

## Meet the Editors

*Eric Chow*

### Who you are and what you do?

Eric is an epidemiologist and biostatistician with considerable expertise in sexual health research. He has joint appointments at Monash University and Alfred Health in Melbourne, Australia. His research focuses on transmission dynamics, sexual behaviours, prevention, health promotion and health program evaluation.

### What things make you want to push the accept button when you see a paper?

- Papers should be clear, well-structured and concise.
- Clearly identify the aim and objective of the research.
- Results should be presented in a scientific way.
- Tables and figures should be self-explanatory.

### What things make you want to push the reject button?

- Poorly written and poorly structured papers.
- Inappropriate methodology and statistical analysis.
- Poor or incorrect interpretation of the data.
- Duplicate publications.

### Advice for authors

- Proofread the manuscript as many times as possible before submission.
- Read the “Author Instructions” section and ensure your manuscript meets the journal requirement.
- Ensure the data and terminology is consistent throughout the manuscript.



*Eric Chow*

*Somesh Gupta*

### Who you are and what you do?

Somesh is a Professor of Dermatovenereology at All India Institute of Medical Sciences (New Delhi), India's premier health institute, established with the help of Government of New Zealand over 60 years ago. His main areas of interests are genital HPV, syphilis, genital herpes, vaginal microbiome, and sexual health in general. His association with IUSTI is long and he has served as Membership Secretary for IUSTI-World (2003–2013) and currently serving as Regional Director for IUSTI-Asia-Pacific. He has edited an international reference text on STI (2nd Edn., 2012, Elsevier) and contributed on evidence-based Asian guidelines on management of early syphilis, genital herpes and syphilis.

### What things make you want to push the accept button when you see a paper?

Clearly written papers on subjects likely to have an impact on sexual healthcare. Papers based on research of high translational significance, coming from multi-disciplinary and multicentric collaborations are most desirable. Sound methodology, including appropriate statistical methods, clear description of results, and a crisp discussion make the job of an editor easier.

### What things make you want to push the reject button?

Mere repetition of previously reported research and papers lacking novel features. Any kind of plagiarism.

### Advice for authors

Read carefully and comply with the instructions for authors. Graphs and tables are a very important part of a paper and they should clearly depict what you want to convey. You, being an author, know everything; however read your manuscript before submission from another person's perspective, who is not involved in the research to find out whether the message is conveyed with clarity or not. Avoid too many tables, elaborate discussions unrelated to the subject as well as strong conclusions not supported by your data.



*Somesh Gupta*

## *Matthew Hogben*

### **Who you are and what you do?**

Matthew works in the Division of STD Prevention at the US Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. He mixes behavioral and structural intervention techniques in behavioral interventions, STD health care provision and partner services, working with colleagues to combine interventions with policy to drive effectiveness and impact.

### **What things make you want to push the accept button when you see a paper?**

The best papers have a coherent narrative based on solid evidence. I'm especially eager to read papers in which the authors have gone beyond defining the questions they are asking to explore the full range of potential answers. In essence, have the authors thought beyond what they think or hope might be true and allowed themselves to be wrong? That's how one discovers new knowledge.

### **What things make you want to push the reject button?**

Thoughtless writing is an instant red flag. Many authors are writing in a second language, so this is not necessarily a question of English usage. Instead, the path to rejection is lined with unproductive tangents, lectures of the reader, and pseudo-conclusions unconnected to the data.

### **Advice for authors**

Write out at least the bones of your introduction before you collect the data. Doing so will anchor your thinking and help you understand the boundaries of your inquiries for that dive into the range of answers to your questions. On a more practical note, please do get a colleague or two to read your work. It's like having a reviewer who has to make eye contact with you afterwards.



*Matthew Hogben*