

EDITORIAL

Mastery of academic writing for journal editors

Sumarno Adi Subrata 

Author information

Department of Nursing, Universitas Muhammadiyah Magelang, Indonesia

 adisubrata@ummgl.ac.id <https://doi.org/10.31603/ihs.16291>

Abstract

The growing of scholarly publication in health demands that journal editors possess more than just subject-matter expertise in the field. They must demonstrate a mastery of academic writing to maintain the research integrity and impact of their publications. A well-written and well-presented article makes it easier for researchers to understand its content and increases the potential for higher citations. Therefore, it is important for journal editors to provide extra attention to every submitted manuscript, particularly those that have been accepted and are awaiting publication. At this present, articles discussing the urgency of academic writing mastery for editors remain scarce; thus, this editorial will address this gap by providing examples within the domain of health innovation. The editorial article explores the role of editors as both gatekeepers of knowledge and facilitators of scientific discourse. It argues that mastery for an editor involves a dual principle such as the technical ability to refine complex arguments for clarity and precision and the pedagogical insight required to provide constructive feedback to authors. The article identifies the basic competencies necessary for editorial process by looking at the current trends in peer review and manuscript preparation. These include a deep understanding of disciplinary conventions, the ability to identify subtle rhetorical shifts that affect the validity of claims, and a commitment to linguistic inclusivity in health innovation research. Furthermore, the discussion addresses how an editor's mastery of structure and flow can significantly enhance a journal's citation impact and readability. The article suggests that formalizing writing mastery within editorial training programs is essential for those who deep dive into publication world. When editors function as master practitioners of the written word, they do more than simply process submissions. They elevate the quality of the writing to make sure that research is communicated with the transparency and power as it deserves.

Keywords: Academic writing, editorial process, gaps analysis, Innovation in health, writing skills

The editor as the "first reader" of the submission

The role of a journal editor is not limited to the traditional boundaries of a scientific judge; rather, it functions as a critical bridge between knowledge, research and implementation (Caelleigh, 1993). In the context of a journal dedicated to innovation in health, the editor acts as the "first reader," tasked with evaluating whether a manuscript can successfully transcend the clinical setting to inform public policy and community practice (Sturmberg & Martin, 2024; McLean & Gallagher, 2025). This process requires an understanding of how raw data is transformed into a narrative that resonates with stakeholders. An editor must possess the vision to see the human life and impact behind the *p*-value of statistical test to ensure that every published piece contributes to the population. With prioritizing the communicative power of a manuscript, the editor ensures that scientific advancements do not remain siloed within ivory towers. In due course, this translation process is what gives research its "legs," allowing it to walk out of the archives and into the real world (Austin, 2021; Mayrink et al., 2022). Therefore, the editor serves as a steward of knowledge and responsible for maintaining the delicate balance between academic rigor and societal relevance. This stewardship is essential for improving an ecosystem where health innovations are not just discovered, but are understood and adopted by those who need them most (Flessa & Huebner, 2021).

A significant challenge in modern scholarship is that even the most groundbreaking health innovations often fail to gain traction when they are buried under inaccessible academic prose (Balayah et al., 2025). Poorly structured manuscripts, excessive jargon, and a lack of clear synthesis can obscure vital findings and its implementation in daily practice (Faber, 2017). When an author fails to articulate the "so what?" of their research, the potential for social change is neutralized by the sheer difficulty of the reading experience. For a health innovation to be effective, it must be interpretable by policymakers, practitioners, and community leaders (Yelpaala et al., 2025). If the writing is opaque, the research risks being ignored by the very people who have the power to implement its findings on a clinical and community level. This creates a gap where interventions remain dormant

due to the complex documentation. Thus, the inability to communicate clearly acts as a barrier to health equity that preventing critical information from reaching vulnerable populations. Mastery of the written word is, therefore, not a mere aesthetic preference but a fundamental requirement for the actualization of scientific progress. Without this clarity, the journey from theoretical innovation to social utility will be halted at the manuscript stage.

