

Review and Prospect of Research on Intangible Cultural Heritage Archives in China: Postprint

Authors: Liu Jing, European roses

Date: 2024-01-10T00:00:00+00:00

Abstract

[Purpose/Significance] This study reviews and summarizes the current state of intangible cultural heritage archives research in China, providing guidance and reference for advancing theoretical research and practical work. [Method/Process] Taking 665 journal articles on intangible cultural heritage archives from CNKI as the research object, this paper employs bibliometric tools VOSviewer and CiteSpace to conduct a complementary and corrective visual analysis of the research forces and hotspots in this field. [Results/Conclusion] Intangible cultural heritage archives constitute a cross-disciplinary research topic with rich connotations and great vitality; however, current research still faces issues of relatively weak and dispersed research forces, relatively limited research perspectives, and research topics requiring further deepening. Future research should focus on integrating research forces through multiple fields and channels, expanding research perspectives across disciplines and theories, and deepening research topics according to specific issues and needs.

Full Text

Preamble

Literature Review and Prospects of Intangible Cultural Heritage Archives Research in China

Liu Jing^{1,2}, Ou Yue²

(1. Archives of Central China Normal University, Wuhan 430079, China;

2. School of Information Management, Central China Normal University, Wuhan 430079, China)

Abstract:

[Purpose/Significance] This study systematically reviews and synthesizes the current state of intangible cultural heritage (ICH) archives research in China to provide guidance and reference for advancing theoretical research and practical

work. [Method/Process] Using 665 journal articles related to ICH archives from CNKI as the dataset, we conducted complementary and corrective visual analyses of research institutions and hotspots in China's ICH archives field using bibliometric tools VOSviewer and CiteSpace. [Result/Conclusion] ICH archives represent a richly connotative and highly vital interdisciplinary research topic. However, current research faces challenges including relatively weak and fragmented research capacity, limited research perspectives, and insufficiently deepened research themes. Future research should focus on: (1) integrating research capacity across multiple fields and channels; (2) expanding research perspectives through interdisciplinary and cross-theoretical approaches; and (3) deepening research themes by addressing specific problems and needs.

Keywords: Intangible cultural heritage archives; Bibliometrics; Knowledge graph

Introduction

In December 2022, General Secretary Xi Jinping issued important instructions on intangible cultural heritage (ICH) protection, emphasizing the need to systematically protect ICH. ICH archives constitute the original records generated during ICH preservation and transmission activities. As practical ICH archival work continues to advance, the academic community has produced numerous research outcomes, making the systematic review of these achievements a recent scholarly focus. Existing research exhibits four key characteristics:

First, regarding research objects, most studies focus on specific ICH archival research outcomes from either domestic or international contexts. For example, Chen Shiju et al. [1] examined international ICH archival practices through typical case studies; Yang Kun [2] reviewed research progress on Bai ethnic tie-dyeing technique archives; and Yang Yongfen et al. [3] evaluated 15 years of sports ICH research in China.

Second, regarding research content, many studies incorporate ICH archives as a sub-theme within broader analyses, while dedicated literature reviews on ICH archives remain scarce. For instance, Xu Fei [4] analyzed ICH archives as one theme within a general ICH research review; Wang Yunqing et al. [5] focused on digital protection perspectives; and Quan Xi [6] conducted bibliometric analyses of ICH archives from a communication studies perspective.

Third, regarding methodology, approaches have gradually shifted from traditional manual reviews to quantitative methods. Early scholars summarized major research findings through literature reading [7] and manually compiled data on ICH archival protection status [8-9], while later researchers began employing Bibexcel and Ucinet for visual analysis [10].

Fourth, regarding temporal coverage, analyses of recent developments are lacking. Most existing reviews cover research hotspots only up to 2018 [11], primarily

examining the state of research before 2014 [12] and 2013 [13], thereby offering limited guidance for current research and practice.

Overall, academic attention to dedicated domestic ICH archives research progress remains insufficient, with relatively monolithic bibliometric tools and a lack of complementary analyses using multiple visualization tools. The few existing reviews are already several years old and cannot comprehensively reflect the latest academic developments. Therefore, this paper employs both VOSviewer and CiteSpace for complementary and corrective visual analysis, supplemented by extensive literature review, to summarize research themes and future directions for China's ICH archives field, providing guidance for both practical work and theoretical research.

