

Traceability and Current Status Analysis of Post-Print Book Open Access Rights Sharing Mechanisms

Authors: Ma Xiaoqi

Date: 2023-07-26T00:00:00+00:00

Abstract

[Purpose/Significance] The rights and interests sharing mechanism for open access books constitutes a prerequisite for achieving an equilibrium between fairness and efficiency in rights and interests sharing, and forms the foundation for studying business models and institutional frameworks of open access books. This paper aims to trace the origins and analyze the current state of research on the rights and interests sharing mechanism for open access books. [Method/Process] Employing literature review and content analysis, this study clarifies the connotation of the rights and interests sharing mechanism for open access books and further investigates its theoretical origins and current research status. [Results/Conclusion] Research on the rights and interests sharing mechanism for open access books has derived from the open access rights and interests sharing mechanism that originated with academic journals. Presently, the rights and interests sharing mechanism for open access books has been examined from legal, policy, economic, management, and technical perspectives, yet research remains lacking on the rights and interests sharing mechanism system from value-added and interactive viewpoints.

Full Text

ChinaXiv Partner Journal, Vol. 63 No. 5, March 2019

Research on the Traceability and Current Status of Rights Sharing Mechanisms for Open Access Books

Ma Xiaoqi

Information Resource Management Research Center, Heilongjiang University,
Harbin 150080

Abstract: [Purpose/Significance] The rights sharing mechanism for open access books is not only a prerequisite for ensuring a balance between fairness and efficiency in rights sharing, but also forms the foundation for studying the business models and institutional systems of open access books. This paper aims to trace the origins and analyze the current state of research on rights sharing mechanisms for open access books. [Method/Process] Using literature research and content analysis methods, this study examines the theoretical origins and current research status of rights sharing mechanisms for open access books based on clarifying their connotations. [Result/Conclusion] Research on rights sharing mechanisms for open access books has evolved from the rights balancing mechanisms of open access academic journals. Current analyses of these mechanisms have covered legal, policy, economic, management, and technological aspects, but systematic research from the perspectives of value-added and interactive rights sharing mechanisms remains lacking.

Keywords: open access books; rights; sharing mechanism

Classification Number: G231

DOI: 10.13266/j.issn.0252-3116.2019.05.009

Open access (OA) is a service model that provides readers with free access to information resources [1]. Since 2013, open access to academic books (open access of academic books or scholarly books, OAB) has gained widespread attention from the publishing, library and information science, and journalism and communication communities as an academic publishing and information exchange model. International exploration of open access books began in 1945, originating from V. Bush's conceptual framework for storing, retrieving, and displaying personal books and films—Memex—proposed in his article “As We May Think” [2]. Subsequent projects and activities attempting free access to books include Project Gutenberg, Google Books' “Ocean Project” research library initiative, and Amazon's Kindle e-books [3]. In the academic book domain, open access initially focused on science, technology, engineering, and medicine (STEM) books, later extending to humanities and social sciences (HSS). In 2008, the UK's Joint Information Systems Committee (JISC) invited HSS monograph publishers to participate in an open access experiment called Open Access Publishing in European Networks (OAPEN). In 2010, OAPEN launched the Directory of Open Access Books (DOAB) and OAPEN Library academic book open access service projects to increase book discoverability and control quality [4]. As of October 12, 2018, DOAB listed 12,979 peer-reviewed academic books and chapters from 282 publishers (accessible at <https://www.doabooks.org/>).

Due to high costs, small audiences, and complex copyright issues of academic books, contradictions among various stakeholders in book open access are particularly prominent, resulting in insufficient sustainable supply. The key to resolving these contradictions lies in balancing costs and benefits from individual stakeholders' perspectives [5] and ensuring equitable rights sharing among stakeholder groups. Since the rights sharing mechanism for open access books is a prerequisite for achieving fair and efficient rights sharing for both individuals

and groups, and forms the basis for studying open access models and policy systems, analyzing and designing such mechanisms holds significant theoretical value and practical importance.

1 Analysis of Related Concepts

1.1 Open Access Books

Open access books, also known as open access e-books (OAB), refer to open access activities targeting academic books—a new academic communication mechanism that provides users with free access to academic book information and research results via the internet while respecting authors' rights. As a form of open resources and a component of open science, open access books encompass academic works, monographs, and conference proceedings [6-7]. Compared to natural sciences, academic books hold greater significance for humanities and social sciences [8].