So, mastery of academic writing must be viewed as a dual responsibility shared between the authors who communicate and the editors who refine the manuscript (Lawton et al., 2025). Authors bear the primary burden of precision to ensure that their arguments are grounded in evidence and structured with a logical flow for a clear conclusion (Barroga & Matanguihan, 2021). At the same time, editor acts as the final guardians of quality, provides the "second pair of eyes" that identifies inconsistencies, and polishes the narrative for maximum impact. This partnership is essential for ensuring that every article meets the highest standards of clarity, ethical integrity, and global accessibility. When both parties commit to this standard, the manuscript serves as a reliable tool for societal advancement rather than a mere line on a curriculum vitae. The editor's mastery lies in the ability to mentor authors, guiding them to sharpen their focus and eliminate the noise that distracts from their core message (Hwang, 2013). This collaborative refinement process is what distinguishes a reputable journal from a mere repository of data. In the pursuit of health innovation, we must demand a level of writing that is as disciplined as the methodology it describes. The goal is to produce work that is scientifically sound, readable, and actionable for the benefit of society. With embracing the dual responsibility, the journal upholds the integrity and serve the best practice for public interest.

The pillars of editorial writing mastery

The "Curse of Knowledge" is a cognitive bias where an expert inadvertently assumes that their audience possesses the same background information they do, leading to dense, inaccessible prose (Tullis & Feder, 2023). For this reason, editors act as the essential bridge in identifying where technical jargon becomes a barrier rather than a tool for precision. To simplify without losing rigor, editors focus on the structural logic of an argument and the elimination of "filler" terminology that obfuscates the core findings. This process involves stripping away unnecessary acronyms and replacing esoteric phrasing with active language. An editor ensures that the methodologies remain intact while the surrounding narrative remains understandable for a broader academic community (Tanwar, 2024). The editor helps protect the integrity of the research by asking authors to define their terms more clearly. High-impact editorial work proves that simplicity is not the enemy of sophistication; but it is the ultimate expression of it. Modern editorial writing must transcend the cold reporting of data points to embrace the "Narrative of Innovation," which frames scientific progress through its human impact. Editors encourage authors to consider how a specific health innovation changes a patient's outcomes. This involves structuring a manuscript with a clear arc: the challenge or disease as the antagonist, the research as the quest, and the results as the resolution. With highlighting the implementation of a study, the editorial process gives the data makes it more applicable to stakeholders and policymakers. Storytelling means contextualizing facts within the framework of human progress and societal benefit (Bietti et al., 2019). This narrative approach ensures that innovation is not just recorded in a journal or publication, but is understood as a vital contribution to the society and clinical settings.

The other pillar of mastery involves maintaining a tone that is simultaneously professional, objective, and encouraging (Modesitt et al., 2022). Precision in language is a reflection of a good copyediting process, as every word must be selected to convey the exact degree of certainty or caution required by the evidence. Editors work to remove hyperbolic language—like "revolutionary" or "perfect"—replacing it with measured descriptions that allow the results to speak for themselves (Nature Catalysis, 2024). However, an objective tone should not be confused and the voice should still reflect the passion and dedication behind the research. This is achieved by using an "encouraging" academic voice that highlights the potential for future discovery and invites the reader into a dialogue. Editors refine the nature of a piece by balancing the passive voice of methodology with the active voice of discovery to keep the reader engaged. A well-edited piece avoids the coldness of a technical manual while steering clear of the informality of a blog post. With fine-tuning the sentence, an editor ensures the author sounds like a seasoned expert who is both confident in their work and open to the evolving science. This mastery of tone establishes a level of trust with the reader that is essential for long-term credibility in any academic or health field.

