

This doc is an appendix to [this piece](#) on the 2018 Thai cave rescue. It covers who the authors are, our relationship to the story, and our offer to generously reward anyone who can find any mistakes in our research, large or small.

## Who we are

This article was a joint production between:

- [Raimund Huber](#), an Austrian filmmaker (and longtime Thai resident) who shot two documentaries on the rescue, both of which he shelved when he realized there was a much larger story to tell. He was also a consultant to the Netflix documentary *The Trapped 13*.
- Jeremy Arnold, a Canadian writer whose [review of the media coverage](#) back in 2018 was used by Musk as context for his initial apology to Vern Unsworth.

Basically we're two regular guys who got sucked into the vortex of an unusually important and mistold story, who then got really stubborn about making sure someone told it well.

**(We're also friendly with diver Ben Reymenants, who features in this story.** We took an early interest in how he and his diving partner Maksym Polejaka were cut out of many of the official narratives, and interviewed him extensively. We may work with him on related projects. To limit our bias here, we independently corroborated everything we could, and gave him no editorial input outside of the same chance to clarify and correct that we offered others.)

## Our research and corrections policy

We've spent 1,000+ hours digging into this story, with a continuously evolving sense of how we'd combine our work and how we'd release it. While it's been slow going as we worked around our day jobs and other projects, we've amassed a considerable trove of documentary evidence—including quite a full accounting of the contradictions between various tellings of it.

One or both of us approached all the main subjects in this story, often multiple times. While some were more forthcoming than others, we've collected extensive personal testimonies, which we combined with public books and interviews, along with all the discovery docs from the Musk-Vern defamation trial. It's a lot. We've tried to make as many claims as possible on the back of multiple pieces of evidence, else on direct confessions or under-oath testimony.

Even so, it's always possible that we got something wrong, or that a source we quote from was itself mistaken on some detail. As we've made some extraordinary claims, we've decided to go beyond Jeremy's [normal corrections policy](#).

- If we got something minor wrong (ie. that has minimal bearing on the main claims listed in the story's TLDR summary), we'll pay \$25-250 USD per correction.
- If we got something major wrong (ie. that would fully or mostly undermine a significant claim), we'll pay up to \$1,000 USD.
- If someone feels that we've wrongly rejected a corrections request, we're happy to have this adjudicated by any reasonable third party.
- For any corrections where we'd done due diligence in sourcing but the source(s) was/were incorrect, we'll decide on a case by case basis, though we'll still happily edit the story accordingly and add them to the log.
- While we won't pay for typos that don't color any of the facts, any feedback there is always welcome.

Corrections requests can be sent anonymously through [this Typeform](#), or DM'd to [Jeremy](#) or [Raimund](#) on X. To make sure all readers have visibility into what's been challenged and our responses, we'll centralize all factual and fairness criticisms in [this dispute doc](#).

**Note that we won't pay out rewards to subjects we reached out to with our questions, nor their immediate affiliates.** While we'll still happily correct our story based on any hard evidence they provide, we're not going to reward them for any withholding of information.

For any journalists whose work we *directly* criticize that we didn't reach out to, we're happy to consider them eligible, and to donate on their behalf to a relevant charity if they view either direct or directed compensation as in conflict with their newspaper's ethics policy.