

Dissemination of Philosophy and Social Science Knowledge and Collaborative Governance in the Evolution of Academic Exchange Systems

ZHANG Yuxiang, ZHAO Xiaoya

2026-08-08

ChinaRxiv

Abstract

The construction of an autonomous knowledge system for Chinese philosophy and social sciences depends not only on theoretical innovation and disciplinary development, but also on an academic communication system capable of supporting knowledge production, dissemination, and evaluation. In the digital age, mechanisms of open access, peer review, academic evaluation, and knowledge dissemination are being continuously restructured. However, the field of philosophy and social sciences still faces governance dilemmas such as evaluation dependence, channel dependence, weak infrastructure, and institutional inertia. Starting from the evolution of the academic communication system, this paper analyzes the constraints imposed by these dilemmas on the construction of an autonomous knowledge system, and proposes a multi-actor collaborative governance framework with libraries as coordinating hubs. The analysis suggests that, by virtue of their role as public intermediaries, their capacity for knowledge organization, and their experience in infrastructure operation, libraries can play a connecting, translating, and supporting role among academic communities, publishing institutions, policymakers, and technology platforms. The paper further proposes localized practical pathways in four aspects: evaluation autonomy, dissemination security, infrastructure construction, and the co-building of an academic ecosystem, providing a reference for the governance of knowledge dissemination in philosophy and social sciences.

Full Text

Dissemination of Philosophy and Social Science Knowledge and Collaborative Governance in the Evolution of Academic Exchange Systems

—From the Perspective of Libraries as Coordinating Hubs*

ZHANG Yuxiang¹, ZHAO Xiaoya²

1. Library of Shandong University of Traditional Chinese Medicine, Jinan, 250355;
2. Institute of Information Studies, Qilu University of Technology (Shandong Academy of Sciences), Jinan, 250353

Abstract: Building an autonomous knowledge system for China's philosophy and social sciences depends not only on theoretical innovation and disciplinary development, but also on an academic exchange system capable of supporting knowledge production, dissemination, and evaluation. In the digital era, mechanisms for open access, peer review, academic evaluation, and knowledge dissemination are being continuously restructured; nevertheless, the field of philosophy and social sciences still faces governance difficulties such as evalu-

ation dependence, channel dependence, weak infrastructure, and institutional inertia. Starting from the evolution of the academic exchange system, this paper analyzes the constraints these difficulties impose on the construction of an autonomous knowledge system, and proposes a multi-actor collaborative governance framework with the library as a coordinating hub. The analysis suggests that, by virtue of their public intermediary attributes, knowledge-organization capabilities, and experience in infrastructure operation, libraries can play roles in connecting, translating, and supporting academic communities, publishers, policymakers, and technology platforms. The article further proposes localized practical pathways in four areas—evaluation autonomy, dissemination security, infrastructure development, and the co-construction of an academic ecosystem—thereby providing references for governance of knowledge dissemination in philosophy and social sciences.

Keywords: academic exchange system; philosophy and social sciences; autonomous knowledge system; collaborative governance; library role

Chinese Library Classification: G250.7

Knowledge Communication and Collaborative Governance in the Evolution of Scholarly Communication Systems for Philosophy and Social Sciences: A Library-Coordinated Hub Perspective

ZHANG Yuxiang¹, ZHAO Xiaoya²

1. Library of Shandong University of Traditional Chinese Medicine, Jinan, 250355, China;
2. Institute of Scientific and Technical Information, Qilu University of Technology (Shandong Academy of Sciences), Jinan, 250353, China

Abstract: The construction of an independent knowledge system in China's philosophy and social sciences (PSS) depends not only on theoretical innovation and disciplinary development, but also on a scholarly communication infrastructure that effectively supports knowledge production, dissemination, and evaluation. In the digital era, mechanisms such as open access, peer review, scholarly evaluation, and knowledge dissemination are undergoing continuous restructuring. However, the PSS field still faces persistent governance challenges, including evaluative dependency, channel reliance, weak infrastructure, and institutional inertia. This paper traces the evolution of scholarly communication systems and analyzes how these constraints impede the development of an autonomous knowledge system. It further proposes a multi-actor collaborative governance framework with the library as a coordinating hub. We argue that,

by virtue of its public intermediary role, robust knowledge organization capabilities, and experience in infrastructure operations, the library is well positioned to connect, translate, and support interactions among scholarly communities, publishers, policymakers, and technology platforms. The article further outlines localized pathways for practice in four dimensions—evaluative autonomy, dissemination security, infrastructure development, and collaborative academic ecosystem building—thereby offering actionable insights for the governance of knowledge communication in philosophy and social sciences.

Keywords: scholarly communication system; philosophy and social sciences; independent knowledge system; collaborative governance; library role

* Fund project: Educational Teaching Research Project of Shandong University of Traditional Chinese Medicine, “Open Science Literacy Education Research from Resource Cognition to Participatory Practice” (Project No.: ZX2026030).

Introduction

Building an autonomous knowledge system for Chinese philosophy and social sciences is a major strategic task facing China’s philosophy and social-science community at present [1]. However, an autonomous knowledge system is not only a theoretical issue, but also an issue of dissemination and evaluation systems: whether knowledge can obtain legitimacy recognition, whether it can be disseminated effectively, and whether it can gain visibility in the international academic arena profoundly affects the production and reproduction of autonomous knowledge. Viewed from the evolutionary history of the scholarly communication system, knowledge production has never been an isolated intellectual activity; rather, it is an institutionalized process embedded in particular communication media, evaluation systems, and infrastructures [2]. The system of academic journals, made possible by seventeenth-century printing technology, shaped the basic paradigm of modern disciplinary knowledge production. In this process of institutionalization, knowledge in philosophy and the social sciences developed forms of validation different from those in the natural sciences: its validity does not depend on experimental reproducibility, but on explanatory power, fit with experience, and normative legitimacy of value [3]. This naturally makes its evaluation criteria more contested and more dependent on context.