Modern challenges in academic publishing

The rapid integration of Large Language Models (LLMs) into manuscript preparation presents a complex dilemma for contemporary academic editors (Mijatović et al., 2026). Although these tools offer efficiency in formatting and language polish, they also introduce risks such as hallucinated facts and fabricated citations that threaten research integrity. An editor's mastery is essential in identifying the subtle signs of automated text, which often lacks the unique and deep contextual reasoning characteristic of human thought. Outside simple grammar checks, editors must discern whether a submission reflects an authentic intellectual contribution or a mere sequence of predicted text. This requires a shift toward higher-order reviewing skills

that prioritize the critical analysis of novelty and domain-specific insights. Editors are tasked with developing policies that mandate transparency in AI usage in manuscript preparation. The goal is to ensure that AI serves as a supportive tool rather than a replacement for original thought of researchers. Through careful oversight, editors can uphold the foundational scientific principles of accuracy and accountability in an era of technological disruption. This mastery warrants that published research remains a reliable record of human discovery and intellectual property.

Inclusive writing is a fundamental pillar for any journal focused on "Society," as it ensures that health research respects and represents diverse populations (Chuisano et al., 2023). Editors play a pivotal role in enforcing language that avoids dehumanizing terms, such as reducing individuals to their conditions or using binary distinctions that alienate minoritized groups. Editors improve the writing quality for both researchers and readers by championing person-first or identity-first language as preferred by specific communities. Respectful terminology is not merely a stylistic choice; it is an ethical imperative that directly impacts the generalizability and equity of public health findings. Journals must actively address structural barriers by including diverse voices on editorial boards and encouraging authors to report on how equity was incorporated into their study design (Manan et al., 2023). This approach helps dismantle harmful stereotypes and reduces health disparities by portraying the lived realities of under-served communities. Editors also guide authors in evolving terms related to ethnicity, gender, and disability to ensure clarity across international contexts. With prioritizing inclusivity, a journal transforms from a passive repository into a proactive force for social progress and justice. Such efforts ensure that the "story" told by research is one where every individual is valued and visible.

The consistent enforcement of reporting standards is the final cornerstone of an editor's mastery in ensuring scientific transparency and replicability. Guidelines such as PRISMA for systematic reviews (Page et al., 2021), CONSORT for clinical trials (Cuschieri, 2019), and GRAMMS for mixed methods research provide the necessary for complete and accurate reporting (Emery et al., 2023). Editors act as gatekeepers who ensure that every essential detail disclosed to prevent the publication of poor-quality or predatory content. Mastery in this area involves addressing author resistance and providing the necessary training to bridge gaps in methodological expertise. Through mandating these checklists, editors facilitate the uptake of research by policy makers and healthcare providers who rely on trustworthy evidence. Transparent reporting also allows other researchers to verify findings and strengthen the integrity. Even when faced with the pressure of high submission volumes, the editorial team must remain committed to these rigorous standards to maintain a journal's prestige.

The ethical dimension of writing

The transition from gatekeeping to mentorship requires editors to influence their writing mastery as a tool for empowerment rather than a barrier. Instead of rejections, mentor-editors engage deeply with a manuscript to identify the "diamond in the rough" within a flawed structure. They provide specific, actionable feedback that explains not just what is wrong, but why it hinders the communication of the author's core ideas (Hill, 2016). This approach transforms the peer-review process into a collaborative masterclass, where the editor's expertise helps the author refine their voice and logic. Furthermore, editors ensure that valuable insights are not lost to the bin. This environment encourages novice scholars to persevere and improve their craft. In the end, editing strengthens the entire field by increasing the quality of discourse rather than filtering it. When editors serve as guides, the relationship shifts from adversarial to symbiotic among authors. Thus, the editor's greatest contribution becomes the growth of the author as every submission is a stepping stone toward excellence in the field. Another ethical dimension is addressing linguistic bias which is a moral and intellectual imperative to make sure that health innovation is presented with good English language. Many researchers from non-English speaking backgrounds face many rejections due to their syntax or vocabulary does not align with "standard" Western academic norms (Gannon, 2008). When editors focus solely on linguistic perfection, they risk discarding revolutionary data or unique perspectives that could solve global challenges. To deal with this issue, editorial boards must implement policies that prioritize the clarity of thought and methodological rigor over grammatical flawless (Fung, 2008). Via this method, the publishing industry acknowledges that scientific or creative genius is not localized to any single language or region. Consequently, the richness of international research can finally be recognized on its own merits, unburdened by the constraints of linguistic gatekeeping.