1. Data Sources and Temporal Distribution

This study uses CNKI as the data source, employing precise title matching with search terms “intangible cultural heritage + archives” and “intangible cultural heritage + record-creation.” The search covered all journal types with no start date limit through 2022, conducted on January 3, 2023, yielding 681 articles. After thorough reading and screening to remove duplicates and non-academic literature (book reviews, reports, prefaces, brief news items, etc.), we obtained a final sample of 665 valid articles.

The annual distribution of China's ICH archives research literature is shown in Figure 1 [Figure 1: see original paper]. Analyzed against the backdrop of national ICH policies, research in this field has experienced three publication peaks since its emergence in 2006. The first peak occurred in 2009, following the 2005 “Opinions on Strengthening ICH Protection Work” and “Notice on Strengthening ICH Protection,” which gradually drew academic attention and led to steady growth starting in 2006. The 2008 implementation of “Interim Measures for the Identification and Management of National-Level ICH Project Representative Inheritors” accelerated research, culminating in the 2009 peak.

The second peak emerged in 2013, after the 2011 “ICH Law of the People's Republic of China” codified record-creation for ICH, significantly increasing research output. The third peak appeared in 2017, when the National Archives Administration's “13th Five-Year Plan for National Archives Development” first explicitly “encouraged ICH record-creation work” at the national level—a crucial turning point for archives institutions' involvement in ICH protection [14]. Large-scale practical explorations by archives at all levels triggered a theoretical research boom, pushing 2017 publications to their zenith before stabilizing at over 30 articles annually through 2018, indicating an active research phase.

2. Analysis of Research Strength in China's ICH Archives

Research strength encompasses indicators such as research institutions, prolific authors, and representative journals, reflecting the distribution of institution

types, collaboration patterns, and formation of core research teams.

2.1 Research Institutions

As of December 2022, 508 institutions had published on ICH archives in China. Setting a minimum threshold of 2 publications per institution yielded 72 institutions, generating the institutional collaboration network knowledge graph shown in Figure 2 [Figure 2: see original paper].

In Figure 2, larger nodes indicate higher publication counts. The School of History and Culture at Shandong University (33 articles) and the School of Management at Anhui University (27 articles) lead significantly. Other institutions with 10+ publications include: Yunnan University School of Public Management (14), Yunnan University School of History and Archives (12), Renmin University School of Information Resource Management (11), Wuhan University School of Information Management (10), and Beijing Union University College of Applied Arts and Sciences (10).

Regarding institution types, universities dominate ICH archives research, followed by archives departments and art research institutes. A few provincial- and municipal-level ICH protection centers (e.g., Hubei Provincial ICH Protection Center, Huizhou Municipal ICH Protection Center, Baotou Municipal ICH Protection Center) also participate, though institution types remain relatively homogeneous, lacking involvement from folklore museums, cultural centers, libraries, museums, and other ICH record-creation institutions.

Regarding collaboration, Figure 2 shows only three clusters with connecting lines (collaborations involving 2+ institutions): (1) Shanghai University Library, Information and Archives Department; Anhui University School of Management; Wuhan University School of Information Management; Wuhan University Information Resource Research Center; and Hubei University School of Resources and Environmental Sciences; (2) Renmin University Beijing Studies Center; Renmin University School of Information Resource Management; Beijing Municipal Archives; and Shandong University School of History and Culture; (3) Jilin University School of Management; Mudanjiang Normal University Library; and Liaoning University School of History. High-frequency publishing institutions show no interconnections, with most appearing as isolated nodes, indicating limited cross-institutional collaboration.

2.2 Prolific Authors

Author productivity reflects research output capacity. Using VOSviewer 1.6.10 with a minimum threshold of 2 publications per author, we generated the author collaboration network shown in Figure 3 [Figure 3: see original paper].

In Figure 3, font size indicates author centrality while circle size represents publication count. Leading authors include Wang Yunqing, Dai Yang, Zhou Yaolin, and Wang Qiaoling, each with 10+ publications. All prolific authors hail from

university archives programs, with few contributions from ICH practitioners or archives professionals, indicating an unbalanced author pool. Collaboration patterns center on these prolific authors with limited scope, while other authors appear as scattered isolated nodes, demonstrating low overall collaboration levels. This suggests China has yet to form a tightly-knit, cross-institutional, interdisciplinary research team in the ICH archives field.

