

Author Copyright Retention in Academic Journal Publishing: Practice, Interest Coordination, and Implications

Authors: Que Chenchen, Ye Hangqing, Que Chenchen

Date: 2024-01-26T00:00:00+00:00

Abstract

Purpose To provide reference and guidance for Chinese academic journals in handling copyright issues in future open access practices. **Method** Using web-based literature research method to investigate and summarize the main types of author copyright retention in international practice, employing stakeholder theory to identify the stakeholder entities in author copyright retention, and analyzing the interest relationships and major conflicts among these entities. **Results** Attempting to explore solutions for interest conflicts in international practice, proposing methods such as authors enhancing copyright awareness, funding agencies and research institutions actively participating in the bargaining process, establishing scientific evaluation systems and incentive mechanisms, developing new academic communication models, and adjusting copyright interest distribution patterns to coordinate conflicts and balance interests. **Conclusion** The digital transformation of journal publishing institutions is an inevitable trend; Chinese academic journals should promptly reform the current situation where publishers and database vendors operate as separate entities to form an integrated publishing entity, while placing greater emphasis on the formulation and improvement of copyright policies and the standardization of copyright agreements.

Full Text

The Practice, Interest Coordination, and Implications of Author Copyright Retention in Academic Journal Publishing

QUE Chenchen¹), YE Hangqing¹)

¹) Zhejiang University Library, 38 Zheda Road, Xihu District, Hangzhou, Zhejiang 310027, China

Abstract

[Purpose] This paper aims to provide reference for Chinese academic journals in handling copyright issues in future open access practices. **[Methods]** Using network literature survey methodology, we investigated and summarized the main types of author copyright retention in international practices. Stakeholder theory was employed to identify the relevant stakeholders involved in author copyright retention and analyze their interests and major conflicts. **[Findings]** We explore solutions to conflicts of interest in international practices, proposing that authors should enhance copyright awareness, funding agencies and research institutions should actively participate in negotiations, scientific evaluation systems and incentive mechanisms should be established, new academic communication models should be developed, and the pattern of copyright interest distribution should be adjusted to coordinate conflicts and balance interests. **[Conclusion]** The digital transformation of journal publishing institutions is an inevitable trend. Chinese academic journals should promptly change the current separation between publishers and database providers to form a unified publishing entity, while placing greater emphasis on improving copyright policies and standardizing copyright agreements.

Keywords: Copyright retention; Open Access (OA); Stakeholders; Balancing of interests

In the process of submitting and publishing journal articles, copyright transfer and changes are common issues that have long concerned all stakeholders. With the advent of the digital era and the development of open access (hereinafter referred to as “OA”), stakeholders’ demands for copyright interest distribution in journal publishing have undergone significant changes. Author copyright retention has become increasingly important for the openness and utilization of literature, leading to continuous development and evolution of relevant practices.

Research by Chinese scholars on author copyright retention includes: Gu Xiujie et al. [1] studied copyright retention and transfer models in foreign OA journals, analyzing changes in the positions and policies of employers, funders, and publishers regarding copyright retention; Ou Yan et al. [2] investigated the copyright agreements and policies of 14 international publishers, including copyright ownership, licensing agreements, and self-archiving related to copyright retention, analyzing the rights and responsibilities of authors and publishers; Xiao Dongmei [3] argued that open access... [6], meaning that stakeholders are entities that can influence the achievement of organizational objectives. This study identifies the main stakeholders in copyright interests throughout the processes of literature production, publication, and utilization as authors, publishers, funders, and literature consumers.

Among them, literature authors refer to creators who invest intellectual effort to produce works and are the original copyright owners. Publishers refer to entities responsible for publishing and distributing journal literature, which are mostly digital journal publishing institutions in international practice, while in China

they mainly include traditional journal publishers and digital journal integrators/database providers. Funders refer to entities that provide financial support for scientific research, including public and private research foundations, with this paper focusing primarily on public funding agencies. Literature consumers refer to groups who purchase, read, and utilize literature, mainly including researchers and the general public.

