally, explicitly stating that activities related to reproducibility may be eligible for funding where relevant could be highly effective, for obvious reasons.

Publishers and editors

Publishers significantly influence scientific dissemination and can shape research practices and publication culture by enforcing reproducibility standards, which are crucial for scientific integrity and trust. However, short-term commercial interests often favor novel, high-impact findings over reproducibility, leading to a lenient attitude toward studies that lack clear reproducibility³⁹. Major publishers recognise that irreproducible science damages credibility, relevance, and ultimately their business⁴⁰. They can enforce policies requiring authors to share detailed methodologies and raw data, and provide reproducibility statements, promote replication studies, and involve tools like ReChart and STEP protocols as frameworks for declaring and ensuring reproducibility.

Requiring raw data and metadata storage in accessible repositories and increasing supplementary information for detailed protocols can improve transparency. This requirement exceeds standard data availability statements that merely indicate data is accessible upon reasonable request, thus leaving compliance to researchers' discretion. Open peer review systems, which publish review comments and author responses with the article, improve accountability. Reviewer-verified reproducibility checklists (ReChart) can greatly clarify and demonstrate validation efforts and help reviewers to assess articles. Documentation requirements may vary by scientific domain; for instance, Nature Portfolio journals specify enhanced reproducibility requirements for certain research areas⁴¹. Also, several publishing houses have dedicated, peer-reviewed protocol journals^{42,43} that focus specifically on solid methodologies.

Publishers can support post-publication verification platforms and independent studies, enabling researchers to share replication experiences and connect original publications with subsequent verification studies. Researchers have recently proposed addressing the reproducibility crisis^{3,4} by having scientists independently validate each other's experiments during the publication process⁴⁴. However, peer validation and publication of these efforts require significant work, necessitating a system to credit such studies for sustainability. This could involve collaboration with bibliometric databases like Web of Science, Scopus, and Google Scholar.

Publishers might introduce reproducibility badges for authors, enhance credit for thorough peer-reviewers, create interactive methodology sections with videos, and enable direct commenting on papers with author feedback. Several journals already offer room for online comments with the article, but these could be implemented as in-line comments and even rated by other readers. Bibliometric tracking of such comments is challenging but possible to implement. Another option is that authors or peer-reviewers could nominate articles that live up to stricter validation and reproducibility criteria to a "gold standard" label, in a manner analogous to "cum laude" designation for Ph.D. candidates.

They could also implement AI-supported replication trackers listing studies replicating the research and dashboards for articles tracking Altmetric scores, citations, replication studies, comments, and requests. As gatekeepers and communication portals, publishers are well-positioned to promote scientific advancement across research fields. For replication and validation journals, the increased burden on voluntary peer reviewers should be addressed, potentially through reward systems³³.

Peer Reviewers

Peer reviewers are gatekeepers of scientific quality, directly responsible for evaluating not only originality but also the validity and reliability of submitted research before publication. The most significant roadblock is that reviewers often face time constraints. Over the past 50 years, the number of journals and submitted articles has increased drastically, reflecting the transition of scientific publications from research society-driven to the billion-euro industry it is today. The increasing number of scientific publications per researcher per year, in combination with a significant increase in administrative tasks and long working week norms³⁵ for senior academics, means that the average time per review has decreased.

Reviewers often lack access to the necessary data and methodologies to thoroughly assess the reproducibility of an article. Incorporating reproducibility assessments into review criteria is a cost-effective method for improving the quality of published literature. However, regardless of whether journal guidelines or editors explicitly require reproducibility checks, individual reviewers should take full responsibility for evaluating the robustness of methodologies and completeness of reported

data, as well as the chance of independent validation. When missing, they should advocate the inclusion of detailed experimental protocols, experimental data, and raw data in submissions.

Tech Transfer

Technology Transfer Offices (TTOs) facilitate the commercialisation of research by managing intellectual property and bridging the academia-industry divide. They act as gatekeepers, similar to journal editors and peer reviewers, regulating knowledge transfer. Institutes like IMEC, LETI, and Fraunhofer connect academia and industry by reviewing research, validating processes in industry settings, and offering demonstration services. Ensuring the reproducibility of early-stage research enhances the likelihood of successful industrial scaling, boosting investor confidence in new technologies. TTOs can improve reproducibility by requiring validation and documentation before commercialisation. Some TTOs already achieve this indirectly by pushing for demonstrated commercial traction during the filing process, for instance through letters of intent or establishment of spin-outs before filing with a PCT application. This has the consequence of requiring the findings to be further validated so that a commercial partner would be willing to bear the financial risks of protecting the IP. Therefore, by placing pressure on inventors to demonstrate concrete commercial traction before continuing further with the filing process, TTOs enhance reproducibility.

The challenge lies in reconciling differing reproducibility standards between academia and industry, especially for non-technical staff. Intellectual property issues also complicate data sharing and collaboration, making it difficult to distinguish between protected information and what should be shared with the scientific community. Furthermore, irreproducible patents can be as problematic as irreproducible research papers, and no system currently exists to detect or report incorrect patents post-publication. Despite potential conflicts with IP regulations, focusing on reproducibility is crucial for deriving value from early-stage research and building trust with industrial partners and investors. While not as important as publishers and funding bodies, TTO can contribute by setting clear reproducibility policies and verification procedures for academic researchers.