2.3 Representative Journals

Analysis of representative journals provides crucial guidance for future research. The 665 articles are distributed across 191 journals, predominantly in archives studies periodicals, with minimal representation in culture, folklore, and sports journals (e.g., *Sports Culture Guide*, *Theatre Home*, *China National Exhibition*). This indicates that while ICH archives research is gradually gaining attention in other fields, cross-disciplinary expansion remains limited.

Setting a minimum threshold of 10 articles per journal yields Table 1, showing 13 representative journals—all in archives studies. *Lantai World* leads with 17% of total publications, far exceeding others, demonstrating highly concentrated publication outlets with a “single standout” rather than balanced development across multiple journals.

3. Research Hotspots in China’s ICH Archives

Driven by the aforementioned research capacity, ICH archives research has produced substantial outcomes. Keywords, as core terms representing research themes and priorities, can reflect field hotspots. We further identified research trends through keyword co-occurrence, burst detection, clustering, and timeline analyses.

3.1 Keyword Co-occurrence

Using VOSviewer 1.6.10 with a minimum keyword frequency threshold of 4, we identified 70 keywords, merging similar terms like “intangible cultural heritage archives,” “ICH archives,” “ICH protection,” and “ICH preservation” to generate the keyword co-occurrence map shown in Figure 4 [Figure 4: see original paper].

China’s vast, diverse ICH projects, widely distributed geographically and ethnically, have prompted scholars to explore from perspectives of type, ethnicity, and protection methods. Figure 4 shows broad keyword coverage, with node size proportional to frequency and connecting lines representing co-occurrence relationships. All research centers on “ICH” and “ICH archives.” Closely associated high-frequency keywords include “archival protection,” “record-creation protection,” “archives,” “social memory,” “archival databases,” “oral archives,” “standard systems,” “ICH inheritors,” “ethnic minorities,” “development and utilization,” and “audio-visual archives,” revealing popular themes such as ICH

archival standard system construction, oral ICH archives resource development, ethnic minority ICH archives resources, and ICH archives utilization.

Line thickness indicates connection strength, with the strongest links between “ICH” and “ICH archives,” “archival protection,” “record-creation protection,” “archives,” “archives management,” and “archival resources.” This demonstrates that regardless of shifting hotspots, ICH record-creation and management remain the field’s enduring core concerns.

3.2 Keyword Burst Detection

While VOSviewer 1.6.10 provides intuitive co-occurrence visualization, burst detection further refines keyword attention duration and intensity, complementing Figure 4. Burst magnitude indicates whether keywords represent research frontiers and emerging trends. Importing the 665 articles into CiteSpace 6.1.R3, we set the timeframe to 2006-2022 with 1-year slices and “TOP N” threshold at 50, generating the top 12 burst keywords shown in Figure 5 [Figure 5: see original paper].

Figure 5 shows that “archives” and “ICH protection” have burst strengths of 11.2 and 7.25 respectively, far exceeding other keywords, both bursting in 2006. This indicates that archives recognized their responsibility for ICH protection from the field’s inception [15], creating records for ICH applications, surveys, projects, and inheritors under archival theories like “fonds theory,” “dual value theory,” “new provenance,” and “life cycle” [16], and integrating ICH archives into local characteristic archival resources [17]. “ICH inheritors” began bursting in 2011, reflecting in-depth academic exploration of inheritor archives. Keywords “cultural inheritance” and “social memory” emerged in 2019, indicating shifting research attention. Figure 5 also includes redundant or invalid burst terms like “archives protection,” “record-creation protection,” and “cultural heritage” that require further manual refinement.

3.3 Keyword Clustering

To more accurately identify research hotspots, we applied the LLR algorithm for keyword clustering visualization. This both refines the 7 clusters in Figure 4’s co-occurrence map and supplements Figure 5, yielding more reliable results. Running CiteSpace 6.1.R3 produced a Modularity Q-value of 0.5627 (>0.3 threshold) and Silhouette S-value of 0.8706 (>0.7 threshold), indicating significant structure and high clustering reliability.

The algorithm automatically generated 16 clusters: ICH, archives, ICH archives, ICH protection, archives management, ICH inheritors, archival resources construction, archives, cultural heritage, inheritors, cultural inheritance, archivalization, protection and inheritance, archival databases, national ICH, and dynamic protection. Cluster numbering partially reflects attention levels. Table 2 summarizes these clusters.