With the advent of the digital age, the Open Access (OA) movement has challenged subscription-based commercial publishing models; preprints have reshaped the temporal order of research dissemination; academic social networks have reconfigured modes of interaction among scholars; and algorithmic recommendation systems have changed the logic by which knowledge visibility is allocated. Yet digital transformation has brought not only improvements in efficiency, but also distinctive governance dilemmas in the field of philosophy and social sciences. Scholarly exchange and dissemination are important links in the knowledge-production system, while platforms for academic resource infor-

mation are also the infrastructure of the scholarly exchange and dissemination system. Therefore, innovating systems of scholarly exchange and dissemination with the construction of new platforms for academic information resources at their core has multiple significance for building China's autonomous knowledge system [4].

Nevertheless, the governance capacity of the current scholarly communication system has not yet adapted in step with the rapid changes of digital practice. This lag is not simply a technical or economic problem; in essence, it is a structural imbalance among evaluation systems, dissemination channels, platform rules, and public infrastructure. In the field of philosophy and social sciences, this imbalance is manifested collectively in fourfold difficulties: external dependence of evaluation standards, platform dependence of dissemination channels, insufficient supply of autonomous infrastructure, and institutional inertia in research management [5]. These difficulties urgently require the construction of a new collaborative governance framework capable of coordinating diverse interests, balancing multiple objectives, and possessing resilience and adaptability. As institutions that combine publicness, intermediary functions, embeddedness, and professionalism, academic libraries are expected to play the role of key coordinators in this governance network.

On this basis, the article raises two mutually related questions. First, after digitalization has restructured the scholarly communication system, why have mechanisms such as open access, peer review, scholarly evaluation, and platform-based dissemination transformed into deeper governance dilemmas in the field of philosophy and social sciences? Second, under conditions of differentiated multi-actor interests and insufficient infrastructural capacity, how can libraries participate in and govern knowledge dissemination as public intermediaries? The basic judgment of this article is that the problem of knowledge dissemination in philosophy and social sciences is not merely one of insufficient dissemination efficiency, but a systemic governance issue involving knowledge legitimacy, evaluation standards, platform rules, and control over public infrastructure.

1 The Evolution of the Scholarly Communication System in the Digital Age

The evolution of the current scholarly communication system is, in essence, an adaptive adjustment and structural reshaping of its internal core mechanisms in the digital environment [6]. The article analyzes the logic of its transformation and its governance implications from four perspectives: open access, peer review, scholarly evaluation, and knowledge dissemination (Table 1).

1.1 Open Access: From an APC Dilemma to Public Knowledge Infrastructure

Open access has developed from an idealist movement into an important force profoundly affecting the publishing landscape. Its core demand is to remove

barriers to reading, but in practice it has triggered a restructuring of the publishing economic model. The traditional subscription system transfers costs to readers or libraries, whereas gold OA shifts them to authors or their affiliated institutions. This transformation has produced a dual effect: on the one hand, it has indeed greatly improved the accessibility of published research outputs; on the other hand, high article processing charges (APCs) may intensify inequalities in research resources and create new barriers to publication for researchers at resource-poor institutions [7].

Unlike commercial publishing in the natural sciences, which is highly dependent on the APC model, philosophy and social-science fields can rely more on state public investment to realize public-interest-oriented openness and to highlight their character as public goods. However, challenges likewise remain. In international scholarly communication, Chinese scholars in relevant fields still depend heavily on Western commercial publishing platforms for releasing their research outputs. This not only causes large outflows of funding, but also subjects the international dissemination of Chinese academic discourse to the platform rules of others. How to embrace the concept of open science while maintaining philosophy

The autonomy and security of social science knowledge dissemination are governance questions that urgently require answers. At a deeper level, the OA movement is promoting the extension of academic exchange from the openness of literature to the openness of data and processes. Yet the research-process elements of the philosophical and social sciences—such as survey data, interview records, and policy-analysis frameworks—are more strongly dependent on context, and their open sharing faces ethical and legal constraints more complex than those in the natural sciences.

Table 1 Technological Reconstruction of the Four Major Mechanisms of Academic Exchange in the Digital Era and Challenges for the Philosophical and Social Sciences

Mechanism	Changes in Power Brought by Digitalization	Risks for the Philosophical and Social Sciences	Governance Orientation
Open access	Publication costs are reallocated from the reader side to the author side, the institutional side, and the platform side.	APC gatekeeping, copyright control, and dependence on external platforms may affect the public nature of knowledge.	Develop diamond OA, institutional knowledge repositories, public open platforms, and cost-transparency mechanisms.

Mechanism	Changes in Power Brought by Digitalization	Risks for the Philosophical and Social Sciences	Governance Orientation
Peer review	Quality certification is expanding from the closed-journal process to open review and post-preprint review.	Review standards may contain disciplinary preferences and external theoretical frameworks, affecting the legitimacy of knowledge rooted in Chinese experience.	Build open-review mechanisms and reviewer-capacity training systems with the participation of local academic communities.
Academic evaluation	Evaluation is expanding from journal-level indicators to the content of outputs, social impact, and open practices.	Dependence on journal reviews and external databases may shape topic selection, methods, and publication strategies.	Construct multidimensional indicators such as representative-work evaluation, policy influence, Chinese-language academic dissemination, and open contributions.
Knowledge dissemination	Dissemination is shifting from linear journal channels to platformized, algorithmic, and networked distribution.	Commercial platforms may influence the visibility of knowledge through inclusion, ranking, recommendation, and indicator displays.	Build open, interoperable, auditable public dissemination infrastructure that can be preserved over the long term.

1.2 Peer Review: The Balance Between Quality Control and Discursive Power Among Schools of Thought

As the gatekeeper of academic quality, peer review has encountered a triple crisis of trust, efficiency, and incentives in the digital era. An opaque review process may lead to biases that cannot be supervised; lengthy review cycles conflict with the demand for the rapid iteration of research outputs; and reviewing, as a form

of unpaid or low-paid academic labor, also faces questions of sustainability [8]. In response to these challenges, reform experiments such as open review and post-preprint review are being carried out worldwide.