This study employs network literature survey methodology to investigate official website information of various institutions and organizations, summarizing the main types of author copyright retention in international practices. Using stakeholder theoretical analysis, it identifies stakeholders related to author copyright retention, analyzes the interest relationships and major conflicts among them, and attempts to explore solutions to these conflicts in international practices, aiming to provide reference for Chinese academic journals in handling copyright issues in future OA practices.

3.1 International Practice

Copyright refers to the rights enjoyed by creators of literary, artistic, and scientific works, including moral rights and economic rights [7]. However, in reality, authors—as copyright owners—often find themselves in a vulnerable position in publishing due to multiple pressures from research evaluation and career development, needing to publish numerous academic articles. They frequently have to completely transfer copyright to journal publishers as required to ensure smooth publication and dissemination. While complete copyright transfer can avoid disputes and protect publishers' commercial interests, it also means authors may lose many legitimate rights, such as storing their work on personal websites and online repositories, using it in teaching and research, and creating derivative works. Today, journal publishing has evolved into a model of “authors pay publication fees, readers pay access fees, and publishers profit” [3], with international journal publishers possessing paper copyrights while continuously increasing publication and database subscription fees. It is against this backdrop that advocacy for author copyright retention and the OA movement have emerged.

In this study, “author copyright retention” refers to authors' efforts to retain partial copyright while transferring rights to the public. Based on our investigation, author copyright retention in international practice can be broadly categorized into three types: the “Author Addendum” initiated by authors or their employing institutions, the “Author Partial Copyright Retention” strategy initiated by public research funding agencies, and the “Author Partial Copyright Retention” policy offered by journal publishers.

3.1.1 Author Copyright Addendum

The “Author Copyright Addendum” (hereinafter referred to as “addendum”) refers to a legally binding agreement initiated and signed by authors with pub-

lishers during journal publication to retain partial copyright and avoid complete copyright transfer clauses in publishing agreements [8].

Addenda are generally applied at the author's discretion or according to specific public funders' copyright retention and open access requirements. The Scholarly Publishing and Academic Resources Coalition (SPARC) first launched the addendum in 2005 [1]. The latest version [9] was jointly released by SPARC, Creative Commons, and Science Commons, with main contents including: (1) authors retain rights for non-commercial use, derivative works, and authorizing others for non-commercial use; (2) publishers agree to send authors the final version of the article without technical restrictions within 14 days of initial publication; and (3) recognition of authors' priority to grant non-exclusive copyright licenses to their employing institutions or funding agencies.

Many universities and research institutions also provide addendum templates. The addendum provided by the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT) differs most significantly from the SPARC version by emphasizing the rights of authors' employing institutions and the public, stipulating that authors may store the final manuscript version on websites controlled by their employing institutions and national open platforms, and may grant non-exclusive licenses to their employing institutions to use, reproduce, distribute, and display their works in electronic or printed form for various academic and professional activities [10]. The MIT addendum was primarily developed to comply with U.S. government directives on "expanding public access to federally funded research results" [11] and applies to publications of research funded by agencies with OA requirements.

3.1.2 Funding Agency Copyright Retention Strategies

As shown in Table , copyright and OA policies of public research funding agencies in some countries/regions require grantees to retain sufficient copyright to enable timely open access. For example: the U.S. National Institutes of Health (NIH) states that all researchers it funds must retain copyright to submit the final peer-reviewed manuscript to PubMed Central (PMC) and make it open access within 12 months of the official publication date [12]; the Canadian Institutes of Health Research (CIHR) requires grantees to confirm that the target journal allows authors to retain copyright or comply with the funder's self-archiving policy, and ensures the full text of the final peer-reviewed manuscript is open access via the publisher's website or online repositories within 12 months of publication [13]; the Australian Research Council (ARC) requires authors to discuss and negotiate appropriate publishing agreement terms to enable research literature to be open access within 12 months of publication date according to copyright or license agreements, with metadata open to the public in institutional repositories within 3 months of publication [14]; and cOAlition S, established with support from the European Commission and Research Councils, released the Rights Retention Strategy in July 2020, stating that research authors may submit to any journal, including subscription journals, but must

retain sufficient copyright to comply with open access requirements, meaning the Author Accepted Manuscript (AAM) or Version of Record (VoR) of funded research must be made open access without embargo under a CC-BY (Creative Commons Attribution) license or equivalent, through prior license or prior obligation [15].