Editor's toolkit

Structural integrity is the backbone of a persuasive manuscript, requiring a perfect alignment between the initial gap analysis and the final conclusion (Subramanyam, 2013). The editor must ensure that the specific problem identified in the introduction is the exact same problem addressed and resolved by the end of the paper. Often, authors begin with a broad societal issue but narrow their conclusion that the original promise of the research is lost. With checking this alignment, an editor helps the author maintain a golden thread of logic that guides the reader without confusion. This process involves verifying that the research questions posed in the opening are answered directly and explicitly in the closing remarks or conclusion. When the conclusion

fails to mirror the introduction, the structural integrity collapses, leaving the reader with incompleteness. An editor's mastery lies in spotting these subtle shifts in scope and pulling the narrative back into focus. Furthermore, this consistency builds the author's credibility, showing that the study was designed with a clear purpose. A well-aligned paper is more likely to be cited because its contributions are easy to identify and verify. Thus, the editor's primary task is to act as an architect and ensure the foundation supports the final structure.

If discussing an abstract, it is the most critical 250 words of any publication because it serves as the primary gateway for societal reach and discoverability (Andrade, 2011). In an age of information overload, most readers—including policymakers, journalists, and fellow scientists—will only read the abstract before deciding whether to engage with the full text. A masterful abstract must summarize the "why," "how," and "so what" of the research with surgical precision and absolute clarity (Tullu, 2019). It acts as a standalone marketing tool that determines whether the work will be indexed effectively by search engines and digital databases. If the abstract is dense, jargon-heavy, or vague, the potential impact of the health innovation is stifled before it can even be shared. Editors must work closely with authors to distil complex findings into high-impact sentences that highlight the practical applications of the work. This brevity is not just about saving space; it is about accessibility for non-specialist stakeholders who need quick, reliable data to make decisions. Through treating the abstract as a high-stakes summary, editors ensure that the core message transcends the academic silo. Therefore, perfecting these few hundred words is the most effective way to amplify a study's voice in the global marketplace of health innovation ideas.

The choice between active and passive voice is not merely a grammatical preference but a strategic tool used to make health policy recommendations more impactful. In the context of policy, the active voice is essential for creating accountability by clearly identifying the actor who must perform the action (Kallestinova, 2011). For example, stating "the government should implement" is far more persuasive and direct than "implementation should be considered." However, the passive voice has a unique role when the editor wishes to emphasize the result or the recipient of an action rather than the person performing it. In scientific methodologies, the passive voice can lend an air of objectivity, focusing the reader's attention on the data rather than the researcher. An expert editor knows exactly when to switch between these modes to balance authoritative recommendations with professional neutrality. When writing for policymakers, using the active voice can instill an urgency and clarity that drives legislative change. Conversely, the passive voice can soften a critique of existing systems, making the feedback more palatable to stakeholders. Mastery of this balance ensures that the prose is grammatically correct and psychologically tuned to its audience.

Editor, submission, and writing style

We must recognize that the final goal of achieving mastery in writing is to serve as a powerful tool for social justice in global health. When we refine the way health information is documented and shared, we are actively working to dismantle the barriers that prevent marginalized communities from accessing knowledge in health innovation. Mastery allows us to elevate voices that have been historically silenced, ensuring that health equity is not just a buzzword but a tangible reality driven by inclusive scholarship. With prioritizing clarity over complexity, editors and authors collaborate to strip away the elitism often associated with academic discourse. This democratization of information ensures that scientific breakthroughs are accessible to the practitioners and patients who need them most. Writing for health society means being intentional about who we are speaking to and whose problems we are attempting to solve. It requires a commitment to truth-telling and the removal of linguistic biases that favour Western-centric perspectives. The power of the pen is a transformative force capable of challenging systemic health disparities on a global scale. Therefore, the mastery is a moral obligation to the public we serve, turning every published word into an instrument for an equitable world.