3.4 Keyword Timeline

To further analyze keyword evolution and reflect each hotspot's development from emergence to decline, we generated a 2006-2022 keyword timeline using CiteSpace 6.1.R3, shown in Figure 6 [Figure 6: see original paper].

In Figure 6, the horizontal axis represents emergence time, node position indicates first appearance, node size reflects thematic richness, connecting lines show inter-theme relationships, and the vertical axis displays automatically calculated cluster modules.

The timeline reveals four explosive research periods. First, during the early record-creation stage, after establishing record-creation necessity, standardization became the primary practical challenge and academic focus, with research addressing ICH archives definition, record-creation necessity, responsible entities, standards, and methods. Second, during initial resource construction, popular themes included ICH archives management, database construction, digitization, audio-visual archives protection, ethnic minority ICH archives, and crowd-sourced wisdom models. These yielded abundant, long-term research but focused on applying basic archival theories and methods to specific ICH archives issues, leveraging archives departments' professional advantages [18] while showing limited theoretical guidance [19] and innovation [20], resulting in some research being confined to archival theory application.

Third, during mid-stage resource construction, the “14th Five-Year Plan for National Archives Development” required “strengthening cross-field, cross-regional, and cross-level integration of relevant archival resources” [21], prompting scholars to address the urgent need to integrate rich but fragmented ICH archives resources at regional levels. Fourth, during later-stage resource construction, protection and inheritance—the core of ICH work and ICH archives resource construction—have generated research hotspots on ICH archives utilization, public cultural services, and cultural dissemination as public demand for access and sharing grows.

4. Conclusions and Future Directions

The above analysis of research capacity and hotspots reveals that ICH archives constitute a richly connotative and highly vital interdisciplinary research topic. However, constrained by relatively homogeneous institution types, limited cross-institutional collaboration, and absent interdisciplinary teams, the field still faces challenges including weak and scattered research capacity, limited perspectives, and insufficiently deepened themes. Future research should focus on three areas:

4.1 Multi-Field, Multi-Channel Integration of Research Capacity

As previously noted, research institutions, prolific authors, and representative journals primarily originate from the archives field, with minimal cross-field

or cross-institutional collaboration, resulting in relatively weak and scattered research capacity lacking support from ICH, folklore, public cultural services, and related fields. Future research must integrate diverse capacity. On one hand, project incubation, regional coordination, and joint applications should attract multi-field scholars while encouraging multi-field journals to publish ICH archives research. On the other hand, increasing ICH archives training across relevant fields and enriching undergraduate curricula will cultivate potential scholars, laying a talent foundation for integrated research capacity.

4.2 Interdisciplinary, Cross-Theoretical Expansion of Research Perspectives

Figures 4 and 5 show that while keyword co-occurrence and burst detection cover broad terms, they remain centered on ICH record-creation and archives management, with perspectives limited to the archives field. ICH archives research is an applied, interdisciplinary field requiring multi-disciplinary participation [22]. Introducing “era-region” theory can provide cross-ethnic, cross-regional holistic perspectives on ICH archives resource construction [23]; public management theories can theoretically examine the production process, characteristics, and governance needs of ICH archives resource construction [24]; and reference to ICH studies as an independent discipline, along with foundational theories like collective memory, cultural life history, and cultural symbols [25], can expand theoretical perspectives.

4.3 Problem- and Demand-Driven Deepening of Research Themes

Based on Table 2 and Figure 6’s clustering and timeline, four mature themes emerge: ICH record-creation standards, ICH archives resource construction, ICH archives resource integration, and ICH archives resource development. However, future research must address current problems and national needs.

First, refine ICH record-creation standards from planning to implementation. Current research has explored standard system construction planning from multiple angles and dimensions [26], producing outcomes on standard development necessity, principles, coverage, and applicability [27], but lacks implementation-level refinement. Future research should transition to practical refinement, deepening understanding of ICH attributes, classification, correlations, and deep structures to further explore standards from perspectives of management processes, carrier types, regions, and provenance.

Second, expand ICH archives resource construction from practical exploration to theoretical development. Early research required practical exploration, while later stages need theoretical synthesis and expansion. As discussed, under archival theories like “fonds theory,” “dual value theory,” “new provenance,” and “life cycle,” archives departments have repeatedly established record-creation and collection as extended functions. Rich practical experience and mature archival theory provide a solid foundation for theoretical expansion in

ICH archives resource construction.

