(b) What to do if you suspect peer review manipulation after publication.*

Contact named peer reviewer on organisational email address and ask if they also use the email address provided to you.

Can reviewer confirm details of manuscript?

- Yes
  - Thank contacted individual and say you plan to investigate

- No
  - Leave publication as stands

**SATISFACTORY EXPLANATION, THANK REVIEWER, LEAVE PUBLICATION AS STANDS**

Contact individual who suggested the named peer reviewer (eg, handling editor) and ask for explanation.

If satisfactory, eg, naive or genuine mistake

- Thank individual but check other reviewers had sufficient expertise to assess the manuscript

  - If ok
    - Leave publication as stands

  - If no
    - Explain situation to author and author institution in neutral terms and see if any further information can be shared

    - If satisfactory, eg, naive or genuine mistake
      - Thank author and institution
    - If unsatisfactory
      - If revisions needed or if flawed
        - CONSIDER POST-PUBLICATION CHANGES AS APPROPRIATE

        Such as correction, retraction, or expression of concern

      - If other reviews unsatisfactory
        - Leave publication as stands

      - If ok
        - Conduct post-publication peer review

        Consider adding expression of concern

    

- If unsatisfactory/no response or author seemingly suggested the peer reviewer

  - If ok
    - Leave publication as stands
  
  - If revisions needed or if flawed

*See also infographic ‘How to recognise potential manipulation of the peer review process’ and flowcharts on ‘What to do if you suspect systematic manipulation of the publication process’. 
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