Table 1

Partial List of Public Research Funding Agencies' Copyright and OA Policies

Agency	Requires Author Copyright Retention	OA Embargo Requirement
Australian Research Council (ARC)	Yes, version not emphasized	Results within 12 months, metadata within 3 months
cOAlition S	Yes, AAM or VoR	Immediate (no embargo)

3.1.3 Publisher Copyright Retention Policies

While publishers traditionally required authors to transfer copyright before publication, their attitudes toward copyright have continuously evolved under pressure from internet development and digital publishing promoting OA. According to our research, publisher policies related to copyright retention typically include three components: copyright ownership, user-facing copyright licensing, and author-facing self-archiving policies (Table).

International publishers can be divided into OA publishers (hereinafter “OA publishers”) and traditional publishers based on their openness. OA publishers such as PLOS [16], SpringerOpen [17], and BMC typically publish fully OA journals and articles, adopting more open attitudes toward copyright by stating that OA article copyright is retained by authors, usually applying the more permissive CC-BY license requiring only attribution, and allowing immediate self-archiving and open access of the VoR. Traditional publishers such as Springer Nature [18], Elsevier [19], Taylor & Francis, and Wiley typically publish fully OA journals and hybrid journals offering OA options. OA journals from these publishers have the same copyright policies as OA publishers, while hybrid journal policies are more complex. For OA articles in hybrid journals, copyright belongs to authors with immediate VoR open access, usually with CC-BY as an option, but self-archiving carries additional conditions such as requiring links to the original publication. For subscription articles, control is stricter with copyright generally belonging to publishers, licenses may restrict commercial use, prohibit derivatives, or require share-alike terms [2], and authors can only self-archive AAM versions with OA embargoes. Some licenses are even more restrictive, such as Elsevier’s user license for open archive (delayed

OA) articles, which not only requires non-commercial use but also prohibits distribution, republication, and extraction or creation of derivatives in other works [20].

Table 2

Copyright and OA Policies for Different Journal Types by International Publishers

Publisher Type	Copyright Ownership	License (User)	Self-Archiving (Author)	OA Embargo
OA Publishers (e.g., PLOS, SpringerOpen, BMC)	Author retains copyright	CC-BY (attribution only)	VoR allowed, immediate OA	None
Traditional Publishers - OA articles (Hybrid journals)	Author retains copyright	CC-BY preferred, 极少数期刊 CC BY-NC (Springer Nature)	Must include official publication URL link (Springer Nature)	6-12 months
Traditional Publishers - Subscription articles	Publisher holds copyright	CC-BY, CC-BY-NC, CC-BY-NC-ND, CC-BY-NC-SA (Elsevier)	AAM only, with conditions: include CrossMark icon, DOI link (Elsevier); for non-commercial academic research only, can store on personal website, funder repository, or institutional repository during embargo, open after embargo (Springer Nature)	6-36 months (Elsevier)

3.2 Stakeholders and Interest Conflicts

By summarizing the three main types of author copyright retention in international practice, we identify the stakeholders most closely related to copyright retention as: literature authors, journal publishers (integrating manuscript submission, peer review, editing, proofreading, and digital publishing), public funding agencies, research institutions, the public, and OA platforms (institutional

repositories, national OA platforms, etc.). Based on the complex interest relationships among these stakeholders (Figure [Figure 1: see original paper]), the problems and conflicts in international practice mainly concentrate in the following areas:

Figure 1 [Figure 1: see original paper]

Stakeholders in Author Copyright Retention and Their Interrelationships

3.2.1 Conflict Between Academic Freedom and Copyright Retention

As shown in Figure 1, both public funding agencies and research institutions impose copyright retention requirements on authors, who bear the most execution pressure during submission and publication. Although authors wish to retain copyright and widely disseminate their work, current mainstream methods for evaluating research achievements and talent heavily rely on bibliometric indicators, creating immense pressure to publish. Mandatory copyright retention by funders and institutions undoubtedly affects authors' journal selection, placing them in a dilemma. While most publishers claim they will not reject manuscripts solely because authors insist on copyright retention, some have made "immediate public disclosure of AAM versions prohibited" a prerequisite for non-OA submissions. A few publishers, such as the American Society for Hematology, have directly refused to accept manuscripts with author copyright retention statements applying "prior license" declarations [22]. In November 2018, multiple scientists published an open letter criticizing the initial Plan S compliance requirements, arguing that the mandate for sufficient copyright retention and immediate OA for funded outputs was "unfair" and "seriously infringed academic freedom," drastically reducing the number of journals available to researchers, potentially including the most influential journals in certain fields, negatively impacting researcher collaboration, career development, and funding applications [23].