The closing thought for any dedicated communicator remains simple yet profound: clear writing leads to clear thinking, better policy, and a healthier society. When an author is forced to write with precision, they are simultaneously forced to sharpen their logical flow and confront any inconsistencies in their research. This intellectual rigor ensures that the resulting evidence is robust and ready to be translated into clinical settings. In the context of healthcare policy, better policy is rarely born from ambiguous or convoluted reports; it requires the sharp, direct communication that only writing mastery can provide. As these clear policies are implemented, they create more efficient healthcare systems that can respond effectively to the needs of the population. A society that values clear communication is one where misinformation struggles to take root and where public trust in science is consistently reinforced. Every sentence we polish and every abstract we simplify contributes to a larger ecosystem of transparency and health literacy. We must view the act of editing as a vital step in the chain of public health intervention. The editorial process do more than just improve a manuscript; we improve the very foundation of how society understands and protects its well-being. Consequently, our commitment to excellence in writing is a direct investment in the longevity and vitality of our global community.

Conclusion

This editorial serves as a reflection on the evolving role of journal editors. It suggests that mastering a specific field of study is no longer sufficient; editors must also possess a deep command of academic writing to ensure that ideas are effectively communicated to a global audience. Furthermore, the prestige of both the editor and the journal is often judged by the calibre of their copyediting. Consequently, proficiency in academic writing is a fundamental pillar for any editor seeking professional competence. Moving forward, research focusing on the specific role of editors in this capacity will offer a compelling contribution to the discourse within the world of scholarly publishing. Similarly, when conveying innovative ideas in the healthcare sector, exceptional academic writing ensures that the core substance of the research or innovation is accurately represented.

Acknowledgments

The Editor-in-Chief would like to express his sincere gratitude to Universitas Muhammadiyah Magelang, Indonesia for the invaluable opportunities and unwavering support provided in maintaining the publication of this journal.

AI statements

The ideas and concepts presented in this editorial are entirely the author's original work. Grammarly was utilized solely as an editing assistant to refine the prose and enhance readability to the reader.

Availability of data and materials

The data and materials in this editorial are based on the literature listed in the bibliography. All sources have been properly documented to support the discussion.

Competing interests

There is no conflict of interest to declare.

Editor's declaration

This article represents the Editor-in-Chief's original insights and analysis regarding the evolving dynamics of the publishing industry. The author did not involve a second party or a professional English proofreader in the structuring and refinement of the sentences in this article.

Ethical clearance

Ethical clearance was not needed for this editorial.

Funding

None.

Publishers and journal's note

Reflecting on the current phenomenon of scholarly publishing, the Editor-in-Chief wrote this article to address the deficit in academic writing competence among journal editors. This is a timely topic for editors dedicated to ongoing skill development and the elevation of their editorial standards.

References

- Andrade, C. (2011). How to write a good abstract for a scientific paper or conference presentation. *Indian Journal of Psychiatry*, 53(2), 172–175. <https://doi.org/10.4103/0019-5545.82558>
- Austin, C. P. (2021). Opportunities and challenges in translational science. *Clinical and Translational Science*, 14(5), 1629–1647. <https://doi.org/10.1111/cts.13055>
- Balayah, Z., Stavropoulou, C., Scarbrough, H., Nigam, A., & Ziemann, A. (2025). Re-conceptualizing implementation outcomes of health innovations as modes or attributes: An integrated framework. *Frontiers in Health Services*, 5, 1373429. <https://doi.org/10.3389/frhs.2025.1373429>
- Barroga, E., & Matanguihan, G. J. (2021). Creating logical flow when writing scientific articles. *Journal of Korean Medical Science*, 36(40), e275. <https://doi.org/10.3346/jkms.2021.36.e275>
- Bietti, L. M., Tilston, O., & Bangerter, A. (2019). Storytelling as adaptive collective sensemaking. *Topics in Cognitive Science*, 11(4), 710–732. <https://doi.org/10.1111/tops.12358>