1.2 Rights and Rights Sharing in Open Access Books

Rights refer to legally protected entitlements and interests. Rights in open access books denote the legally protected entitlements and interests of various stakeholders in the processes of book opening, storage, dissemination, and access. As part of intellectual property rights in books, these are protected by intellectual property law (especially copyright law) and related laws, giving rise to moral rights (or ethical rights) [9-10].

Rights sharing in open access books refers to the transfer and enjoyment of knowledge products ownership among relevant stakeholders. Since the transfer and usage rights of knowledge products must be defined through conditions and restrictions such as contracts, laws, policies, or best practices tested through judicial and market processes, rights sharing also involves transfer and enjoyment within frameworks of law, policy, and convention [11]. Examples include mandatory open access book laws (e.g., in the US, Argentina, Peru), open access book policies (e.g., the UK's "Open Access Monograph Services Report" exploring integrated services to support and encourage open access peer review for monograph publishers [12]), and licensing agreements (e.g., Digital Peer Publishing License, Open Publication License, Open Content License, and the most commonly used Creative Commons License) [13].

1.3 Rights Sharing Mechanism for Open Access Books

Mechanism originally referred to a machine's structure and operating principles, later extended to describe the internal workings of organisms or systems, including their structure, functions, interrelationships, and interactions. In a narrow sense, mechanism typically denotes institutional mechanisms—systems where internal components interact in specific ways to achieve particular functions. Mechanisms play a fundamental role in any system, enabling adaptive

responses to external changes and optimizing objectives.

The rights sharing mechanism for open access books refers to a collection of mechanisms that ensure fair and efficient rights sharing among stakeholders. Under legal constraints and based on clarifying stakeholders' interests and interdependencies, these mechanisms analyze rights distribution structures, value-added methods, and dynamic rights transfers. They are formed either through stakeholder negotiations or by third-party institutions. This mechanism is fundamental to studying open access book operations, publishing models, service methods, and institutional systems. It includes both external mechanisms (legal, policy, economic, technical, social) and internal mechanisms (self-development and self-regulation) [6-7].

The objective of designing, constructing, and implementing these mechanisms is to achieve fairness and efficiency in rights sharing. G. Jasso and B. Wegener define distributive justice as subjective judgments, evaluations, and attitudes toward the fairness of social resource allocation [14]. Abstract fairness can be temporally distinguished into three types: starting-point fairness, procedural fairness, and outcome fairness [15]. Efficiency can be categorized by different criteria: dynamic versus static efficiency based on temporal changes; economic, technical, social, or ecological efficiency based on domain; with economic efficiency further subdividable into division-of-labor and competition efficiency theories. Therefore, standards for fairness and efficiency in designing these mechanisms require multi-perspective considerations integrating breadth, depth, and temporal stages.

2 Tracing the Origins of Research on Rights Sharing Mechanisms for Open Access Books

Research on rights sharing mechanisms for open access books both domestically and internationally has evolved from rights balancing mechanisms for open access academic journals [16], indirectly derived from information resource sharing mechanisms in contexts such as libraries, cloud computing, knowledge alliances, and interlibrary lending [17-18]. Open access represents a free philosophy and publishing mechanism for academic information sharing [19], and defining its connotations and denotations is prerequisite for analyzing rights sharing mechanisms. Broadly, open access includes various information resources such as academic papers, books, images/videos, and preprints [20], making academic book open access one form. Narrowly, however, open access refers only to journal information resources [21].

2.1 Related Research on Open Access Rights Sharing Mechanisms

Using “open access” as the keyword, this study searched major international databases including ScienceDirect, Web of Science, and Emerald, filtering for articles to obtain over 160 documents. Matching these with keywords such as “intellectual property rights,” “copyrights,” “policy,” and “business model” yielded

over 20 documents; combining with “mechanism” yielded about 10 documents. Additionally, using Chinese keywords “open access” or “open access” combined with “rights,” “mechanism,” or “system” in CNKI and Wanfang databases, and after careful reading, over 40 Chinese documents related to open access rights sharing mechanisms were identified. These documents span 2002-2018, a 16-year period.