3.2.2 Conflict in Copyright Interest Distribution

Copyright ownership and interest distribution after publication represent the core conflict among stakeholders in author copyright retention. The research literature lifecycle includes production, evaluation, publication, and utilization. Public funding agencies (primarily funded by taxpayer money) provide financial support, research institutions provide platforms, equipment, and personnel, and authors invest substantial intellectual labor to produce research literature, after which publishers organize peer review, editing, production, and dissemination. High-quality manuscripts provided by authors form the foundation for publishers' survival and development. However, digital internet development has transformed international publishers from print-only to digital journal publishers, while literature dissemination and value assessment increasingly depend on digital publishing.

Unlike print publishing, digital publishing has substantially reduced marginal

costs for production, publication, and dissemination [24]. Under these circumstances, in subscription publishing, international publishers profit excessively from copyright ownership, restricting authors' ability to openly share, self-archive, and create derivatives. This prevents research institutions from utilizing achievements produced by their employees and denies the public—represented by public funders—timely access to research benefits. In OA publishing, funders and authors pay high Article Processing Charges (APCs) to retain copyright and enable OA, while international publishers still profit handsomely. This analysis reveals that publishers gain excessive profits under current copyright interest distribution models, causing severe imbalance among stakeholders.

3.2.3 Conflict in Pricing of Copyright Retention Fees

In the global OA movement, complete resistance to author copyright retention and OA is clearly untenable for international publishers. International practice shows that, while ensuring no loss of commercial interests, publishers have adopted more flexible and open approaches to copyright. If authors choose copyright retention and OA publication, publishers charge high APCs. Prestigious journals *Nature* and *Cell* announced gold OA options starting January 2021, with APCs as high as €9,500 [25] and €8,500 [26], respectively. OA publishing is not cost-free and requires converting subscription revenue to APCs to maintain operations. However, unregulated, excessively high APC pricing undoubtedly increases the cost of copyright retention and openness, shifting researchers from being “unable to afford reading papers” to “unable to afford publishing papers,” contrary to OA's original intent of breaking payment barriers and promoting free dissemination and sharing of research. Furthermore, publishers unilaterally control APC pricing, simply announcing that fees cover editing, peer review management, and promotion costs, yet never publicly accounting for OA costs or disclosing pricing standards and increase justifications. Consequently, funders, research institutions, and authors cannot assess APC pricing reasonableness or conduct effective supervision and negotiation.

4.1 Authors' Enhanced Awareness of Copyright Retention

Research literature represents authors' intellectual achievements, and without special agreements, creators are the original copyright owners. However, due to publication pressures, authors often occupy a weak position in academic publishing, forced to accept publishers' “take-it-or-leave-it” agreements and transfer copyright or abandon legitimate interests. The “publish or perish” culture has driven academic communication into a dead end. Author copyright retention can protect legitimate rights and interests while promoting dissemination, utilization, and re-innovation of achievements. In this context, authors should remain true to their original aspirations, correctly understand the positive significance of copyright retention for public interest and the academic community, and fully recognize that open sharing of research literature will advance scientific development and social progress, thereby more actively participating in copy-

right retention practices. For instance, authors can preferentially select open and inclusive publishers that do not require exclusive copyright, actively communicate and negotiate with publishers to retain reasonable rights when issues arise, and comply with funder regulations for storing and opening achievements when receiving public funding.