Level 3 stakeholders: recommendations

Research teams

Research teams using published scientific results or methods can contribute by writing Comment articles, publishing validation studies, and openly discussing their replication experiences at conferences. Sharing reproduced results, whether negative or positive, will be more impactful if publishers and funding bodies modify their frameworks to support this and if effective reward systems are established.

Industry, research and technology organisations (RTO)

RTOs and industries, including start-ups, SMEs, and large corporations, are crucial in converting scientific research into practical and commercial applications. Entities in the 2D materials sector drive innovation and market integration by connecting initial research with potential end-users. Despite promising scientific advances, challenges arise from material variability, inconsistent or absent methodologies, and an overwhelming volume of research with often untraceable reproducibility. As a secondary stakeholder in academic research, industry has limited leverage to demand transparency or reliability. Intellectual property concerns and competition also hinder data sharing and open collaboration, impeding reproducibility.

2D materials industry is mostly comprised of small companies and start-ups with limited scale and resources. Large enterprises, though better positioned, may lack understanding of these materials and exhibit a conservative approach to unproven technologies, leaving early development risks to

SMEs and start-ups. Overreliance on optimistic preliminary research can harm vulnerable companies and divert stronger ones from strategic goals, leading to significant costs and inefficiencies.

Industry can enhance reproducibility by collaborating with academic institutions with proven records in reproducibility to validate research before commercialisation. R&D teams in companies are often assigned to different roles compared to academic research, positioning academia to lead in exploring new ideas. For example, the large semiconductor industry highly values academic collaboration, evidenced by joint publications from leading companies like TSMC, INTEL, and SAIT. Pilot lines like 2D-EPL can gather experience, validate, and disseminate data on feasible materials and processes, thereby mitigating investment risks for companies in validation activities⁴.

Standardised protocols and methodologies must be adopted and advocated in collaborations with all actors. The validation of research results can be achieved through contracts with metrology and standardisation institutes, such as the National Physical Laboratory in the UK and the Federal Institute for Materials Research and Testing (BAM) in Germany, or by establishing consortia and collaborative platforms to share best practices, data, and methodologies.

Level 4 stakeholders: Recommendations

Communicators and media

Communicators and media professionals, including associations and societies, are vital for disseminating scientific knowledge to the public, policymakers, and stakeholders, shaping perceptions of research processes, capabilities, and directions. While researchers participate in communication and outreach, professional communicators act as advocates, gatekeepers, and influencers, providing channels for researchers and generating content. They prioritise agendas and could significantly emphasise the importance of reproducibility in 2D materials and science. This involves highlighting independently confirmed studies and advocating the reproducibility agenda.

While sensationalism and hype has been a part of how progress, potential and promises have been communicated in mass media, there are plenty of serious media-orientated organisations that understand and embrace their responsibility, reporting on topics important for science and its relationship with society, irrespective of the 'wow factor'. Future directions should focus on building stronger collaborations between scientists and leading communicators to ensure accurate and realistic representations of scientific results and their potential, both in terms of how researchers communicate their findings to media and how media communicate science to the public.

Governmental bodies and policymakers

Governmental bodies and policymakers significantly shape the framework for scientific research by setting priorities, allocating resources, and establishing policies that can either advance or hinder progress. They aim to ensure public funds benefit society, climate, or resources, that political decisions are evidence-based, and that public trust is upheld. Research leaders must advise policymakers responsibly and maintain a realistic and pragmatic discourse on the future impact of new materials and technologies.

Policymakers indirectly influence the reproducibility agenda but can enhance their impact by enforcing strict reproducibility criteria in funding and research evaluations, mandating detailed reproducibility plans, promoting standardised methodologies and open data practices, and supporting replication studies and transparency initiatives. National bodies like The Danish Ministry of Higher Education and Science, and the European Commission have established Codes of Conduct for Research Integrity, including reproducibility⁴⁵.

Level 5 stakeholders: recommendations

Educators and study leaders/planners

Curriculum developers design and implement educational programs for undergraduate and graduate university courses, ensuring they are current, comprehensive, and prepare students for research and professional careers. While course coordinators determine specific content, curriculum coordinators must ensure that general skills, including principles of reproducibility, are taught to develop reliable and credible conduct. However, reproducibility and scientific methods are not inherently part of most courses in natural science and engineering. Although error analysis and thorough documentation are taught in experimental coursework and projects, these alone do not sustain a healthy research and innovation culture. University teaching often prioritises individual work, assessment, and competitive success, not necessarily supporting the adoption of reproducible research practices. Limited resources and time constraints further hinder integrating reproducibility training into existing programs.

The way curriculum creators can incorporate reproducibility principles into the curriculum, is by requesting departments to create specific normative courses on the topic, or by organising faculty seminars and workshops aimed to establish a common understanding and culture among faculty members and educators. The last method, where the need to teach students how to ensure comprehensive documentation, robust methodology, replication, transparency, and data sharing when carrying out their final bachelor and master projects and other experimental coursework is adopted among the members of the faculty, is probably the most efficient and sustainable one. We recommend involving students in replication studies and open science practices, and establishing collaborative educational programs between academia and industry where reproducibility is part of the curriculum.

Additionally, rapidly evolving best practices in reproducibility and their integration into the curriculum pose a challenge, especially concerning experimental and theoretical tools and methodologies in emerging research fields.