- Caelleigh, A. S. (1993). Role of the journal editor in sustaining integrity in research. *Academic Medicine*, 68(9 Suppl), S23–S29. <https://doi.org/10.1097/00001888-199309000-00030>
- Chuisano, S. A., Rafferty, J., Allen, A., Chang, T., Diemer, M., Harris, K., Vaughn, L. M., Watkins, D. C., & DeJonckheere, M. (2023). Increasing representation and diversity in health research: A protocol of the MYHealth research training program for high school students. *PloS One*, 18(9), e0281790. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0281790>
- Cuschieri, S. (2019). The CONSORT statement. *Saudi Journal of Anaesthesia*, 13(Suppl 1), S27–S30. https://doi.org/10.4103/sja.SJA_559_18
- Emary, P. C., Stuber, K. J., Mbuagbaw, L., Oremus, M., Nolet, P. S., Nash, J. V., Bauman, C. A., Ciraco, C., Couban, R. J., & Busse, J. W. (2023). Quality of reporting using good reporting of a mixed methods study criteria in chiropractic mixed methods research: A methodological review. *Journal of Manipulative and Physiological Therapeutics*, 46(3), 152–161. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jmpt.2023.11.004>
- Faber, J. (2017). Writing scientific manuscripts: Most common mistakes. *Dental Press Journal of Orthodontics*, 22(5), 113–117. <https://doi.org/10.1590/2177-6709.22.5.113-117.sar>
- Flessa, S., & Huebner, C. (2021). Innovations in health care-A conceptual framework. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 18(19), 10026. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph181910026>
- Fung, I. C. (2008). Open access for the non-English-speaking world: Overcoming the language barrier. *Emerging Themes in Epidemiology*, 5, 1. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1742-7622-5-1>
- Gannon, F. (2008). Language barriers. *EMBO Reports*, 9(3), 207. <https://doi.org/10.1038/embo.2008.14>
- Hill, J. A. (2016). How to review a manuscript. *Journal of Electrocardiology*, 49(2), 109–111. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jelectrocard.2016.01.001>
- Hwang, K. (2013). Appropriate roles for the subscriber, publisher, editor, author, and reviewer in the archives of plastic surgery. *Archives of Plastic Surgery*, 40(6), 663–665. <https://doi.org/10.5999/aps.2013.40.6.663>
- Kallestinova, E. D. (2011). How to write your first research paper. *The Yale Journal of Biology and Medicine*, 84(3), 181–190.
- Lawton, J. S., Robich, M., & Holmes, S. D. (2025). Writing a manuscript for beginners. *Annals of Thoracic Surgery Short Reports*, 3(3), 814–817. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.atssr.2025.03.013>
- Manan, M. R., Nawaz, I., Rahman, S., Razzaq, A., Zafar, F., Qazi, A., & Liblik, K. (2023). Diversity, equity, and inclusion on editorial boards of global health journals. *Asian Bioethics Review*, 15(3), 209–239. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s41649-023-00243-8>
- Mayrink, N. N. V., Alcoforado, L., Chioro, A., Fernandes, F., Lima, T. S., Camargo, E. B., & Valentim, R. A. M. (2022). Translational research in health technologies: A scoping review. *Frontiers in Digital Health*, 4, 957367. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fdgh.2022.957367>
- McLean, A. C., & Gallagher, G. T. (2025). How to perform an excellent manuscript review. *Head and Neck Pathology*, 19(1), 3. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12105-024-01740-4>
- Mijatović, A., Žuljević, M. F., Ursić, L., & Marušić, A. (2026). Responsible use of large language models in manuscript preparation. *Current Protocols*, 6(1), e70300. <https://doi.org/10.1002/cpz1.70300>
- Modesitt, S. C., Havrilesky, L. J., Previs, R. A., Alejandro Rauh-Hain, J., Michael Straughn, J., Bakkum-Gamez, J. N., Fuh, K. C., & Cohn, D. E. (2022). Ridiculously good writing: How to write like a pro and publish like a boss. *Gynecologic Oncology Reports*, 42, 101024. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gore.2022.101024>
- Nature Catalysis. (2024). The unbearable lightness of hyperbolic language. *Nature Catalysis*, 7(6), 607–608. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41929-024-01191-8>
- Page, M. J., McKenzie, J. E., Bossuyt, P. M., Boutron, I., Hoffmann, T. C., Mulrow, C. D., Shamseer, L., Tetzlaff, J. M., Akl, E. A., Brennan, S. E., Chou, R., Glanville, J., Grimshaw, J. M., Hróbjartsson, A., Lalu, M. M., Li, T., Loder, E. W., Mayo-Wilson, E., McDonald, S., McGuinness, L. A., ... Moher, D. (2021). The PRISMA 2020 statement: An updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. *BMJ (Clinical research ed.)*, 372, n71. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.n71>
- Sturmberg, J. P., & Martin, C. M. (2024). From theory to practice: The pragmatic value of applying systems thinking and complexity sciences in healthcare. *Journal of Evaluation in Clinical Practice*, 30(2), 149–152. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jep.13979>
- Subramanyam, R. (2013). Art of reading a journal article: Methodically and effectively. *Journal of Oral and Maxillofacial Pathology: JOMFP*, 17(1), 65–70. <https://doi.org/10.4103/0973-029X.110733>
- Tanwar, S. (2024). Navigating the seas of publications in a medical journal: The role of an editor. *Cureus*, 16(2), e55233. <https://doi.org/10.7759/cureus.55233>
- Tullis, J. G., & Feder, B. (2023). The "curse of knowledge" when predicting others' knowledge. *Memory & Cognition*, 51(5), 1214–1234. <https://doi.org/10.3758/s13421-022-01382-3>