4.2 Active Participation in Negotiations by Funding Agencies and Research Institutions

In academic journal publishing practice, authors have long been in a weak position relative to publishers, while public funding agencies and research institutions have greater bargaining power. Therefore, they should proactively take responsibility, prioritize public interest, and effectively intervene to promote author copyright retention. First, copyright retention requirements should be explicitly incorporated into relevant regulations, enhancing researchers' awareness and implementation of copyright retention and OA while importantly pressuring publishers. Second, funding agencies and research institutions should strengthen communication and cooperation, coordinate efforts, accelerate negotiations, and strive to gain discourse power, using alliance status and collective bargaining advantages to negotiate reasonable author copyright retention and OA with publishers. Additionally, they should urge publishers to publicly account for OA publishing costs and disclose APC pricing and increase justifications. Only by establishing a credible APC price supervision and bargaining mechanism involving all stakeholders can OA APC pricing align with services provided, preventing payment for copyright retention and OA from becoming a new profit-extraction method for publishers.

4.3 Establishing Scientific Evaluation Systems and Talent Incentive Mechanisms

The widespread recognition and use of journal bibliometric indicators in research achievement and talent evaluation systems have increased the bargaining power of “high-impact” journals and consolidated the monopoly position of large international publishers. Current evaluation mechanisms have essentially “outsourced” research quality judgment to commercial publishers. Therefore, establishing scientific evaluation and incentive mechanisms requires changing existing models. First, funding agencies, research institutions, and academic communities should firmly grasp the dominant role in research evaluation, refocusing on research achievements and researchers themselves, fully considering originality and diverse value, disciplinary backgrounds, and differences in achievement characteristics at various career stages. Diversified evaluation forms should be applied, ceasing to use data indicators generated by commercial publishers as decisive evaluation criteria. Second, compliance with author copyright retention and timely OA should become a prerequisite or basis for research evaluation. For example, the University of Liège only conducts promotion and tenure reviews for researchers who deposit literature in institutional repositories [27]. Finally,

clear guidance should be provided for researchers' journal submissions, avoiding concentration in journals with academic misconduct or commercial profit orientation. Only by establishing scientific and reasonable evaluation and incentive mechanisms that incorporate author copyright retention and OA can conflicts between mandatory copyright retention and authors' career development be effectively coordinated, genuinely improving awareness and implementation.

4.4 Developing New Academic Communication Models

The OA movement has continuously driven innovation in academic communication models, with preprint platforms and open peer review flourishing. Preprints, bypassing peer review, offer high efficiency, rapid dissemination, and broad reach, enabling researchers to share findings with peers and the public more quickly. Open peer review makes evaluation processes and results more transparent. These new models adopt more open attitudes toward copyright, allowing authors to retain copyright and independently decide on sharing license forms. Preprints and open peer review provide alternatives to journal publishing for academic communication, dissemination, and evaluation, gaining increasing recognition and support. The NIH has expressed support for preprints [28], and cOAlition S states that academic papers undergoing independent peer review have equal value and status to those published in journals or platforms [29]. New academic communication models help eliminate inappropriate use of journal-based indicators in evaluation, promoting the return of evaluation authority. More importantly, their relaxed copyright provisions pressure restrictive publishers, potentially forcing them to continuously adjust copyright interest appropriation methods.

4.5 Adjusting the Copyright Interest Distribution Pattern

Since the 21st century, extensive acquisitions in the global publishing industry have concentrated numerous academic journals under a few large international publishers, which have essentially monopolized the research literature copyright market. As an important carrier of human creative achievements, research literature's irreplaceability means that monopolizing it causes immeasurable harm to public interest and scientific development. Analysis of stakeholder relationships reveals that publishers' excessive commercial profits from copyright are extremely unreasonable and have created significant conflicts. However, expecting publishers with advantageous positions to voluntarily relinquish benefits is unrealistic. While commercial publishers cannot be completely excluded from journal publishing, if they use monopoly positions to unreasonably raise prices and pursue excessive profits, other stakeholders should counteract through guided submissions, negotiations, litigation, and innovative communication models, ceasing to support harmful commercial publishing models. Only through proactive efforts by other stakeholders can publishers be forced to rebalance interest distribution, such as allowing partial copyright retention, providing more permissive sharing licenses, permitting immediate AAM archiving, and

improving OA pricing transparency. Although implementing author copyright retention may impact publishers' short-term interests, it aligns with most stakeholders' long-term demands. Only by actively adjusting interest distribution, seeking balance points, and exploring fair, reasonable, healthy, and sustainable academic journal publishing models and market mechanisms can consensus be gradually achieved, ultimately ensuring the public's free access to research information resources.