Educators and curriculum creators can incorporate reproducibility principles into courses and their learning goals by focusing on comprehensive documentation, robust methodology, replication, transparency, and data sharing. Engaging students in replication studies and open science practices, as well as developing collaborative educational programs between academia and industry might seem inefficient, but in our view likely to lead to more competent researchers and engineers in the long run. Both the European community and many industry actors are very well aware of the importance of this to decrease the effect of future skill shortages. Ultimately, educators are vital in promoting proper epistemological principles, including reproducibility, at all academic educational levels.

Standardisation organisations

SDOs publish documentary standards developed through the consensus of a broad group of experts, to ensure best practices, consistency, and quality in research and industry. These standards provide a common framework that enhances comparability and reliability across studies and applications. Although primarily developed for industry, standardised measurement protocols also ensure that research findings can be reliably replicated. These standards specify detailed protocols for measurements, including sample preparation, instrument calibration, data analysis, and final reporting, with associated uncertainties. Normative documentary standards are established through interlaboratory comparisons, which test method reproducibility and quantify measurement uncertainty, involving both academic and industrial labs. As research on 2D materials is rapidly

evolving, cross-disciplinary, and highly diversified, combining well-established research disciplines and methodological frameworks in novel ways. This inherent complexity of 2D materials research is further complicated by diverse methodologies and reporting standards across laboratories and institutions, making standardisation crucial for consistent measurement of these materials. It is crucial to follow relevant standards to ensure reliable performance comparison within each scientific body of work. This would enable the industry to accurately compare cutting-edge research with state-of-the-art product performance, facilitating informed decisions on commercialisation 2D materials and technology across sectors.

The standardisation process typically spans years due to its rigorous nature and the necessity for consensus at national or international levels. Adoption in industry and academia may be hindered by resistance, as it necessitates changes to established practices, additional training, resources, or new experimental facilities. A practical approach involves aligning standards with widespread practices and equipment. SDOs can aid this by developing clear, detailed, and widely accepted standards for experimental procedures, data reporting, and material characterisation, and by facilitating workshops and training sessions to promote these standards. Increased academic participation in technical committees of SDOs, especially at the international level through national bodies, will ensure the standardisation of the most accurate and reliable methods. Additionally, developing reliable digital tools and platforms can streamline the consistent implementation and dissemination of standards.

Bibliometric databases

Bibliometric databases like Web of Science, Scopus, and Google Scholar are crucial for assessing scientific impact through citation metrics and publication counts. Accurate data is essential for evaluating research credibility, as reproducible studies are more frequently cited. However, existing metrics often prioritise quantity over quality and reproducibility, favouring novel but potentially unreliable studies. To address this, databases could introduce metrics that emphasise reproducibility, tag articles with reproducibility declarations, link to replication studies, and provide quantitative reproducibility indicators. As independent entities, these databases must voluntarily implement these changes, some of which are already in progress. We recommend that bibliometric databases develop new metrics prioritising reproducibility, improve search functionalities for reproducible research, and collaborate with researchers, publishers, and funding bodies to standardise and adopt these metrics.

Open Science

Open Science (OS) aims at making scientific research, data, and dissemination accessible to all levels of an enquiring society, amateur or professional. The fundamental principles of OS include transparency, accessibility, and collaboration to increase the reach and impact of scientific research, and is closely related to data management and FAIR principles⁴⁶, as described below. These principles support practices that make scientific data and methodologies openly available to the broader community and are, therefore, both dependent on and essential for the dissemination of the reproducibility agenda. Concerns about data privacy, intellectual property, and the potential misuse of shared data challenge OS itself.

OS practices can promote the development and use of open-access repositories and data-sharing platforms. OS advocates and organisations can work towards creating incentives for researchers to adopt OS practices, such as funding opportunities for open research collaborations. Furthermore, they can engage in education at various levels, including the political arena, and support the development of policies and collaborative research and educational programs that promote open data and methods as part of publication and funding requirements. Addressing legal, ethical, and

privacy concerns in collaboration with relevant stakeholders will be essential for the broader adoption of OS practices.

Data management

Data management (DM) is crucial for sustainable, transparent, and traceable research, despite no single stakeholder being solely responsible. Effective DM involves recording, organising, storing, and sharing research data to facilitate reproducibility and transparency, encompassing data collection, curation, storage, and sharing practices. Professional DM in scientific research, as embodied in the FAIR principles and increasing requirements for Data Management Plans (DMPs) by public funding bodies and research organisations, is being promoted. However, researchers prioritise DM less, likely due to time constraints and apprehensions about sharing data or methodologies that confer competitive advantages. Evaluating the sincerity of data availability statements required by many journals would be insightful. Standardised formats are lacking, complicated by the diversity and rapid evolution of the 2D Materials research field. Metadata inclusion is crucial for understanding measurement conditions, data provenance, and comparability. Data management and sharing are not yet prevalent in 2D Materials, and researchers may lack training in best practices. Future efforts should establish robust DM infrastructure and policies mandating comprehensive DMPs in research projects, ultimately creating highly valued materials databases that enable accurate digitalisation of 2D materials research.

Conclusions and Future Directions

The rapid advancement of 2D materials research, technology transfer and industrial adoption is being slowed by significant challenges related to reproducibility. Our recommendations offer specific guidelines to enhance reproducibility.

Key suggestions to support consistent reproducibility in research articles and proposals include standardised protocols like STEP and structured declarations such as ReChart. Another critical aspect is the need for altering the reward structures - the 'game rules' that define how researchers and Ph.D. students should behave to achieve a successful academic career.

