(a) What to do if you suspect peer review manipulation during the peer review process.*

SUSPEND PEER REVIEW PROCESS IF PEER REVIEWER NAME APPEARS LEGITIMATE BUT SUSPICIOUS EMAIL ADDRESS PROVIDED

Verify peer reviewer at organisation

Yes

No

Check publication record, online search or reviewer database to find other means of independently locating email address

Yes

No

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

Yes

No

Can named reviewer independently provide details of the manuscript they are reviewing?

Satisfactory explanation, thank reviewer

If satisfactory, e.g., naive or genuine mistake

Thank the contacted individual and say you plan to investigate

If no response

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

If satisfactory, e.g., naive or genuine mistake

THANK INDIVIDUAL AND CONSIDER WHETHER AN ADDITIONAL PEER REVIEWER COULD BE SOUGHT

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

Explain situation to author and author institution in neutral terms and see if any further information can be shared

THANK AUTHOR AND INSTITUTION, CONSIDER CONTINUING WITH PEER REVIEW BUT INVITE ADDITIONAL REVIEWERS

If unsatisfactory

REJECT MANUSCRIPT

Explain to author and author institution

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

*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'.

**PEER REVIEWER NAME APPEARS LEGITIMATE BUT SUSPICIOUS EMAIL ADDRESS PROVIDED**

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

- **Yes**
  - Can reviewer confirm details of manuscript?
    - **Yes**
      - Satisfactory explanation, thank reviewer, leave publication as stands
    - **No**
      - Thank contacted individual and say you plan to investigate

- **No response**
  - Contact individual who suggested the named peer reviewer (eg, handling editor) and ask for explanation
    - **Yes**
      - Thank reviewer, leave publication as stands
    - **No**
      - Check if other reviewers had sufficient expertise to assess the manuscript, if revisions are needed or if the manuscript is flawed

- **No**
  - Leave publication as stands
    - **If ok**
      - Thank individual but check other reviewers had sufficient expertise to assess the manuscript
        - **If ok**
          - Leave publication as stands
        - **If no**
          - Conduct post-publication peer review
            - Consider adding expression of concern
              - **If ok**
                - Leave publication as stands
              - **If unsatisfactory**
                - Check if other reviewers had sufficient expertise to assess the manuscript, if revisions are needed or if the manuscript is flawed

- **If unsatisfactory/no response or author seemingly suggested the peer reviewer**
  - Explain situation to author and author institution in neutral terms and see if any further information can be shared
    - **If satisfactory**
      - Thank author and institution
        - **If ok**
          - Leave publication as stands
        - **If unsatisfactory**
          - Consider post-publication changes as appropriate
            - Such as correction, retraction, or expression of concern
              - **If revisions needed or if flawed**
                - If revisions needed or if flawed