The review reveals that both broad and narrow open access concepts share overlapping mechanisms for rights sharing. For instance, open access stakeholders naturally shift funding toward authors in a supply-side-tilted market [22], yet intense conflicts exist among authors, publishers, readers, and other institutions regarding funding and copyright. Resolving these conflicts requires legal, economic, technical, managerial, administrative, and ethical approaches [23-26]. From the green open access perspective, mechanisms for balancing stakeholders in institutional repository construction include policy system development, reasonable copyright agreements, and advanced access technologies [27]. Differences exist between Chinese and US institutional repository policies regarding law and rights distribution, requiring proper handling of relationships with publishers and authors and adoption of existing open content licenses [28].

2.2 Heterogeneity in Research on Rights Sharing Mechanisms for Open Access Books

Although research on rights sharing mechanisms for open access books originates from open access rights sharing mechanisms and existing open access mechanisms are not incompatible with book open access models [29], academic books differ significantly from journals in cost, audience size, embargo periods, copyright complexity, and quality review mechanisms. These differences make contradictions among book open access stakeholders particularly prominent. Consequently, besides common mechanisms, rights sharing mechanisms for open access books exhibit heterogeneous characteristics due to unique features in rights sharing objects, subjects, and transfer processes [30].

Given the close connections between open access book rights management and issues such as open access publishing, institutional repositories, library publishing, digital rights management, and licensing systems, this study extends vertically and horizontally to strip away common elements while highlighting heterogeneous features specific to open access books.

3 Current Status of Research on Rights Sharing Mechanisms for Open Access Books

This study selected Web of Science, Elsevier, Emerald (2002-2018), CNKI, and Wanfang as data sources. Using search terms including “open access books,” “open access academic books,” “monograph,” “intellectual property rights,” “copyrights,” “mechanism,” “business model,” “policy,” and “technology,” and after multiple trial searches balancing recall and precision, over 20 results were

obtained as of October 10, 2018. Combined with the overlapping content from Section 2.1, this study identified domestic and international scholars' application of intellectual property theory, social network theory, two-sided market theory, and stakeholder theory to analyze rights sharing mechanisms from legal, policy, economic, management, and technological perspectives.

3.1 Legal and Policy Mechanisms for Rights Sharing in Open Access Books

Legal and policy mechanisms constitute the constraint and guarantee mechanisms for equitable rights sharing in open access books. Through corresponding institutional establishment and reform, these mechanisms are realized in practice.

Legal Mechanisms: Only a few countries, including the US, Argentina, and Peru, have enacted mandatory open access book laws. Scholars have explored how copyright law, transfer agreements, and mandatory legal provisions coordinate rights balancing between stakeholders. Research indicates that balancing rights between authors and publishers regarding copyright has been a central issue in both traditional and open access publishing [31]. Open access books acknowledge authors' copyright law rights while granting partial rights to the public through licensing agreements, essentially transferring exclusive private rights to society through contractual freedom [32].

Policy Mechanisms: Since policies and institutions guide and promote rights sharing and balance, they have become important drivers of open access development. Since 2013, funding agencies and research institutions in countries including the US, UK, Netherlands, Germany, Canada, China, Japan, and India have extended open access policies to books. Researchers argue that book open access publishing development is influenced by government attitudes, copyright legal environments, and publisher policies [33], and that governments should intervene in public goods like books [34] to impact disciplinary development and academic exchange.

3.2 Economic Mechanisms for Rights Sharing in Open Access Books

Economic mechanism research primarily addresses cost-benefit, market, and business model issues, analyzing the economic conditions and transfer effects for achieving rights sharing balance at individual, bilateral, and multilateral levels.

3.2.1 Individual-Level Balance from Cost-Benefit Perspective Currently, three main types of stakeholders provide open access book services: content and funding providers (authors, funding agencies, governments, foundations) [35]; commercial and OA book publishers [36]; and open storage institutions and libraries [4, 37]. The individual-level balance condition for these stakeholders is that benefits must exceed costs [38].

3.2.2 Bilateral Optimal Balance from Two-Sided Market Perspective

M. McCabe argues that literature resources form a “two-sided market” connecting readers and authors. Determining the optimal balance requires calculating the costs of adding authors or readers and measuring how participation on one side affects benefits on the other [39].

3.2.3 Overall Multilateral Balance from Stakeholder Perspective

Scholars propose that book publishing business models consist of four interlocking elements: customer value proposition, profit formula, key resources, and key processes [40], with customer value proposition being critical. Open access book publishing models reflect payment patterns among stakeholders and embody economic balancing mechanisms driven by collaboration.