Enhancing reproducibility in 2D materials research is universally advantageous; however, it necessitates collective action across various stakeholders. In this article, we provide detailed recommendations for the individual research team, but also consider concrete recommendations for all key stakeholders. Researchers must prioritise meticulous documentation and transparency. Publishers can enforce reproducibility standards and create platforms for replication studies. Funding bodies should value and integrate reproducibility criteria into grants, while standardisation organisations must develop consistent methodologies, with input from academia where much expertise lies. Governmental bodies and policymakers are crucial in shaping supportive frameworks through coherent policies and infrastructure investments. We do believe that primary research gatekeepers such as journal publishers, peer reviewers, and funding bodies are central to this effort; without their support, real impact and change is unlikely.

The recommendations do not comprise an action plan *per se*, but a pragmatic catalogue of actions that individual or groups of stakeholders could take to enhance reproducibility in this or other fields.

Reproducibility is a complex and nuanced entity, and the specific need for strict reproducibility protocols may depend on researcher stage, research field, type of research (explorative or applied) and technology readiness level (TRL). Results that may not be easy to reproduce can still inspire other ideas and studies and are therefore worth sharing. However, the level of established and expected reproducibility in any study must be declared clearly and transparently to avoid misleading

other researchers. Finally, we note that many observations and principles developed in this article should be broadly applicable to other disciplines, promoting better research practices that may benefit a much larger part of the scientific community.

References

- 1 Begley, C. G. & Ellis, L. M. Raise standards for preclinical cancer research. *Nature* **483**, 531-533 (2012).
- 2 Errington, T. M., Denis, A., Perfito, N., Iorns, E. & Nosek, B. A. Reproducibility in Cancer Biology: Challenges for assessing replicability in preclinical cancer biology. *Elife* **10**, e67995 (2021).
- 3 Baker, M. 1,500 scientists lift the lid on reproducibility. *Nature* **533**, 452-454 (2016).
- 4 Boggild, P. Research on scalable graphene faces a reproducibility gap. *Nat Commun* **14**, 1126 (2023).
- 5 Wallace, P. R. The Band Theory of Graphite. *Phys Rev* **71**, 622-634 (1947).
- 6 Novoselov, K. S. *et al.* Electric field effect in atomically thin carbon films. *Science* **306**, 666-669 (2004).
- 7 Gjerding, M. N. *et al.* Recent progress of the computational 2D materials database (C2DB). *2d Mater* **8**, 044002 (2021).
- 8 Geim, A. K. & Grigorieva, I. V. Van der Waals heterostructures. *Nature* **499**, 419-425 (2013).
- 9 Twenty years of 2D materials. *Nat Phys* **20**, 1-1 (2024).
- 10 A mixed legacy. *Nat Mater* **22**, 793-793 (2023).
- 11 Schmaltz, T., Wormer, L., Schmoch, U. & Döscher, H. Graphene Roadmap Briefs (No. 3): meta-market analysis 2023. *2d Mater* **11**, 022002 (2024).
- 12 <https://spectrum.ieee.org/iedm> ;
https://irds.ieee.org/images/files/pdf/2023/2023IRDS_BC.pdf ; <https://www.imec-int.com/en/articles/smaller-better-faster-imec-presents-chip-scaling-roadmap>
- 13 Munafò, M. R. *et al.* A manifesto for reproducible science. *Nat Hum Behav* **1**, 0021 (2017).
- 14 Baker, M. & Dolgin, E. Cancer reproducibility project releases first results. *Nature* **541**, 269 (2017).
- 15 Johansson, P. *et al.* Ten Ways to Fool the Masses When Presenting Battery Research. *Batteries Supercaps* **4**, 1785-1788 (2021).
- 16 Barkan, T. Graphene: the hype versus commercial reality. *Nat Nanotechnol* **14**, 904-906 (2019).
- 17 Hype kills your story. *Nat Nanotechnol* **19**, 715 (2024).
- 18 Lanza, M., Smets, Q., Huyghebaert, C. & Li, L. J. Yield, variability, reliability, and stability of two-dimensional materials based solid-state electronic devices. *Nat Commun* **11**, 5689 (2020).
- 19 Kauling, A. P. *et al.* The Worldwide Graphene Flake Production. *Adv Mater* **30**, 1803784 (2018).
- 20 Chatterjee, S., Abadie, T., Wang, M. H., Matar, O. K. & Ruoff, R. S. Repeatability and Reproducibility in the Chemical Vapor Deposition of 2D Films: A Physics-Driven Exploration of the Reactor Black Box. *Chem Mater* **36**, 1290-1298 (2024).
- 21 Amontree, J. *et al.* Reproducible graphene synthesis by oxygen-free chemical vapour deposition. *Nature* **630**, 636-642 (2024).
- 22 Guo, W., Wu, B., Wang, S. & Liu, Y. Q. Controlling Fundamental Fluctuations for Reproducible Growth of Large Single-Crystal Graphene. *Acs Nano* **12**, 1778-1784 (2018).
- 23 Turner, P. *et al.* International interlaboratory comparison of Raman spectroscopic analysis of CVD-grown graphene. *2d Mater* **9**, 035010 (2022).
- 24 Cao, Y. *et al.* Unconventional superconductivity in magic-angle graphene superlattices. *Nature* **556**, 43 (2018).