5 Implications for Chinese Academic Journals

Large Western international journal publishers (hereinafter “international publishers”) have long completed their transformation into specialized, systematic, and clustered digital publishing entities with systematic journal portfolios and professional publishing companies. Due to historical reasons, Chinese academic journal publishing involves two relatively independent entities: journal publishers and journal database providers (hereinafter “database providers”), which differs significantly from international publishers. Chinese academic journal publishers are scattered, small-scale, and unsystematic, unable to independently build clustered journal databases, thus relying on database providers for digital publishing. This coexistence of two separate yet closely related publishing entities creates more copyright issues and greater difficulty in interest coordination for Chinese academic journals. Although international copyright practices cannot be directly applied, international experience still offers valuable insights for Chinese academic journals in handling copyright issues against the backdrop of the OA movement.

5.1 Improving Copyright Agreements and Policies

International publishers integrate editorial offices and digital publishing functions into a single entity, with copyright agreements between authors and publishers having appropriate parties and clear content, and their official websites featuring very clear and detailed copyright and OA policies. In contrast, Chinese journal publishers handle manuscript submission, peer review, editing, and print publishing, while database providers handle digitization, database integration, and maintenance—two separate entities with different divisions of labor. Database providers, not directly receiving manuscripts, cannot sign copyright transfer or authorization agreements with authors, thus shifting the responsibility for obtaining copyright sub-licenses to publishers. Research by Zhang Yin [30] and Zhu Jian [31] found that sub-licensing clauses in Chinese journal publishers' copyright agreements are often missing or incomplete, creating dual infringement risks for publishers toward both authors and database providers after submitting literature to databases. Moreover, except for journals with international cooperation, most Chinese journal publishers have weak copyright awareness, with few specific copyright policies beyond declarations, and even those with OA journals rarely have complete policies [32], often lacking self-archiving policies [33], leaving copyright management in disarray. As China

increases copyright protection emphasis, we recommend that journal publishers enhance legal awareness, standardize copyright agreements, make sub-licensing a core component with clear terms on territory, methods, duration, and fees, and promptly develop copyright and OA policies that include copyright retention provisions.

5.2 Rejecting Exclusive Authorization Cooperation Models from Database Providers

Against the backdrop of digital dissemination becoming mainstream, Chinese database providers such as CNKI (China National Knowledge Infrastructure) and Wanfang Data have leveraged their advantageous positions to propose exclusive or sole cooperation agreements with publishers. CNKI, which indexes over 90% of China’s publicly published journals, has exclusive or sole authorization cooperation with 43% of these journals [34]—a staggering proportion. While exclusive cooperation appears to offer higher download revenue shares, calculations show the economic difference between exclusive and non-exclusive cooperation is not significant [34], yet it creates numerous negative issues: hindering author copyright retention implementation, inconveniencing readers, and narrowing journal impact and dissemination scope. This not only contradicts publishers’ original intention of joining databases to expand influence but also exacerbates inequality between publishers and database providers over time. In international practice, copyright exclusivity is an important factor in forming monopolies by large publishing groups. Therefore, to achieve literature sharing and circulation and maintain a healthy publishing ecosystem, we recommend Chinese journal publishers reject exclusive authorization cooperation with database providers.

5.3 Forming Integrated Journal Publishing Entities

Compared with international publishers’ integrated digital publishing systems, China’s separate system of publishers and database providers is considerably outdated, hindering Chinese journal brand building and complicating copyright management. In reality, journal “digital transformation” does not mean print publishing followed by digital publishing, as in current Chinese practice, but rather digital publishing replacing print publishing. Therefore, forming integrated digital publishing entities is the inevitable trend. In 2019, the China Association for Science and Technology and other departments jointly issued “Opinions on Deepening Reform and Cultivating World-Class Scientific and Technological Journals,” proposing to “achieve digital transformation of scientific journals, promote clustering and accelerate transition to conglomeration, and comprehensively enhance specialization and internationalization,” while requiring construction of digital knowledge service platforms that “integrate paper collection, editing, and publishing dissemination.” Therefore, China should promptly align with international standards by establishing integrated digital journal publishing systems. This would resolve current issues of copyright sub-

licensing and exclusive cooperation, lay foundations for developing scientific copyright policies and implementing copyright retention and OA, and enhance the international competitiveness and brand influence of Chinese academic journals while strengthening China's discourse power in global research publishing and evaluation.