Based on stakeholder nature and quantity, OA book business models can be categorized as: (1) “Author + Publisher (Platform)” freemium models (e.g., French OpenEdition) and self-publishing platforms (e.g., US Smashwords) [41]; (2) “Author + Academic Library” self-archiving institutional repository models (e.g., University of California Library, Chinese Academy of Sciences Documentation and Information Center); (3) “Library + Library” interlibrary lending models (e.g., UK BookNow) [42]; (4) “Author + Commercial Publisher + Non-profit Publisher + Library/Institution” UK Knowledge Unlatched (KU) model [43]; and (5) “Author + Commercial Publisher + Non-profit Publisher + Pure Funder” European OAPEN academic book publishing model, plus “commissioned publishing” and “tiered quality” models [3]. The equilibrium condition for overall stakeholder interests is that all parties obtain significant benefits and establish stable cooperative relationships with reasonable division of labor [39].

3.3 Management Mechanisms for Rights Sharing in Open Access Books

Management mechanisms primarily manifest in operational and quality review mechanisms.

Operational Mechanisms: Due to editing, proofreading, peer review coordination, distribution, and royalties, book processing charges exceed article processing charges. Consequently, who funds, whom to fund, and how to fund become critical issues affecting user information access, knowledge dissemination quality, positive externalities, and disciplinary development balance [44].

Quality Review Mechanisms: These include quality evaluation and control. Publisher brand is a primary quality factor. Peer review is the main quality control method. Academic monographs are lengthy, specialized works representing the “gold standard” for hiring, tenure, and promotion. The review process is professionally labor-intensive for publishers, making it difficult and time-consuming to find qualified reviewers. Under compressed publication cycles or when appropriate experts cannot be found, peer review may be less rigorous than for journal articles [8]. Peer review and plagiarism are the two most common reasons for

retracting publications, with peer review being essentially an institutional issue.

3.4 Technical Mechanisms for Rights Sharing in Open Access Books

Technical mechanisms primarily involve digital rights management and preservation, integration, and reuse technologies.

Digital Rights Management and Balance: Open access books require digital rights management concepts and technical support for open metadata and data integration. While digital rights management technology effectively protects copyright holders' interests, it may infringe upon consumers' fair use rights, disrupting the balance among copyright holders, publishers, and consumers [45].

Preservation, Integration, and Reuse: Open access implementation relies on OAI-based open metadata mechanisms, DOI-based permanent preservation and utilization mechanisms, search engine-based mechanisms, and Web Service-based mechanisms [46], affecting stakeholders' information access. For open access books, integration technologies for homogeneous and heterogeneous systems, direct metadata ingestion, embedded search interfaces, and social sharing technologies are also required [47].

4 Research Gaps and Future Directions

Analysis of domestic and international literature reveals that open access books represent an irreversible trend. Fair and efficient rights sharing depends on multi-coordinated mechanisms. Current research emphasizes practice over theory, particularly lacking systematic studies on rights balancing mechanisms to address prominent contradictions. Three main deficiencies exist:

4.1 Lack of Research on Rights Sharing Mechanisms Balancing Fairness and Efficiency

Fairness and efficiency are the primary goals of rights sharing mechanisms. However, current research focuses on equity in rights stock sharing while neglecting efficiency in rights increment sharing. This deficiency stems from a supply-side perspective driving rights transfer, lacking demand-side analysis of value-added rights. Stakeholder relationships in book open access are not unidirectional supply-demand transmissions but multi-directional interconnected networks. Future research should adopt demand-side drivers for holistic analysis of both stock and incremental rights sharing, exploring mechanisms that achieve both fairness and efficiency.

4.2 Lack of Systematic Research on Mechanism Systems Integrating Internal and External Mechanisms

Mechanisms are institutionalized methods. Achieving fair and efficient rights sharing requires a system combining internal and external mechanisms. Current

research emphasizes external mechanisms (economic, policy, legal) while neglecting internal mechanisms (reputation, social ethics, culture) and systematic studies of mechanism generation principles. Future research should design and construct a systematic framework comprising internal operational mechanisms (self-development and self-regulation) and external supportive mechanisms. Internal mechanisms include competitive incentives, value creation, value accumulation, investment, and innovation (self-development), as well as decision-making, control, supervision, and early-warning systems (self-regulation).