- 25 <https://thewire.in/education/research-productivity-increased-most-in-pakistan-last-year-at-first-glance>
- 26 Enough Quantity: Time to Focus on Quality of Researchers in Pakistan DOI:
<https://doi.org/10.6017/ihe.2017.91.10135>
- 27 Park, M., Leahey, E. & Russel, J. F. Papers and patents are becoming less disruptive over time. *Nature* **613**, 138-144 (2023).
- 28 Funk, R. J. & Owen-Smith, J. A Dynamic Network Measure of Technological Change. *Manage Sci* **63**, 791-817 (2017).
- 29 Dance, A. Stop the peer-review treadmill. I want to get off. *Nature* **614**, 581-583 (2023).
- 30 Gammelgaard, L., Whelan, P. R., Booth, T. J. & Boggild, P. Long-term stability and tree-ring oxidation of WSe using phase-contrast AFM. *Nanoscale* **13**, 19238-19246 (2021).
- 31 Consort 2010. *Lancet* **375**, 1136-1136 (2010).
- 32 Smith, A. Who discovered the magnetocaloric effect? *Eur Phys J H* **38**, 507-517 (2013).
- 33 Hanson, M. A., Barreiro, P. G., Crosetto, P. & Brockington, D. *The strain on scientific publishing* (2023).
- 34 Knoepfler, P. Reviewing post-publication peer review. *Trends Genet* **31**, 221-223 (2015).
- 35 Woolston, C. Workplace habits: Full-time is full enough. *Nature* **546**, 175–177 (2017).
- 36 Pizzocchero, F. *et al.* The hot pick-up technique for batch assembly of van der Waals heterostructures. *Nat Commun* **7**, 11894 (2016).
- 37 The example explaining in great detail the van der Waals assembly of a stack (graphene monolayer encapsulated in hexagonal boron nitride) in Supplementary Information took two people, Bjarke Sørensen Jessen and Peter Bøggild 5 hours to write down and format.
- 38 The Danish Code of Conduct for Research Integrity,
<https://ufm.dk/en/publications/2014/the-danish-code-of-conduct-for-research-integrity>.
The European Code of Conduct for Research Integrity (https://ec.europa.eu/info/funding-tenders/opportunities/docs/2021-2027/horizon/guidance/european-code-of-conduct-for-research-integrity_horizon_en.pdf)
<https://www.nature.com/collections/fhhagdbehg>
- 39 Wu, P., Zhang, T. Y., Zhu, J. D., Palacios, T. & Kong, J. 2D materials for logic device scaling. *Nat Mater* **23**, 23–25 (2024).
- 40 <https://www.nature.com/nature-portfolio/editorial-policies/reporting-standards>
- 41 Moon, J. Y. *et al.* Protocol for preparing layer-engineered van der Waals materials through atomic spalling. *Star Protoc* **4**, 102228 (2023).
- 42 Park, D. W. *et al.* Fabrication and utility of a transparent graphene neural electrode array for electrophysiology, imaging, and optogenetics. *Nat Protoc* **11**, 2201-2222 (2016).
- 43 Crow, J. M. Peer-replication model aims to address science’s ‘reproducibility crisis’. *Nature* (2024).
- 44 The Danish Code of Conduct for Research Integrity,
<https://ufm.dk/en/publications/2014/the-danish-code-of-conduct-for-research-integrity>.
The European Code of Conduct for Research Integrity (https://ec.europa.eu/info/funding-tenders/opportunities/docs/2021-2027/horizon/guidance/european-code-of-conduct-for-research-integrity_horizon_en.pdf)
- 45 FAIR principles aims at data to be Findable, Accessible, Interoperable and Reusable.
<https://www.go-fair.org/fair-principles/>

Acknowledgements

P.B. acknowledges financial support from BIOMAG – Novo Nordisk Challenge Programme and DFF METATUNE. N. L. gratefully acknowledges financial support from the Swiss National Science

Foundation (*Postdoc Mobility* P500PT_211105) and the Villum Foundation (*Villum Experiment* 50355). B. S. J. acknowledges financial support from BioNWire – Novo Nordisk Synergy Project.

We acknowledge input and discussions with Alex Wotherspoon, Timothy John Booth, Sanna Arpiainen and Cedric Huyghebaert from IOP Publishing.

Author contributions

P.B. conceived the study and wrote the first draft of the manuscript. B. S. J wrote the STEP example with input from P.B.

All authors read and provided input for the manuscript, reflecting their personal and stakeholder perspectives.

Competing interests

There are no competing interests. The opinions expressed in this paper reflect the views of the individual authors and should not be taken as a statement of the official policy of their institutions.

Supplementary information

Example of STEP template

The example shows the steps needed to produce a van der Waals heterostructure with a monolayer graphene encapsulated in 20-50 nm thick hexagonal boron nitride with minimal bubbles and contamination. In this example we presume that a polycarbonate (PC) stamp has already been made, following for instance the description in Ref [1]. We note that part of the process below (step 8-9) will depend significantly on the type of polymer as well as other layers in the stamp stack (there might be several layers on top of the glass slide).

The recipe below is intended for assembly in ambient conditions but could be modified to work in a glovebox. The STEP – Standardised Template for Experimental Procedures is described in the main text. This example is the most comprehensive and detailed protocol for the basic assembly process in literature, and the time to document it was approximately 5 hours for two people.