- Tullu, M. S. (2019). Writing the title and abstract for a research paper: Being concise, precise, and meticulous is the key. *Saudi Journal of Anaesthesia*, 13(Suppl 1), S12–S17. https://doi.org/10.4103/sja.SJA_685_18
- Yelpaala, K., Gibbons, M. C., Vigil, I. M., Leaño, J., McCall, T., Opara, I., Zink, A., Nunez-Smith, M., Mukherjee, B., & Ranney, M. (2025). The role of data in public health and health innovation: Perspectives on social determinants of health, community-based data approaches, and AI. *Journal of Medical Internet Research*, 27, e78794. <https://doi.org/10.2196/78794>

Editor's perspective

Innovation points

- Proficiency in academic writing acts as a critical tool for editors to make sure that innovative research is communicated with the clarity and precision required by the international scholarly community.
- The quality of a journal is often reflected in its linguistic polish. Therefore, an editor's ability to refine prose directly influences the perceived authority and reputation of the publication in health innovation.
- Although deep knowledge of health innovation is essential, an editor's professional competence is incomplete without a high-level mastery of academic writing and copyediting.

Potential areas of interest

- How does the linguistic quality of an article impact the global visibility and citation potential of innovative research in fields like Healthcare?
- Should academic writing proficiency become a standardized requirement or a formal competency benchmark for the appointment of journal editors?
- In the age of digital publishing, to what extent does meticulous copyediting distinguish a high-impact journal from a predatory or low-quality publication?

How to cite this article (APA style)

Subrata, S. A. (2026). Mastery of academic writing for journal editors. *Innovation in Health for Society*, 6(1), 1–7. <https://doi.org/10.31603/ihs.16291>