4.3 Lack of Research on Multi-Stakeholder Frameworks with Role Exchange and Interactive Collaboration

Mechanism research is based on system structure and stakeholder relationships. Current studies focus on individual decision-making or static equilibrium in non-cooperative multi-stakeholder scenarios, lacking long-term dynamic strategy analysis with role exchange and coordination. Future research should treat stakeholder relationships as multi-directional interconnected networks, employing network game frameworks to analyze conflict and cooperation conditions, explore behavioral motivations, mobilize participation enthusiasm, and achieve fair and efficient mechanism design through game rule redesign.

References

- [1] SUBER P. Open access[M]. Boston: MIT Press, 2012: 3-9.
- [2] CONNAW L S, WICHT H L. What happened to the e-book revolution? The gradual integration of e-books into academic libraries[J]. Journal of electronic publishing, 2007, 10(3): 3-9.
- [3] FAYAZ A L. Open access e-book collection on Central Asia in selected digital archives[J]. Collection building, 2011, 30(3): 126-130.
- [4] WEI Rui. Review of research and practice progress in OAPEN open access academic monographs[J]. Library and information service, 2017(9): 135-144.
- [5] WEI Rui, CHU Jingli. Academic book open access and university library publishing services in the United States[J]. Journal of academic libraries, 2014(3): 17-22.
- [6] YE Jiyuan. Conceptual analysis of academic books, academic works, and academic monographs[J]. Journal of library science in China, 2016(1): 21-29.
- [7] MCGRATH M. Interlending and document supply: a review of the recent literature: 85[J]. Interlending & document supply, 2014, 42(1): 33-38.
- [8] MARTIN P E. Open access publishing and scholarly communications in non-scientific disciplines[J]. Online information review, 2015, 39(5): 717-732.
- [9] BEN C P, KATIA P. Intellectual property rights and knowledge sharing across countries[J]. Journal of knowledge management, 2009, 13(5): 331-344.
- [10] GIUDITTA D E P, JEAN P S. Public policies and government interventions in the book publishing industry[J]. Info, 2014, 16(2): 47-66.
- [11] ZHANG Xiaolin, ZHANG Dongrong, LI Lin, et al. Rights management for content preservation and dissemination in institutional repositories[J]. Journal

of library science in China, 2012(7): 46-54.

[12] CHEN Jing. Interpretation and reflection on the UK's "Open Access Monograph Services Report"[J]. Library theory and practice, 2017(6): 48-52.

[13] FU Rong. Research on open content licensing agreements and their applications[J]. Information studies: theory & application, 2012(12): 37-43.

[14] JASSO L G, WEGENER B. Methods for empirical justice analysis: Part 1. Framework, model, and quantities[J]. Social justice research, 1997, 10(4): 393-430.

[15] YANG Yang, CHEN Si. Analysis of starting-point fairness, procedural fairness, and outcome fairness[J]. Journal of Liaoning Normal University (social science edition), 2010(5): 33-35.

[16] DINESHR, LISA M G, ERIC F. Interorganisational partnerships and knowledge sharing: the perspective of non-profit organisations (NPOs)[J]. Journal of knowledge management, 2014, 18(5): 867-885.

[17] WU Zhiqiang, LIU Mei. Research on legal mechanisms for digital resource rights sharing[J]. Knowledge of library and information science, 2011(5): 93-100.

[18] DING Dawei, HU Zhiqiang. Open access knowledge sharing mechanisms in network environments: an analysis based on the perspective of scientific sociology[J]. Studies in science of science, 2016(10): 1441-1448.

[19] LI Wu, LIU Ziheng. Analysis of a new academic publishing model: open access publishing model[J]. Journal of library science in China, 2004(6): 66-69.

[20] ROBIN O. Open access publishing, academic research and scholarly communications[J]. Online information review, 2015, 39(5): 604-636.

[21] STEPHEN P. Making open access work: the "state-of-the-art" in providing open access to scholarly literature[J]. Journal of academic librarianship, 2013, 39(1): 32-39.

[22] ZHAO Wenyi. The internal logic and development path of academic journal open access[J]. Publishing research, 2016(10): 67-69.

[23] MARC S. On the access principle in science: a law and economics analysis. Copyright versus open access—on the organisation and international political economy of access to scientific knowledge[M]. Berlin: Springer, 2015: 83-139.