#	Main task	Sub task	ME – Materials and Equipment	PR – Parameters and Ranges	IWTD – Issues, Warnings, Troubleshooting and Difficulties	VEO – Validation and Expected Outcomes
Description of checkpoints			Specify all materials and equipment used, including alternatives if primary options are not available. Include details about manufacturers, models, and modifications.	List and record all controlled and uncontrolled parameters. Provide a range of values tested for each critical parameter.	Identify potential safety hazards, operational issues, and provide troubleshooting tips. Point out if and how a step is difficult, and how the experimenter can reduce the difficulty to increase the chance of success.	Describe the expected results or outputs clearly, including any specific observations or measurements that indicate that the process/characterisation step was successful.
1	Exfoliation of graphene		We used graphite from NGS Naturgraphit. HOPG or most natural graphite providers would serve as well. 3M Magic scotch tape or blue tape i.e. product 6571 from cleanroomtape.com. The type of tape is not critical, but it may influence the temperature range used later.		Graphite: there may be differences in mosaic spread, but in our experiences, most will result in sizeable monolayer flakes.	
1.1		Fixate tape on work area,				
1.2		Press down graphite using gloved fingers or Q-tip, repeatedly.				
1.3		Lift graphite gently and press repeatedly on uncovered tape area until high coverage within target area on chip.				High coverage of graphite on tape by visual inspection (before step 4). Microscope not needed.
1.4		Cover area with graphite with another layer of tape, to protect it until application to target SiO ₂ chip.				
2	Plasma treatment of target SiO ₂ chip	Position chip in Plasma chamber. Only place 1-2 chips at a time, for quicker handling (see IWTD). We use 30s at low power O ₂ plasma (20-50 W, at medium-high pressure, 50 mTorr).	Equipment: Plasma ashing system PE-50 from Plasma Etch. Material: SiO ₂ /Si: use chip with 90 or 285 nm oxide[2], for high optical contrast. We usually deposit oxide in our own cleanroom on standard Si wafers for exfoliation, using a dry oxidation system.	Plasma treatment time, power, pressure, chip handling time Parameters may vary considerably depending on system. Optimisation of parameters should be done on local system, to balance coverage and ease of picking up/ stickiness (see IWTD). SiO ₂ /Si: Different thickness may be optimal for other materials[3]. Use high-quality oxide. We recommend using oxide made by dry oxidation.	The purpose is that the treatment suffices to remove hydrocarbons from surface without roughening the SiO ₂ . This balance will be different depending on system and system parameters and would require optimisation. It is important to handle the chips relatively quickly, i.e. move to next step within seconds, to avoid unnecessary reabsorption of atmospheric hydrocarbons	

3	Tape applied to chip	Open the plasma chamber, take chips out on flat working area, open the tape (see 1.4), and press graphite side down onto chip. Rub against top of tape with a blunt object (see ME).	Equipment: blunt object (pencil, a gloved finger) i.e. with a radius of curvature > 3 mm.	Chip handling time Time from opening plasma chamber to application of tape should be less than 10 seconds, or as fast as possible, see task 2 (IWTD).	See PR. This step requires a little practice. We recommend be fast but calm. When rubbing tape onto chip, use just enough force to squeeze out trapped air bubbles.	Validation is during optical inspection
4.1	Heat treatment	Heat chip on hotplate and remove tape.	Any hotplate with precise temperature control (plus minus 5 degrees) will do.	Temperature, time We use 100 C in 1 minute. Time can be increased to 2 minutes (maybe more), but should not be less than 1 min. We recommend precise temperature control. 100 °C is optimal for 3M Scotch Tape to be soft enough to promote conformation of graphene flakes to surface, while not melting. The optimal temperature may be different for other types of tape but should then be kept consistent.		
4.2		Remove tape	2 pairs of tweezers, one for holding the chip, and one for removing the now soft tape. For high temperatures, use metal tweezers.	We do not note any important differences by varying angle, speed or force at this step.	Don't burn your fingers. If the coverage of graphene/graphite is low, considering increasing the plasma time or power.	Optical inspection with microscope: there will be plenty tape residues on the chip, but these should be around the deposited graphene/graphite areas, not on top. It may look messy, but it should not matter.
5	Exfoliation of hBN	The remaining part of the process for hBN is identical to 1-4.	We use either hBN acquired from HQ Graphene[4], or from collaborators at NIMS in Japan[5]. We use 3M Scotch tape like in step 1.	Tape: some groups recommend using 3M Scotch Greener tape in combination with 3M Scotch tape, but this is in our experience not necessary.		
6	Identification and selection of graphene flakes	Typically, mono-, bi- and tri-layers are of interest.	Optical microscope with 100x objective (preferably) and 10x for overview screening of larger areas.	White light source.	It will require practice to consistently discriminate graphene flakes based on layer thickness. This can be solved by using an automated "flake finder" method [ref].	On a 1 cm ² chip, we expect to find 5-10 monolayer flakes with areas of at least 100 μm ² . This can vary significantly from chip to chip, and with practice. Depending on the application prioritise flakes with (1) no visible damage, cracks or contamination, (2) large straight edges, (3) no folds and wrinkles.
7	Identification and selection of hBN flakes	Typically, depending on application, flakes ranging from a few (2-4 nm thickness) to many (40-50 nm thickness) layers are of interest.	Same as task 6.	Same as task 6.	(1) it can be hard to see monolayer step edges, i.e. assess the uniformity of hBN due to its low optical contrast. (2) hBN flakes are diffraction-coloured according to their thickness, and we recommend creating a baseline colour map using atomic force microscopy for quick reference. (3) Darkfield microscopy may significantly help to highlight step-edges and structural defects (4) Averaging of several/many images effectively increases the signal-to-noise ratio allowing thinner flakes and smaller defects to be observed.	See IWTD On a 1 cm ² chip, we expect to find 5-10 flakes in the 20-50 nm thickness range with uniform areas of at least 100 μm ² . This can vary significantly from chip to chip, and with practice.
8	Heterostructure assembly (hBN/G/hBN)		Key equipment is using a stacking system, consisting most often of an optical microscope equipped with micromanipulators (at least 3 degrees of freedom – XY + Z), clamp or vacuum fixation		It is beyond the scope of this STEP recipe to specify the stacking system; however, a few key concerns include: (1) heater and temperature controller which can reliably control the temperature up	