In the field of the philosophical and social sciences, the particularities of peer review are especially pronounced. The evaluation of research in the philosophical and social sciences, unlike in the natural sciences, cannot be verified through the repeatability of experiments; judgments of quality depend heavily on reviewers' academic positions, theoretical preferences, and school affiliations. This means that peer review is not only a technical form of quality control, but also involves the allocation of academic discursive power and competition among schools of thought [9]. At present, the peer-review systems of international journals in the philosophical and social sciences are, to a large extent, dominated by Western academic communities, and their review standards often take Western academic traditions as the default frame of reference. This implicit output of standards often places Chinese scholars' research, when evaluated by international journals, in a predicament of "not being acclimatized," and also makes it difficult for research questions and methodologies suited to the Chinese context to obtain equal international recognition.

1.3 The Predicament of Academic Evaluation: From Journal-Based Paper Evaluation to Evaluative Autonomy

The journal-based paper-evaluation model centered on journal impact factors has long dominated research evaluation. It has distorted research behavior, strengthened the monopolistic position of journals, and cannot effectively identify the value of open-science practices. In the field of the philosophical and social sciences, the harms of journal-based paper evaluation are particularly severe. It is not merely a methodological simplification; more directly, it has led to the implicit dominance of Western academic standards over Chinese academic evaluation. When the professional-title review of a Chinese university, a graduate-student thesis defense, or the completion assessment of a research project all take publication in international journals indexed by SSCI or A&HCI as the basis, Chinese scholars are compelled to produce knowledge according to the agenda-setting, theoretical frameworks, and discourse norms of the Western academic world. The deeper consequence of this evaluative logic is that the problem consciousness of research in China's philosophical and social sciences is drawn along by Western academic agendas, theoretical innovation is confined to the extension of Western paradigms, and Chinese experience is ultimately interpreted through Western frameworks. This is precisely the greatest institutional obstacle to building an autonomous knowledge system.

The core direction of reform is to shift from dependence on a single journal indicator toward a **multidimensional value evaluation** based on the output itself. This includes introducing alternative metrics (Altmetrics) to capture the social influence of research outputs; advocating responsible research evaluation, such as the value assessment based on the research content itself as guided by

the *San Francisco Declaration on Research Assessment* (DORA); and exploring approaches based on local academic communities

...specific evaluation mechanisms, such as the reflections and explorations of scholars including the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences Evaluation Studies [10], the Renmin University of China Center for Book and Newspaper Materials [11], and Ye Jiyuan [12]. China's indigenous evaluation system for philosophy and social sciences is moving from concept to practice.

1.4 Knowledge Dissemination: Discourse Security in the Era of Platforms for Philosophy and Social Sciences

The channels of knowledge dissemination have undergone a revolutionary expansion. The traditional linear channels constituted by journals, conferences, and libraries have already been covered by a complex, networked, platformized ecosystem [13]. Academic search engines determine researchers' visibility through algorithms, while academic social networks blur the boundary between formal and informal exchange. This change has a dual impact on the dissemination of knowledge in philosophy and social sciences. On the positive side, platformization has greatly improved the efficiency and coverage of knowledge dissemination, enabling the research outputs of Chinese scholars to enter the global academic field of vision more conveniently. Yet the challenges are equally prominent: first, algorithmic recommendation may create information cocoons, narrowing scholars' academic horizons through the recommendation logic of commercial platforms. Second, there is a fundamental tension between the private ownership of commercial platforms and the public nature of academic knowledge; platform rules are controlled by commercial companies, and the publicness of academic dissemination gives way to commercial interests. Third, the dissemination of knowledge in philosophy and social sciences involves ideological security and discursive power competition. Building autonomously controllable infrastructure for disseminating philosophy and social science knowledge is therefore strategically urgent. In recent years, several infrastructure projects, including the National Philosophy and Social Sciences Literature Center [14] and Academic World¹, have been put into use, providing solid support for the generation, dissemination, and application of an autonomous knowledge system.

2 The Special Governance Logic of Knowledge Dissemination in Philosophy and Social Sciences

Analyzing changes in the academic exchange system solely at the technical level is still insufficient to explain the special governance needs of knowledge dissemination in philosophy and social sciences. Compared with the natural sciences, knowledge in philosophy and social sciences relies more heavily on interpretive frameworks, value standpoints, historical experience, and the legitimacy certification of academic communities. Therefore, this paper analyzes the issue from five levels: knowledge legitimacy, the generation of local knowledge, dissemina-

Figure 1: Multilevel theoretical explanatory framework for the dissemination of philosophy and social science knowledge

Figure 1: Figure 1: Multilevel theoretical explanatory framework for the dissemination of philosophy and social science knowledge

tion visibility, publishing institutions, and open governance. These five levels respectively answer the questions of how knowledge is recognized, how it is produced, how it is seen, how it is institutionalized, and how it is governed, together forming the theoretical chain for understanding the dissemination of knowledge in philosophy and social sciences (Figure 1).

Figure 1 Multilevel theoretical explanatory framework for the dissemination of philosophy and social science knowledge

^{^1} Note: Academic World is developed by the Renmin University of China Center for Book and Newspaper Materials. It includes *Philosophy and Social Sciences Literature*, *Philosophy and Social Sciences Preprints*, and the *Philosophy and Social Sciences Think-Tank Workshop*, among others, and has become important academic infrastructure in the field of philosophy and social sciences. Website: <http://zlzx.ruc.edu.cn/>.

2.1 The Plural Construction of Knowledge Legitimacy

Sociology of science concerns itself with the process by which scientific knowledge obtains recognition within institutional structures. The legitimacy of traditional systems of academic exchange depends heavily on an authority system constructed by journal rankings, peer review, and citation networks. However, the construction of legitimacy for knowledge in philosophy and the social sciences is more complex than in the natural sciences: it depends not only on consensus within the academic community, but is also profoundly shaped by national ideology, cultural traditions, and struggles over linguistic power.

