HOW TO RECOGNISE POTENTIAL MANIPULATION OF THE PEER REVIEW PROCESS



Peer reviewers may be suggested by:

- the Editor handling the manuscript.
- authors on submission of their manuscript to a journ
- another reviewer who is unable to peer review the manuscript.

While there is an expectation that everyone involved in the process acts with integrity ^(Ref 1), the peer review process can be susceptible to manipulation ^(Ref 2-4) as discussed at **COPE's 2016 North American Seminar.** ^(Ref 5)

The features or patterns of activity shown opposite are suggested to help Editors recognise potential signs of peer review manipulation. Often it is the occurrence of these features in combination that may indicate a potential issue, and they may only become apparent at later stages in the peer review or publishing process.

Relevant COPE Cases:

Case 11-27: Author Creates Bogus Email Accounts for Proposed Reviewers

http://bit.ly/2eTOmVm

Case 12-12: Compromised Peer Review in Published Papers http://bit.lv/2wVLkKU

Case 12-16: Compromised Peer Review (Unpublished) http://bit.ly/2y2O4nv

References:

- COPE Ethical Guidelines to Peer Review. http://bit.ly/2xZcZrk
- 2. COPE Statement on Inappropriate Manipulation of Peer Review Processes.
 http://bit.ly/2f2NRMw
- Who Reviews the Reviewers? Jigisha Patel http://bit.ly/1AqfKDc
- 4. Inappropriate Manipulation of Peer Review. *Elizabeth Moylan* http://bit.lv/2w64bTN
- 5. Can You Spot a Fake? The Trend of Fake Peer Reviews.

 Alison McCook

Who Reviews the Reviewers?

Kristen Overstreet

Peer Review Manipulation. New Challenges and New Solutions. *Jigisha Patel*

http://bit.ly/2vSjZoY

6. Organised Crime Against the Academic Peer Review System. *Adam Cohen et al*

http://bit.ly/1UmIH7Y

YOU ARE VIEWING AN ARCHIVED VERSION OF THIS DOCUMENT

View the latest version at https://doi.org/10.24318/cope.2019.2.15

(purportedly from different individuals)

A review that is vague in style

(language not typical of apparent seniority, experience, or educational background of reviewer) (Ref 6)

Positive review in strong contrast to other reviewers

(with mainly grammatical changes)

Complimentary review but point out minor technical issues

(appearing credible)

Reviews frequently returned well ahead of the deadline

tional email address

, but not limited to: , or hotmail accounts)

delital signs of peer reliable manipulation

Suspicious email address

(atypical for that reviewer)

Fictitious name

Work in an unrelated subject to the manuscript

Atypical features of the IP address

Extremely quick to agree to peer review

Agreeing to review many manuscripts

(and particularly 'active' in a journal's peer review database

Best Practice to Minimise Peer Review Manipulation



Require that authors submit manuscripts to the journal themselves.



Never recommends rejection

Try to use institutional emails or institutionally verified ORCIDs when inviting peer reviewers.



Always check that suggested peer reviewers are qualified to review the manuscript and their email address is accurate.



Check for unusual patterns of behaviour which in combination may suggest peer review manipulation is occurring.