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

Verify peer reviewer at organisation

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

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

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

Satisfactory explanation, thank reviewer

Thank the contacted individual and say you plan to investigate

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

SATISFACTORY EXPLANATION, THANK REVIEWER

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

Thank individual and consider whether an additional peer reviewer could be sought

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

Thank author and institution, consider continuing with peer review but invite additional reviewers

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 unsatisfactory

Reject manuscript

Thank individual and consider whether an additional peer reviewer could be sought

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

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

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

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

Note
See also infographic ‘How to recognise potential manipulation of the peer review process’ https://doi.org/10.24318/cope.2019.2.15 and guidance on ‘Systematic manipulation of the publication process’ https://doi.org/10.24318/cope.2019.2.23.