From the perspective of sociology of science, the core problem facing the construction of China's autonomous knowledge system is how to establish an independent foundation of legitimacy for Chinese knowledge in philosophy and the social sciences within the existing international academic certification system. This requires, while participating in global academic dialogue, the establishment of local evaluation and certification mechanisms that do not depend on Western journal-ranking systems [15]. In this process, libraries can, by promoting institutional open-access policies, supporting open peer-review experiments, and providing professional research data-management services, embed the normative depth of autonomous knowledge production into the institutional logic of academic exchange [16].

2.2 Local Knowledge and the Construction of an Autonomous Knowledge System

The sociology of knowledge emphasizes the transformation of modes of knowledge production and their interactive symbiosis with social structures [17]. From the perspective of the sociology of knowledge, all knowledge is local in origin; it is rooted in specific cultural traditions, historical experience, and social practice. The reason knowledge in Western philosophy and the social sciences is regarded as universal knowledge is not that it is naturally universal, but that Western economic and political hegemony has universalized its particular experience.

The construction of China's autonomous knowledge system is, in essence, a response to this Western universalist conception of knowledge. It requires that, on the premise of acknowledging the local origins of knowledge, new knowledge with universal explanatory power be refined from the great practice of Chinese-style modernization. The implication of this theoretical perspective for library practice is that libraries should not passively collect and disseminate universal knowledge from Western academic systems; rather, they should actively participate in the production, organization, and dissemination of local knowledge. This includes systematically collecting and preserving research outputs in Chinese philosophy and the social sciences, building specialized databases that reflect Chinese academic networks, and promoting the international dissemination of local academic achievements [18].

2.3 Visibility of Dissemination and Discursive Security in the Platform Era

Information dissemination theory provides a core tool for analyzing the mechanisms by which academic knowledge flows. In digital environments, the efficiency and pathways of information distribution depend heavily on platform architectures and algorithmic logic [19]. Commercial academic platforms manipulate the visibility of knowledge through opaque recommendation algorithms, thereby eroding the publicity and neutrality that academic exchange should possess.

Unlike knowledge in the natural sciences, the international dissemination of knowledge in philosophy and the social sciences is a strategic activity involving the export of values, cultural identity, and competition for discursive power. Allowing Chinese knowledge in philosophy and the social sciences to be carried and disseminated by Western commercial platforms means that the visibility, dissemination pathways, and reception effects of Chinese academic discourse are all constrained by others' commercial logic and algorithmic black boxes. In the face of this challenge, libraries can provide crucial alternative public channels for academic dissemination by building and maintaining open, interoperable, and auditable information infrastructures [20], such as institutional repositories, discovery systems based on open protocols, and academic data platforms, thereby striving to reduce the negative effects of algorithmic black boxes while observing

public standards.

2.4 The Return of the Public-Goods Attribute of Academic Publishing

Academic publishing is the core hub of the academic exchange system. While traditional subscription-based publishing models ensure quality control, they have also systematically created barriers and inequalities in access to knowledge. The deeper significance of the open-access movement lies in the reaffirmation and institutional return of the public-goods attribute of academic publishing [21].

In the field of philosophy and the social sciences, the public-goods attribute of academic publishing is even more evident. Yet at present, a large number of research outputs by Chinese scholars in philosophy and the social sciences are published in journals of foreign commercial publishers. This not only results in publicly funded research outcomes being collected a second time by commercial companies, but also requires that academic publishing return to a framework of public governance [22]. Specifically, first, vigorously develop open publishing models with no APCs, such as Diamond OA, so as to reduce the financial pressure on scholars and institutions; second, cultivate a cluster of China-based, world-oriented public academic journals and break the monopoly of foreign commercial publishing; third, promote a new publishing model of “platform-first release + journal publication.” In this process, libraries should actively transform from purchasers of journal resources and payers of fees into advocates and promoters of publishing-model reform.

2.5 The Tension Between the Open-Science Ethos and Knowledge Sovereignty

Open science is a complex, integrated governance system encompassing data, publishing, evaluation, and ethics. The open-science ethos advocates the free flow and sharing of knowledge, which is highly consistent with the publicness demanded by the dissemination of knowledge in philosophy and the social sciences [23]. However, there is a profound tension between the open ethos and knowledge sovereignty. In the field of philosophy and the social sciences, this tension is especially acute. On the one hand, concepts such as open access and open data help break the monopoly of Western commercial publishers and promote the universal sharing of knowledge. On the other hand, indiscriminate comprehensive openness may endanger national ideological security and cultural security. Some research findings in philosophy and the social sciences involve sensitive areas such as national strategies, social systems, and history and culture, and their dissemination requires prudent governance.

How to establish a governance framework for knowledge in philosophy and the social sciences that meets national security requirements while embracing the open-science ethos is a topic requiring continuous exploration. By virtue of their

cross-disciplinary and cross-departmental neutrality and organizational position, libraries can play a unique coordinating role in formulating institutional open-science policies, participating in the governance of research integrity and ethics, and providing sustainable research-data preservation services [24].