Third, deepen ICH archives resource integration from partial optimization to full fusion. The 2022 “Opinions on Promoting National Cultural Digitization Strategy” mandates that “by the end of the 14th Five-Year Plan, data centers of various cultural institutions will be essentially interconnected, forming an online-offline integrated, three-dimensionally covered cultural service supply system” [28]. This requires cross-institutional integration of vast, heterogeneous ICH archives resources [29]. Future research should promote deep ICH archives resource fusion from multi-source, multi-standard, and multi-language perspectives [30].

Fourth, transform ICH archives resource development from traditional to digital humanities models. Addressing public demand for differentiated ICH archives access [31], future development research should transition from partial trials to comprehensive advancement, balancing research objects and methods. Regarding development objects, research should expand from regional cultures (e.g., Zhili ICH) [32] to broader scopes, avoiding limited thinking [33] by extending from some ethnic minorities to others and from local to national and world-level ICH, such as underdeveloped world-level ICH like Peking Opera archives [34] and Chinese tea culture, inscribed in November 2022 [35]. Regarding development methods, research should focus on deep culture-technology integration, combining traditional and digital approaches to advance big data, cloud computing, and AI applications in ICH archives content and value development, exploring digital humanities-oriented innovative utilization to match public needs.

China stands at a critical juncture in ICH archives research. Against the backdrop of increasingly rich “great heritage” concepts and the renaming of the “Library, Information and Archives Management” first-level discipline to “Information Resource Management,” the boundaries of both ICH studies and archival science are expanding, presenting opportunities for diversified research capacity and more mature, systematic outcomes in ICH archives research.

References

- [1] Chen Shiju, Xu Miaomiao. Research on the Progress of Archival Protection of Foreign Intangible Cultural Heritage[J]. *China Archives*, 2016(6): 74-75.
- [2] Yang Kun. Research on the Construction of Archives Resources for Bai Tie-dyeing ICH Techniques[D]. Yunnan University, 2021.
- [3] Yang Yongfen, Zuo Yi, Fan Lingshuo. Historical Review and Hotspot Summary: A Review of Sports ICH Research in China in the Past 15 Years[J]. *Guizhou Ethnic Studies*, 2021(4): 130-141.
- [4] Xu Fei. Analysis of the Research Status of Intangible Cultural Heritage—Based on CNKI (2003-2019) Data[J]. *Information Science*, 2021, 39(12): 179-186.
- [5] Wang Yunqing, Peng Xin. Review of Domestic Research on Digital Protection of Intangible Cultural Heritage[J]. *Archives and Construction*, 2017(4):

9-13.

- [6] Quan Xi. Bibliometric Analysis of Intangible Cultural Heritage Research in China from the Perspective of Communication Studies—Visualization Map Based on CiteSpace[J]. *Cultural Heritage*, 2016(2): 15-22.
- [7] Chen Yide. Review of Research on the Protection of Intangible Cultural Heritage Archives[J]. *Archives Management*, 2020(3): 42-43.
- [8] Ma Yujie, Li Xin, Bi Yunping, et al. Analysis of Research Trends in Archival Protection of Intangible Cultural Heritage in China[J]. *Archives World*, 2018(7): 45-46, 52.
- [9] Chen Jian, Gao Ning. Review and Prospect of Research on Archival Protection of Intangible Cultural Heritage in China[J]. *Archives Science Study*, 2013(5): 58-62.
- [10] Li Xiaomin. Visual Analysis of Intangible Cultural Heritage Archives Research in China[J]. *Shanxi Archives*, 2018(4): 28-30.
- [11] Wu Ruili. Analysis of Research Hotspots and Development Trends of Intangible Cultural Heritage Archives in China[J]. *Library and Information Guide*, 2019, 4(4): 65-71.
- [12] Li Ranran. Bibliometric Analysis of Intangible Cultural Heritage Archives Research in China[J]. *Digital & Micrographic Imaging*, 2016(3): 36-40.
- [13] Zhang Lei. Review of Intangible Cultural Heritage Archives Research[J]. *Shanxi Archives*, 2015(4): 99-101.
- [14] Zhao Yue. Reflection and Reorientation of Archives Institutions' Participation in ICH Protection in the New Era[J]. *Archives Science Communication*, 2020(2): 40-48.
- [15] Zhou Linxing, Su Junhua. The Lifeline of Cultural Continuation—A New Examination of the Relationship Between Public Archives and Intangible Cultural Heritage[J]. *Shanxi Archives*, 2006(3): 9-11.
- [16] Zhao Yamin, Wang Yunqing. Approaches for Archives and Cultural Institutions to Protect Intangible Cultural Heritage[J]. *Zhejiang Archives*, 2006(8): 15-18.
- [17] Zhou Jianjun. Rethinking Local Characteristic Archives Construction from the Perspective of ICH Protection[J]. *Archives Science Communication*, 2014(3): 17-20.
- [18] Wang Qiaoling, Sun Aiping, Chen Wenjie. Analysis of Advantages and Disadvantages of Archives Departments' Participation in ICH Protection[J]. *Beijing Archives*, 2013(6): 11-13.
- [19] Ding Wanlin, Wang Yunbin. Responsibility and Collaborative Path of Archives Departments in ICH Digital Archiving[J]. *Zhejiang Archives*, 2021(10): 25-27.
- [20] Zhou Yaolin, Zhao Yue. Research on the “Crowd Wisdom Model” for ICH Archives Resource Construction[M]. Wuhan: Wuhan University Press, 2020: 46.
- [21] General Office of the CPC Central Committee and State Council Issue the “14th Five-Year Plan for National Archives Development”[EB/OL]. (2021-6-9)[2023-7-15]. <https://www.saac.gov.cn/daj/toutiao/202106/ecca2de5bce44a0eb55c890762868683.shtml>.
- [22] Feng Li. Practice and Theoretical Exploration of “Archiving” in China's