Through investigation and analysis of international practices, we find that although the flourishing OA movement has forced publishers to gradually make concessions on copyright appropriation, promoting author copyright retention in journal publishing remains fraught with difficulties, with conflicts among stakeholders. This paper attempts to explore solutions to international conflicts and offers specific recommendations for China's separated publishing entities and interest conflicts based on international experience. However, this study only surveyed some foreign public funding agencies and large international publishers, potentially presenting a partial perspective. We will continue monitoring domestic and international developments and research on copyright retention.

China is a major global producer of research literature, yet insufficient emphasis on author copyright retention has caused serious outflow of high-quality literature copyrights for years. Therefore, China should enhance protection of literature achievements and increase research on author copyright retention. Domestically, timely reform should establish integrated digital journal publishing entities combining publishers and databases, fundamentally eliminating copyright authorization defects and exclusive cooperation issues to lay foundations for copyright retention rules. Internationally, China should strengthen its discourse power in global research publishing by promoting copyright retention and open access for Chinese academic literature published in foreign journals. Only then can we truly "write papers on the land of our motherland," promoting academic innovation and scientific self-reliance.

References

- [1] Gu Xiujie, Wang Yingjie. Research on Copyright Models of Foreign OA Journals Supporting Open Access[J]. *Library and Information*, 2012(04):62-69+119.
- [2] Ou Yan, Ge Shichao. Research on Copyright Policies of International Scientific Journal Publishers[J]. *Science-Technology and Publication*, 2021(05):115-119.
- [3] Xiao Dongmei. Copyright Acquisition, Transfer and Protection of Public Information Rights[J]. *Journal of Library Science in China*, 2006(04):91-94.
- [4] Fu Rong. Copyright of Open Access Journals[J]. *Chinese Journal of Scientific and Technical Periodicals*, 2007, 18(03):445-448.
- [5] ANSOFF H I. Corporate strategy: an analytic approach to business for growth and expansion [M]. New York: McGraw Hill, 1965:34.
- [6] Fu Junwen, Zhao Hong. A Review of Stakeholder Theory[J]. *Journal of Capital University of Economics and Business*, 2006(2):16-21.
- [7] Li Mingde. Intellectual Property Law[M]. Beijing: Social Sciences Academic

Press, 2007:57.