3 Fourfold Governance Obstacles to Building an Autonomous Knowledge System

The preceding analysis shows that the difficulties facing the dissemination of knowledge in philosophy and the social sciences are not caused by any single link, but are the result of the combined effects of open publishing, peer review, academic evaluation, platform dissemination, and research-management systems. In general, these difficulties can be summarized into four aspects: dependence on evaluation, dependence on channels, weak infrastructure, and institutional inertia (Figure 2). They are not isolated from one another: dependence on evaluation affects researchers' choices about where to publish; dependence on channels affects the international visibility of research outputs; weak infrastructure undermines autonomous dissemination capacity; and institutional inertia enables existing patterns of evaluation and dissemination to be continually reproduced.

flowchart TB

A[Fourfold governance obstacles to building China's autonomous knowledge system]

A --> B[Dependence of the evaluation system
• SSCI/A&HCI have become hard indicators

A --> C[Dependence on dissemination channels
 Publishing and distribution are monop

A --> D[Weakness of infrastructure
 Insufficient autonomous open platforms
 Pre

B --> E[Institutional inertia of institutional arrangements

I. The simplified e

C --> E

D --> E

Figure 2 Fourfold governance obstacles to building China's autonomous knowledge system and their transmission mechanisms

3.1 External Dependence of Evaluation Standards

The current academic evaluation system is, to a considerable extent, dependent on the Western journal-ranking system, forming entrenched inertia at the institutional, behavioral, and cultural levels. The continued operation of this dependent evaluation system directly dissolves the epistemological foundation of "autonomy": when evaluation standards are not in one's own hands, there is no way to speak of "autonomy." More specifically, through the selection of evaluation indicators, database inclusion standards, and the setting of journal quartiles, this external dependence potentially and tacitly influences researchers' choices of topics, research methods, and writing strategies, causing Chinese research in philosophy and the social sciences to be incorporated, to a considerable degree, into externally dominated problem frameworks.

3.2 Platform Dependence of Dissemination Channels

The international dissemination of Chinese philosophical and social-science knowledge is highly dependent on Western commercial academic platforms. Elsevier, Springer Nature, Taylor & Francis, and other transnational publishing groups control the publication and distribution of most academic journals worldwide. For Chinese scholars' research outputs to enter the international academic field of vision, they must, to a great extent, be published through these platforms. The risks brought by this dependence cover many aspects, including the economy, discourse power, and security; especially for research outputs in philosophy and the social sciences, it constitutes a strategic vulnerability that cannot be ignored.

3.3 Insufficient Supply of Infrastructure for Independent Academic Exchange

For a long time, China has lacked independently controllable infrastructure for academic exchange in philosophy and the social sciences. In terms of open access, there is a lack of public-interest open-access platforms with international influence; in terms of preprints, it was not until 2024 that the first preprint platform covering all disciplines appeared in the field of philosophy and the social sciences (PSSXiv); in terms of main-text literature

25

, there is a lack of a domestic citation database with academic evaluation functions like Web of Science; and in terms of academic social networking, there is a lack of a local academic social network with international competitiveness. This weakness at the infrastructure level has left China's academic community without institutionalized channels for independently organizing knowledge production, certification, and dissemination.

3.4 Institutional Inertia in the Research-Management System

The above threefold obstacles continue to exist because their deeper cause lies in institutional inertia. A simplified evaluation system centered on journal impact factors has been in use for decades, forming stable institutional expectations and patterns of interest. Research-management departments tend to adopt quantitative indicators to avoid subjective disputes; high-impact-factor journals and large publishing groups lack incentives for reform; and the operational difficulty of multidimensional evaluation far exceeds that of consulting journal rankings. This institutional inertia means that any reform attempting to break the existing pattern of evaluation and dissemination faces enormous resistance. This is not only a technical or conceptual issue, but also a problem of the reproduction of organizational behavior and interest structures.

4 Libraries as Coordinating Hubs for the Dissemination of Philosophical and Social-Science Knowledge

In the face of the above systemic obstacles, local optimization by a single actor is already insufficient to promote the healthy evolution of the system

26

. This article proposes a multi-actor collaborative-governance framework with the library as the core coordinator, and attempts to answer what role libraries can ultimately play in the field of philosophy and the social sciences in constructing China's independent knowledge system.

4.1 The Theoretical Basis of Collaborative Governance and the Hub Positioning of Libraries

Collaborative Governance Theory emphasizes the participation of multiple actors, goal consensus, and resource sharing. What distinguishes it from cooperation or coordination is that it involves consensus-building amid interest contests, institutional design in the allocation of power, and dynamic balancing among multiple goals. Libraries can become the core hub of governance for the dissemination of philosophical and social-science knowledge

27

28

, owing to their distinctive institutional attributes. Specifically, these are manifested as follows: first, publicness. The mission of libraries is to guarantee fair access to knowledge, which makes libraries naturally stand on the side of knowledge as a public good, rather than on the side of commercial interests or school-based interests. Second, neutrality. Libraries do not participate in academic competition and do not belong to any particular discipline or school; they can establish trust among different academic communities. Third, embeddedness. Libraries are deeply embedded in the entire process of research and teaching, maintain continuous and close interactive relationships with researchers, and deeply understand researchers' real needs. Fourth, professionalism. Libraries possess professional skills in information organization, digital preservation, and knowledge services.

Therefore, the hub position of libraries is not a central position in the sense of administrative power, but a coordinating position in the sense of a functional network. Compared with publishing institutions, libraries are better able to safeguard the public-good nature of knowledge; compared with research-management departments, libraries are closer to the research process and researchers' needs; compared with commercial technology platforms, libraries place

greater emphasis on open standards, long-term preservation, and public responsibility. Libraries do not directly replace theoretical innovation or academic evaluation judgments, but they can provide stable institutional support for multi-actor governance through resource organization, standards development, data services, and platform collaboration.

4.2 The Collaborative-Governance Role of Libraries

Based on the above positioning, the role of libraries in helping build China's independent knowledge system in the field of philosophy and the social sciences can be understood from four dimensions (Figure 3).

- (1) **Promoting evaluation autonomy.** By providing influence-evaluation tools based on alternative metrics and analysis of research-output content, libraries can offer more refined decision-making references for research-management departments. In the field of philosophy and the social sciences, libraries can develop 符合

China's academic context [29], promoting the transition from evaluation based on "whether it is published" to evaluation based on "quality." For example, they may participate in formulating reform plans for academic evaluation at the institutional level, incorporating diversified outcomes such as preprints, data contributions, and policy impact into the evaluation horizon; use data-analytics capabilities to provide empirical support for reform of evaluation systems; and promote the institutionalization of existing localized evaluation models.