ICH Protection—Taking the “Chinese Thangka Culture Archives” Project as an Example[J]. Journal of Minzu University of China (Philosophy and Social Sciences Edition), 2021, 48(3): 109-119.

[23] He Xuan. Research on ICH Archives Resource Construction from the Perspective of “Era-Region” Theory[J]. Archives Science Communication, 2016(6): 34-37.

[24] Wang Qiaoling, Zhu Jianbang, Xie Yongxian. Research on Production Characteristics and Governance Needs of ICH Archives Resource Construction[J]. Archives Science Study, 2022(2): 56-61.

[25] Li Yuanyuan. “Intangible Cultural Heritage Studies Course” Explores the Path of ICH Discipline Construction[J]. Folklore Studies, 2022(2): 2, 161.

[26] Zhang Yun, Wang Hao, Liu Youhua, et al. Research on Theme Evolution of ICH Archives Work in China[J]. Archives and Construction, 2021(6): 15-19.

[27] Dai Yang, Li Caifu. Reflections on the Standard System for ICH Archiving in China[J]. Archives Science Study, 2014(5): 35-39.

[28] General Office of the CPC Central Committee and State Council Issue the “Opinions on Promoting the Implementation of National Cultural Digitization Strategy”[EB/OL]. (2022-6-6)[2023-1-29]. <http://dsj.guizhou.gov.cn/zwgk/xxgkml/zcwj/zcfg/202206/t202206>

[29] Dong Lili. Research on Cross-Institutional Integration Strategies for ICH Archives Resources Under Informatization[J]. Archives Management, 2022(2): 67-69.

[30] Peng Bo. Knowledge Discovery Method for Cultural Heritage Information Resources Based on Text Classification and Topic Modeling[J]. Journal of Literature and Data, 2022, 4(3): 52-65.

[31] Liu Jing. Investigation on Information Dissemination of Intangible Cultural Heritage Archives[J]. Zhejiang Archives, 2018(9): 22-24.

[32] Xie Haiyang. Research on Digital Protection and Dissemination Strategies of Zhili Intangible Cultural Heritage from the Perspective of Archival Science[J]. Archives Science Study, 2018(4): 97-101.

[33] Wang Fang. Guard Against Four Types of Thinking in Archives Protection and Development[N]. China Archives News, 2022-2-10(003).

[34] Wang Qiaoling, You Hongbo, Li Xi. Research on Current Status and Countermeasures of Peking Opera Archives from the Perspective of ICH Project Protection Units[J]. Beijing Archives, 2016(11): 22-24.

[35] Lu Yao. Let Chinese Tea Fragrance Spread Worldwide[N]. Zhejiang Daily, 2022-11-30(002).

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

Source: ChinaXiv — Machine translation. Verify with original.