[24] JOSE C, CATIA L, VASCO V et al. Monitoring a national open access funder mandate[J]. Procedia computer science, 2017(3): 283-290.

[25] GEORGIA K H. OA, IRs and IP: Open access, digital copyright and marketplace competition[OL]. [2018-10-12]. <http://www.doc88.com/p-7754494707906.html>.

[26] ANN R H, MILES A K, MAURA I. Mandatory open access publishing for electronic theses and dissertations: ethics and enthusiasm[J]. The journal of academic librarianship, 2013, 39(1): 32-39.

[27] YANG Feng, HAN Qianqian, ZHANG Wentao. Analysis of rights balance mechanisms in institutional repositories[J]. Library development, 2015(5): 13-16.

[28] XIANG Liling, FAN Xiaolu. Comparison of policy and legal mechanisms in the utilization of institutional repositories between China and the United States[J]. Information studies: theory & application, 2015(5): 114-118.

- [29] NIU Xiaohong. Implications of open data policy coordination for book open access policies[J]. Modern information, 2018(9): 24-28.
- [30] JIA Lijun. Analysis of policy mechanisms in foreign book open access[J]. Library and information, 2017(3): 93-97.
- [31] WANG Yingkuan, WANG Yuanjie, JI Fang, et al. Latest research progress and development trends of foreign open access publishing[J]. Chinese journal of scientific and technical periodicals, 2015, 26(10): 1054-1064.
- [32] JIN Pin. Analysis of open access journal publishing model and its copyright characteristics[J]. China copyright, 2014(4): 63-67.
- [33] LIU Yong. Analysis of principles, models, and influencing factors of open access publishing[J]. Publishing wide angle, 2016(11): 36-38.
- [34] MARY A K. Learning to share: mandates and open access[J]. Library management, 2011, 32(4/5): 302-318.
- [35] SU Hongying. Analysis of economic models for open access journals based on supply-side payment: from the perspective of foreign practice[J]. Library world, 2017(3): 42-45.
- [36] CHEN Jin. Economic operation model of open access journals[J]. Journal of library science, 2012(6): 3-6.
- [37] TU Zhifang, LIU Ziheng. Overview of practice progress of academic libraries participating in open access publishing at home and abroad: from the perspective of publishing channels[J]. Library and information, 2017(3): 61-71.
- [38] LI Jin, SHENG Xiaoping. Research on academic book open access publishing model from the perspective of interests[J]. Library and information service, 2017(3): 39-46.
- [39] LIU Haixia, SUN Zhenqiu, HU Dehua, et al. Economic analysis of open access journals[J]. Information studies: theory & application, 2007, 30(1): 48-51.
- [40] GEOGINA A T, VALENTINO M L. A business model for electronic books[J]. Social and behavioral sciences, 2014(147): 268-275.
- [41] MA Xiaoqi, LI Ya. Research on WeChat public platform publishing model from the perspective of information stack[J]. Publishing research, 2017(7): 27-30.
- [42] MICHELE S, MARIE P D, JILL E. Consortial monograph interlending in the UK: a case study[J]. Interlending & document supply, 2006, 34(1): 24-28.
- [43] NING Shenghong. Knowledge Unlatched: a new model for academic book open access[J]. Library tribune, 2015(7): 14-20.
- [44] JOSEPH W I. Research into open access science publishing[J]. Library hi tech news, 2009(26): 16-18.
- [45] CHANG Jiang. Solution path for the conflict between digital rights management and fair use rights[J]. Publishing wide angle, 2016(8): 38-40.
- [46] LI Chunwang. Open access to academic information in network environments[J]. Journal of library science in China, 2005(1): 33-37.
- [47] ZHU Benjun, LONG Shitong, XIAO Long, et al. Research on book open access models and integrated utilization[J]. Journal of academic libraries, 2015(5): 25-30.
- [48] LIU Chunyan. Influence mechanism of internal knowledge transfer in

industry-university-research collaborative innovation teams[M]. Beijing: Intellectual Property Publishing House, 2017: 298-300.

[49] SUN Ruiying, MA Haiqun. Implications of Taiji philosophy for the coordination of open data and data security policies[J]. Modern information, 2018(5): 3-10.

Note: Figure translations are in progress. See original paper for figures.

Source: ChinaXiv — Machine translation. Verify with original.