- (2) **Safeguarding dissemination security.** Libraries are important public channels for the dissemination of knowledge in philosophy and the social sciences. Through such infrastructure as institutional repositories, open-access acquisition platforms, and discipline-navigation systems, they constitute an important line of defense against the erosion of academic dissemination by commercial logic. Examples include actively participating in the construction of national academic exchange platforms; promoting the interconnection of institutional repositories with the Philosophy and Social Sciences Preprint Platform (PSSXiv); providing scholars with open-access publishing-route navigation; and reducing dependence on single commercial platforms [30].

- (3) **Jointly building infrastructure.** Libraries should be deeply involved in the construction and operation of infrastructure for autonomous academic exchange. Examples include participating in the content construction and standards formulation of the Philosophy and Social Sciences Main-Text Platform; providing professional services such as publishing platforms and editorial systems for diamond OA journals; and promoting the adoption of open standards (such as ORCID and the COAR Resource Sync protocol). Libraries' professional capabilities in information organization, metadata management, and digital preservation are precisely what infrastructure construction urgently requires [31].

(4) **Empowering the academic ecosystem.** Libraries should empower researchers in philosophy and the social sciences to master the ability to produce and disseminate autonomous knowledge through systematic literacy education and services embedded in the entire research process. Examples include carrying out open-science literacy education for researchers at different career stages; providing integrated support such as data-management plan preparation, open-publishing-route navigation, and academic-identity identifier registration; helping scholars identify the implicit assumptions of Western academic discourse; and strengthening awareness of academic subjectivity.

Figure 3. The library's four-dimensional roles and layered action pathways

- **Collaborative-governance goal layer**
 - Evaluation assistance | Dissemination security | Infrastructure autonomy | Academic-ecosystem health
- **Collaborative action layer**
 - **Policy makers**
(funding agencies/government)
Evidence support
 - **Technology platforms**
(commercial/open-source/developers)
Standards co-construction
 - **Library** (coordination hub)
 - Policy consultation; policy translation
 - Advocacy for algorithmic transparency; leading infrastructure
 - Publicness | Intermediacy | Embeddedness | Professionalism
 - Literacy education and capacity development
 - Conversion protocols and diamond OA support
 - Open peer review and publishing-ecosystem co-construction
 - **Academic community**
(researchers)
 - **Publishing institutions**
(commercial/nonprofit)
 - **Scholarly societies / journal editorial offices**
- **Collaborative mechanism layer** (institutional design and process assurance)
 - Consensus building | Allocation of powers and responsibilities | Information sharing | Trust building

4.3 Collaboration Between Libraries and Academic Communities

In collaboration with academic communities, the core functions of libraries need to shift from providing resources toward cultivating research capacity and empowering awareness of autonomous knowledge production. In the field of philosophy and the social sciences, the focus of library work should shift from pro-

viding literature to cultivating subjects. First, open-science literacy education should be provided. Libraries should systematically conduct training programs for researchers at different stages, covering the preparation of data-management plans, the choice of open-publishing routes, intellectual property rights, compliant use of AI tools, and other topics, helping researchers acquire the practical capacities needed to practice open science [32]. Second, peer-review capacity should be built. Libraries can give full play to their strengths in organization and coordination by offering training in new review models such as open review and rapid review, helping researchers understand and participate in them, and enhancing the academic community's autonomy in quality control. Third, integrated service platforms should be developed. Through the continuous operation of institutional repositories, the promotion of preprint platforms, and the provision of ORCID

registration support and other services, providing researchers with a low-threshold, integrated support pathway for practicing open science and transforming the concept of open science into actionable practice in everyday research.

4.4 Collaboration Between Libraries and Publishing Institutions

Libraries and publishing institutions are shifting from a simple procurement relationship toward becoming co-builders of, and drivers of change in, the publishing ecosystem. First is collective negotiation for transformative agreements. By forming or joining alliances at regional, national, and even international levels, libraries engage in dialogue with commercial publishing groups through collective bargaining over transformative agreements, aiming to promote a smooth transition in which content subscribed to by institutions becomes fully open at a sustainable cost structure [33]. Second is exploration of the diamond OA model. Libraries should participate deeply in, and even take the lead in, exploring and practicing nonprofit publishing models such as diamond open access. This includes supporting scholar-led journal creation, providing basic infrastructure for editorial publishing, and undertaking professional services such as coordination of peer-review processes [34], thereby leveraging libraries' professional value upstream in the publishing value chain. Third is transparency in publishing processes. By advocating for and participating in practices such as open peer review and open-data-linked publishing, libraries can promote the visualization and verifiability of the publishing process and reshape an academic communication ecosystem led by the scholarly community.

4.5 Collaboration Between Libraries and Policymakers

In collaboration with funding agencies and governments, libraries play the dual role of policy consultants and implementation agents. In the field of philosophy and social sciences, libraries should become participants in the design of policies

for constructing autonomous knowledge systems. First is evidence support and policy consultation. They should systematically collect empirical information such as article-publication data in institutional philosophy and social science research, APC expenditures, and journal usage, providing data support for the formulation of national-level open science strategies and reform plans for evaluation systems [35]. Second is policy translation and implementation. Libraries need to assume the function of policy translators, converting macro-level policy directives into clear and operable implementation rules, workflows, and support services within their own institutions [36]. This includes providing researchers with personalized compliance consultations and developing policy-adaptability self-check tools. Third is a communication and feedback mechanism. Regular communication channels should be established between researchers and policymakers so that real challenges and needs on the research front line can be promptly conveyed to the policymaking level, forming a policy feedback loop.