			of sample and chip heater with temperature controller. We use both homebuilt[4] and commercial systems [HQ Graphene '2D Heterostructure Transfer System'].		to 200 °C with 0.1 °C precision. (2) should be placed in a vibration-free environment or on a vibration isolation stage. (3) Objectives should include (very/ultra) long working distance 20x-50x objective. WD should long enough to accommodate the glass slide between the objective and the silicon oxide chip. Glass-corrected objectives can help increasing clarity of imaging. (4) We recommend using a motorised z-stage, as this greatly simplifies the task of achieving a smooth, continuous approach, as well as achieving reproducible, operator-independent results.	
8.1		Pickup of first hBN flake				
8.1.1		Place hBN chip on stage and identify the target flake. Center it in the optical viewfield.				
8.1.2		Glass slide mounted on microcontroller with PC area approximately centered around target flake.				
8.1.3		Flake chip and slide is brought close to each other at a safe distance		Distance: 1-2 mm.	Smaller distances make accidents more likely. When temperature is increased in next step, expansion can lead to unwanted contact.	
8.1.4		Temperature is increased to 110 °C.		Temperature, Stabilisation time Wait 1-2 minutes for stabilisation Temperature should be 110 °C. Note: this is not important; there can be advantages of using significantly lower temperatures.	This task can be done earlier (i.e. at 8.1.1)	When focusing on the target flake, a change in temperature will lead to drift of the focus. When focus no longer drifts, the system can be taken to be thermally stable.
8.1.5		Stamp brought into contact with hBN flake. (1) the polymer stamp will often touch first at a certain point close to the flake, which is clearly observable in the microscope (2) upon further approach, the contact area will expand until its edge has passed over and is now fully covering the hBN flake.		Time, rate It is not important to do this very slowly; from initial touch-down to stamp covering hBN (ready to retract) can be a few minutes.	(1) We recommend continuing until the edge of stamp-chip contact area extends at least 50-100 microns beyond the flake. This helps to ensure consistent lift-up in step 8.1.6, even if mechanical or polymer drift occur. (2) While we here focus on the approach done by the micromanipulator, similar results can be achieved by slowly increasing the temperature using the thermal expansion of the polymer to close the gap between stamp and polymer. (3) If the stamp and chip are already in contact, this can give a very smooth approach; care should be taken to use only moderate temperature increase (e.g. 10-20 °C, depending on polymer)	The stamp-chip contact area covers the flake, extending 50-100 microns beyond.
8.1.6		Stamp with hBN flake is lifted up / retracted from chip.		Stabilisation time, speed of retraction We recommend waiting at least 3-5 minutes for		Retraction speed can be compared to the approach speed by watching the stamp-chip contact line, or

				<p>the system to achieve thermal and mechanical stability. In our experience this increases the chances of successful pickup.</p> <p>Retraction speed can be similar to or slightly lower than in step 8.1.5.</p>		<p>by using a motorised z-stage (see point 8)</p> <p>Validation of successful pick-up is done by making sure that the hBN flake is no longer on the chip. It is advisable to inspect the glass slide in a different/good optical microscope (100x) to ensure the structural integrity of the hBN as well as the contact with the stamp.</p> <p>At this stage it is recommendable to record optical images for later use (troubleshooting, optimisation or publication).</p>
8.2		Pickup of graphene flake, using the stamp with hBN flake.	As in 8.1			
8.2.1		Place graphene chip on stage and identify the target flake. Center it in the optical view-field.				
8.2.2		Glass slide mounted on microcontroller with PC area approximately centered around target flake.				
8.2.3		Flake chip and slide is brought close to each other at a safe distance		As 8.1.3	As 8.1.3	As 8.1.3
8.2.4		Temperature is increased to 110 °C.		As 8.1.4	As 8.1.4	As 8.1.4
8.2.5		Stamp brought into contact with graphene flake. Align graphene and hBN flakes using microcontrollers. The rest of the step follows 8.1.5.		<p>Time, rate</p> <p>Initially, approach the two surfaces slowly until first contact. From here the approach process should be very slow (typical time from first contact to final state is over 10 minutes).</p>	<p>(1) When aligning the two target flakes, they will initially have different focal planes (until they touch).</p> <p>(2) Continuously compensate the lateral positions of the flakes during vertical approach, as they tend to drift sideways.</p> <p>(3) Gradually move the stamp closer to the chip while performing this procedure. As the targets are very close, the focal plane will be almost identical.</p> <p>(4) The very slow approach allows contaminants and bubbles at the mechanical junction between the flakes to be expelled. If the flakes are brought into contact too quickly, bubbles and contamination might get trapped. These can still be agglomerated using thermal treatment leaving more space for devices[6], removed by postprocessing[1], scrapped by contact-mode AFM[7] or avoided entirely by assembly in vacuum[8]. The advice above will limit the need for either of these when assembling in ambient conditions.</p> <p>(5) If contamination and bubbles are still problematic, increasing the temperature (i.e. up to glass transition temperature of the polymer which for PC is 147 °C) during drop-down can help.</p>	As 8.1.5