- [8] SPARC. Author rights: Using the SPARC author addendum[EB/OL].[2022-11-14].<https://sparcopen.org/our-work/author-rights/brochure-html/>.
- [9] SPARC. SPARC Author Rights Brochure[EB/OL].[2022-11-14].<https://sparcopen.org/our-work/author-rights/#background>.
- [10] MIT libraries. MIT amendment to publication agreement[EB/OL].[2022-10-30]. <https://libraries.mit.edu/scholarly/files/mitamendment2008rev1-without-faculty-policy-REVISED-for-White-House-Directive-2014-FINAL.pdf>.
- [11] MIT libraries. Updated MIT amendment to publication agreements released: incorporates new federal public access requirements. [EB/OL].[2022-10-30]. <https://libraries.mit.edu/news/versions-amendment/16883/>.
- [12] NIH public access policy. Frequently Asked Questions about the NIH Public Access Policy[EB/OL].[2022-10-30]. <https://publicaccess.nih.gov/faq.htm#778>.
- [13] CIHR. CIHR open access policy[EB/OL].[2022-10-30].<https://cihr-irsc.gc.ca/e/46068.html>.
- [14] ARC. Open access policy[EB/OL].[2022-10-30]. <https://www.arc.gov.au/about-arc/program-policies/open-access-policy>.
- [15] COALition S. Plan S Rights Retention Strategy[EB/OL].[2022-10-30].<https://www.coalition-s.org/rights-retention-strategy>.
- [16] PLOS. Open access[EB/OL].[2022-11-9].<https://plos.org/open-science/open-access/>.
- [17] SpringerOpen. What is SpringerOpen?[EB/OL].[2022-11-12].<https://www.springeropen.com/about/what-is-springeropen>.
- [18] Springer Nature. Open access policies for journals [EB/OL].[2022-11-12]<https://www.springernature.com/gp/open-research/policies/journal-policies>.
- [19] Elsevier. Article sharing[EB/OL].[2022-11-12].<https://www.elsevier.com/about/policies/sharing>.
- [20] Elsevier. Open access licenses[EB/OL].[2022-11-9].<https://www.elsevier.com/about/policies/open-access-licenses>.
- [21] Elsevier. Journal embargo finder [EB/OL].[2023-6-10]. <https://www.elsevier.com/open-access/journal-embargo-finder>.
- [22] COALition S. Plan S 2021 Annual Review[EB/OL].[2022-10-30].<https://www.coalition-s.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/01/Plan-S-annual-report-2021.pdf>.
- [23] Nature-News Q&A. Arguments over European open-access plan heat up[EB/OL].[2022-10-30].<https://www.nature.com/articles/d41586-018-07386-x>.
- [24] Lei Bing, Zhong Zhen. Analysis and Strategic Recommendations on Pricing Mechanism of Chinese Journal Databases from Social Welfare Perspective[J]. Chinese Journal of Scientific and Technical Periodicals, 2018, 29(10):963-970.
- [25] Springer Nature. Springer Nature announces gold open access options for Nature journals from January 2021[EB/OL].[2022-10-30].<https://group.springernature.com/gp/group/media/press-releases/springer-nature-announces-gold-oa-options-for-nature-journals/18614608>.
- [26] Elsevier. Elsevier expands Open Access options for Cell Press Journals from January 2021[EB/OL].[2022-10-30].<https://www.elsevier.com/about/press-releases/corporate/elsevier-expands-open-access-options-for-cell-press-journals->

from-january-2021.

- [27] BOAI. The Budapest Open Access Initiative:20th anniversary recommendations[EB/OL].[2022-10-30].<https://www.budapestopenaccessinitiative.org/boai20/>.
- [28] BARSH G S, BERGMAN C M, BROWN C D, et al. Bringing PLOS Genetics Editors to Preprint Servers[J]. PLoS Genetics, 2016, 12(12):e1006448.
- [29] COAlition S. Statement on peer reviewed publications[EB/OL].[2022-10-30].<https://www.coalition-s.org/statement-on-peer-reviewed-publications>.
- [30] Zhang Yin, Han Xinyue. Research on Standardized Application of Copyright Contracts in Academic Journals—Taking Chinese Library and Information Science Journals as Examples[J]. Library and Information Service, 2019, 63(12):22-28.
- [31] Zhu Jian. Ten Theses on the Relationship Between CNKI and Contributing Journals and Their Authors—Starting from Professor Zhao Dexin’s Lawsuit Against CNKI for Infringement[J]. Journal of Tsinghua University (Philosophy and Social Sciences Edition), 2022, 37(02):25-47+213.
- [32] Zhang Xinhe, He Xia Ziwei. Research on the Policy System and Content of Open Access for Chinese Academic Journals[J]. Library Tribune, 2019, 39(04):50-59.
- [33] Ding Xianfeng, Zhang Xinhe, Wu Jing. Research on the Current Situation and Formulation Strategies of Open Access Policies for Chinese Academic Journals[J]. Chinese Journal of Scientific and Technical Periodicals, 2018, 29(11):1078-1084.
- [34] Huang Changwu. Breaking Platform Barriers to Promote Healthy Development of Academic Journals[J]. Acta Editologica, 2022, 34(01):72-75.

[Author Contribution Statement]:

QUE Chenchen: Proposed the topic, collected materials, wrote and revised the paper;

YE Hangqing: Collected materials, provided writing guidance.

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

Source: ChinaXiv — Machine translation. Verify with original.