4.6 Collaboration Between Libraries and Technology Platforms

In collaboration with technology platforms and developers, libraries are firm advocates of public value and open standards. In the field of philosophy and social sciences, libraries should actively participate in the governance of autonomous technological infrastructure. First is advocacy for algorithmic transparency. As collective representatives of academic users' rights and interests, libraries should proactively require large commercial academic platforms, search engines, and social networks to improve the transparency and auditability of their recommendation algorithms, and should engage in dialogue and oversight regarding issues such as data ownership, privacy protection, and the public nature of knowledge dissemination, so as to resist the potential encroachment of "algorithmic black boxes" on the freedom of academic inquiry [37]. Second is construction of public infrastructure. Libraries should directly lead or deeply participate in the development and maintenance of core academic infrastructure based on open standards and open-source software. This includes investing in or cooperatively developing next-generation open discovery systems, technical platforms supporting open peer review, open annotation tools, and middleware that promotes cross-platform interoperability. Third is prevention of technological and ethical risks [38]. Libraries should participate in formulating industry norms for AI-generated content identification and data privacy protection, and conduct forward-looking institutional design targeting risks such as algorithmic bias and the Matthew effect, so as to ensure that technological development serves the free flow and equitable access of academic knowledge.

5 Localization Implementation Strategies

Applying the above collaborative governance framework to the Chinese context requires combining the characteristics of the country's research system,

level of informatization, and institutional culture, and formulating practical and forward-looking localization strategies (Figure 3).

5.1 Deeply Embed the National High-End Platform Strategy and Strengthen the Role of Public Infrastructure

Libraries should participate at three levels in the construction of the “National High-End Exchange Platform for Scientific Research Papers and Scientific and Technological Information” [39]. First, content construction. They should systematically organize their institutions’ academic achievements in philosophy and social sciences, upload them in accordance with unified metadata specifications to platforms such as Academic World, and establish a mechanism for continuously updating outputs. Second, standards formulation. They should participate in the platform standards working group, promote the adoption of international open standards, and at the same time ensure China’s discursive authority in standards development. Third, service innovation. Based on platform data, they should develop value-added services such as disciplinary development trend analysis and compliance diagnosis for open access, transforming platform capabilities into support tools for teaching and research. At the institutional level, libraries should take the lead in formulating their own institutions’ open science roadmaps and organically integrate them into university “Double First-Class” construction or the “15th Five-Year Plan” phase

planning.

5.2 Exploring a Chinese Path for Open Access Based on the Dual-Track Parallelism of Transformative Agreements and Diamond OA

The advancement of open access in China requires a dual-track strategy of external negotiation and internal capacity building. Externally, China should strengthen the collaborative negotiating capacity of institutions such as the Digital Resource Acquisition Alliance of Chinese Academic Libraries (DRAA), and build synergy in negotiations over transformative agreements with major international publishing groups. Internally, priority should be given to cultivating clusters of diamond OA journals led by national-level societies and top research institutions. In the field of philosophy and social sciences, efforts should be based on national platforms such as the Digital Innovation Platform for the Independent Knowledge System of Chinese Philosophy and Social Sciences, guiding more philosophy and social science journals to transform toward diamond OA. Libraries should actively participate in this process by providing professional services such as publishing platforms and editorial systems for diamond OA journals.

5.3 Forward-Looking Deployment of Governance and Service Capabilities for AI for Science

AI for Science is driving a profound transformation of the scientific research paradigm toward data- and algorithm-driven research [40]. Libraries must move beyond passive response and build a support system integrating “capacity building-service innovation-ethical governance.” In the field of philosophy and social sciences, AI governance has particular urgency. First, capacity building. Systematic AI-empowered research literacy training should be provided for philosophy and social science researchers, covering the compliant use of large-model tools, data and algorithm ethics, prompt engineering, and so forth. Second, service innovation. Exploration should be undertaken of intelligent literature review generation tools and disciplinary knowledge graphs based on large language models [41]. Third, ethical governance. Research management departments, information technology departments, and ethics committees should work together to formulate localized guidelines for AI-assisted research and standards for generated-content identification, and establish risk-prevention mechanisms for risks such as algorithmic black boxes and data bias. In the field of philosophy and social sciences, special attention must also be paid to the challenge posed by AI-generated content to academic integrity—namely, how to identify AI ghostwriting and how to define the boundaries of AI-assisted academic contributions.

5.4 Deep Participation in Building the Preprint Ecosystem for Philosophy and Social Sciences

Libraries should go beyond simple publicity for preprints and participate deeply in building the ecosystem of philosophy and social science preprint platforms (such as PSSXiv), thereby achieving a role transformation from promoter to builder. Specifically, libraries can undertake more active organizational and intermediary functions: for example, serving as coordinators of preprint review and organizing rapid, open peer review; developing tools that link preprints with subsequently formally published literature, thereby connecting the full chain of scholarly-output dissemination; and incorporating “post-review preprints” that have undergone community review and quality certification into the collection, preservation, and evaluation systems of institutional knowledge bases [42]. These measures can provide researchers with a rapid, transparent, and credible channel for disseminating results, effectively complement the traditional publishing system, promote the early dissemination and collaboration of high-quality research outputs, and at the same time consolidate the library’s key nodal position in new processes of academic communication.

Conclusion

The core question this article seeks to answer is why, against the background of the digital reshaping of academic communication systems, the dissemination

of philosophy and social science knowledge cannot accomplish self-adjustment solely by relying on market-oriented platforms, external evaluation indicators, or a single administrative force. The study shows that dependence on evaluation, reliance on channels, weak infrastructure, and institutional inertia together constitute structural constraints on the construction of an autonomous knowledge system. Unlike existing studies, which focus on open access, academic evaluation, or the transformation of library services, this article places libraries within the governance network of academic communication and emphasizes their functional value as public intermediaries and infrastructure operators. Future governance of philosophy and social science knowledge dissemination should form a dynamic balance among autonomy, openness, and security. Autonomy is not closure, openness does not mean loss of control, and security should not become a mechanism that blocks the flow of knowledge. The key value of libraries lies precisely in safeguarding knowledge security through publicness, supporting evaluation autonomy through professionalism, and promoting international dialogue through openness.