8.2.6		Stamp with hBN flake is lifted up / retracted from chip.		<p>Stabilisation time, retraction rate The surfaces are kept in contact for at least 30 minutes, corresponding to the baking step in Ref [4]. This appears to facilitate the adhesion between the graphene and hBN flakes.</p> <p>Retraction rate: 1-5 minutes from full contact to full release.</p>	(6) On the retraction rate: Provided the above 'baking' step is successful it should not be necessary to retract very slowly. A time from full contact to release of 1 minute should be sufficient, however, spending more time could be safer and does not pose any other problems we know of. Different group use very different strategies for this step, with seemingly similar outcomes.	
8.3		Drop-down on second hBN flake				
8.3.1		Place hBN chip on stage and identify the target hBN flake. Center it in the optical view-field.				
8.3.2		Glass slide with hBN/graphene stack mounted on microcontroller.				
8.3.3		Flake chip and slide is brought close to each other at a safe distance		As 8.1.3	As 8.1.3	As 8.1.3
8.3.4		Temperature is increased to 110 °C		As 8.1.4	As 8.1.4	As 8.1.4
8.3.5		Stamp with stack brought into contact with graphene flake. Align hBN/graphene stack and hBN flake using microcontrollers. The rest of the step follows 8.1.5.		As 8.2.5	As 8.2.5	As 8.2.5
8.3.6		Temperature is increased to 200 C until polymer stamp is melted onto chip, separating it from glass slide.		<p>Temperature, Time Temperature at 200 C ensures that PC reflows (starts at 155 °C).</p> <p>The time should be at least 10 minutes, to ensure that the reflowing process has completed.</p>	During the heating process, the polymer will expand, so it is advisable to compensate by gently adjust the z-position (height) to maintain a relatively constant contact area.	PC polymer will not change appearance.
8.3.7		Retraction of glass slide		<p>Time Retraction time should be slow enough to allow the separation of the glass and polymer to progress controllably. We recommend 5-10 minutes for this process (from contact to non-contact) as a starting point.</p>	If the stabilisation time is too short, the polymer may be lifted partly up with the glass slide, potentially damaging the stack.	After retraction of glass slide, the stack should be located on the chip, visible through the deposited polymer (8.3.6).
8.3.8		Removal of melted polymer is achieved using 1 or more repetitions of the following cycle: (1) Dip chip for 10 seconds in Chloroform, move directly to (2) 10 seconds in acetone, and (3) 10 seconds in IPA. Following this, the chip is gently dried with a flow of nitrogen.	3 beakers, with (1) Isopropanol Alcohol, (2) Chloroform*, (3) Acetone Fumehood (see IWTD).	Time per dip. Approximately 10 seconds for each dip. Nitrogen blow until dry.	<p>WARNING: (1) Chloroform is toxic and should handled with the greatest care, following all possible safety precautions. The removal process MUST be carried out in a fumehood and/or personal protection equipment, and consultancy and approval with the local working safety responsible is mandatory. Stay safe. (2) The reason for the quick alternating dips in three liquids is that we observed that prolonged immersion in chloroform can lead to contamination and degradation of some 2D materials. It is not known whether this is detrimental specifically to hBN/G/hBN</p>	The chip should appear clean upon visual (naked eye) inspection. The cycle (Chloroform, Acetone, IPA) can be repeated several times until the chip is clean.

					stacks, yet we recommend this procedure for caution.	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

References

1. Purdie, D.G., et al., *Cleaning interfaces in layered materials heterostructures*. Nature Communications, 2018. **9**: p. 5387.
2. Blake, P., et al., *Making graphene visible*. Applied Physics Letters, 2007. **91**(6).
3. Jessen, B.S., et al., *Quantitative optical mapping of two-dimensional materials*. Scientific Reports, 2018. **8**: p. 6381.
4. Pizzocchero, F., et al., *The hot pick-up technique for batch assembly of van der Waals heterostructures*. Nature Communications, 2016. **7**: p. 11894.
5. Jessen, B.S., et al., *Lithographic band structure engineering of graphene*. Nature Nanotechnology, 2019. **14**(4): p. 340.
6. Haigh, S.J., et al., *Cross-sectional imaging of individual layers and buried interfaces of graphene-based heterostructures and superlattices*. Nature Materials, 2012. **11**(9): p. 764-767.
7. Kim, Y., et al., *Reliable Postprocessing Improvement of van der Waals Heterostructures*. ACS Nano, 2019. **13**(12): p. 14182-14190.
8. Mannix, A.J., et al., *Robotic four-dimensional pixel assembly of van der Waals solids*. Nature Nanotechnology, 2022. **17**(4): p. 361.