References

- [1] Wang Xuedian. Three paths for constructing China's autonomous knowledge system [J]. People's Tribune · Academic Frontiers, 2025, (21): 12-20.
- [2] Meadows A J. The scientific paper as an archaeological artefact [J]. Journal of Information Science, 1985, 11(1): 27-30.
- [3] Research Group of the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences Evaluation Studies, Jing Linbo, Du Hongwei. Evaluation system for philosophy and social sciences with Chinese characteristics in the new era ... Construction and Prospects of the Evaluation System[J]. Chinese Social Sciences Evaluation, 2026, (2): 23-43, 153-154.
- [4] Lin Shangli. Activating the Academic System with the Construction of a New Academic Information Resource Platform at the Core[N]. Beijing Daily, 2025-05-12.
- [5] Zhang Shuhua. Changes in the World and the Study of China—On the Historical Background and Direction of Efforts in Constructing China's Independent Knowledge System[J]. Academic Research, 2025, (10): 1-6, 177.
- [6] Han Mingyue. Explorations and Implications of Reform in Academic Exchange Systems in the First Half of the Twentieth Century[J]. Chinese Journal of Scientific and Technical Periodicals, 2025, 36(2): 175-182.
- [7] Ford Y A, Alemneh G D. Inclusive global scholarly communication: Toward a just and healthier information ecosystem[J]. Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology, 2024, 75(10): 1058-1069.
- [8] Nosek B A, Bar-Anan Y. Scientific Utopia: I. Opening scientific communication[J]. Psychological Inquiry, 2012, 23(3): 217-243.
- [9] Su Jinyan. Acceptance of Open Peer Review and Review Quality—Empirical Evidence from the Field of Humanities and Social Sciences in China[J]. World

Social Sciences, 2025, (5): 178-193, 246-247.

[10] Jing Linbo, Qiu Wanhui. Research Progress on the Evaluation of Philosophy and Social Sciences in China in the New Era: Theory and Practice[J]. Journal of Renmin University of China, 2023, 37(2): 168-181.

[11] Xu Yongjun, Yang Hongyan, Liu Pingping. Standards and Examples: Research on the Evaluation of Original Academic Theories in Chinese Philosophy and Social Sciences[J]. Journal of Renmin University of China, 2025, 39(4): 1-12.

[12] Ye Jiyuan. Problems and Approaches in Building an Evaluation System for Philosophy and Social Sciences with Chinese Characteristics from the Perspective of Academic “Full Evaluation” [J]. Library Work and Study, 2025, (1): 5-15.

[13] Du D H, Ding J D, Chen Y F, et al. The evolution and development landscape of scholarly communication based on the analysis of published articles[J]. Journal of Librarianship and Information Science, 2025, 57(1): 40-56.

[14] Wang Gang, Zhao Yi'an. Building a National Public-Welfare Academic Resource Information Platform—Practice and Prospects of the National Documentation Center for Philosophy and Social Sciences[J]. Journal of Library and Data, 2023, 5(1): 3-15.

[15] Cui Weihang. Accelerating the Construction of China's Independent Knowledge System in Philosophy and Social Sciences: A Threefold Logic[J]. Journal of University of Chinese Academy of Social Sciences, 2025, 45(12): 5-19, 170, 177.

[16] Han Li, Wang Min, Chu Jingli. Research on the Transformation of Open-Access-Driven Scholarly Communication Systems from an Ecological Perspective[J]. Chinese Journal of Scientific and Technical Periodicals, 2017, 28(2): 105-111.

[17] Zhao Chao, Zhao Wanli. Research on Paradigm Transformation and Its Dynamic Mechanisms in the Sociology of Knowledge[J]. The Journal of Humanities, 2015, (6): 113-121.

[18] Cui Haiyuan, Luo Pengcheng, Nie Hua, et al. Research and Construction of a New-Generation Scholarly Communication Ecosystem: A Case Study of Peking University[J]. Library and Information Service, 2018, 62(22): 22-31.

[19] Wang Yicheng, Wang Ping, Zhang Lu, et al. Research on the Content Intelligent Distribution Platform “Information Cocoon” from the Perspective of the Network Information Ecological Chain[J]. Library Research, 2018, (9): 7-13, 36.

[20] Lin Xin, Du Ying. Connotations, Construction Approaches, and Key Issues of a “High-End Exchange Platform” —A Review of the Project Demonstration Meeting on Building a High-End Exchange Platform for National Scientific Research Papers and Scientific and Technological Information[J]. Journal of Information Resources Management, 2024, 14(1): 146-152.

[21] Chen Xiaoting, Xia Junhui, Zhang Qunqun. The “Toward Responsible Publishing” Initiative and Its Opportunities and Challenges for the Scholarly Communication Ecosystem[J]. Library and Information, 2023, (6): 21-31.

[22] Ding Jin, Liu Xiwen, Gu Lihua. Practices and Framework Construction

- of Academic Publishers' Social Responsibility under the Background of Open Science[J]. *Chinese Journal of Scientific and Technical Periodicals*, 2025, 36(2): 164-174.
- [23] Guo Zhan, Chen Zhongwei. Philosophy and Social Sciences as Public Consciousness[J]. *Social Sciences in Chinese Higher Education Institutions*, 2017, (4): 47-55, 158.
- [24] Tian Xiaodi. The Evolution of the Role of Academic Libraries and the Construction of Core Capabilities in an Open Science Environment[J]. *Library*, 2025, (9): 107-116.
- [25] Ye Jiyuan. Selection of "Main Literature" in Philosophy and Social Sciences and the Reshaping of the Value of Academic Evaluation[J]. *Information and Documentation Services*, 2026, 47(1): 24-30.
- [26] Research Planning and Review Committee. ACRL 2024 Top Trends in Academic Libraries: A Review of the Trends and Issues[J]. *College & Research Libraries News*, 2024, 85(6): 231-246.
- [27] Ren Ningning. Building a high-level exchange system through the implementation of a knowledge-management model—On the transformation of the service model of the Library of the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences in the flourishing development of philosophy and social sciences[J]. *Information and Documentation Services*, 2007, (4): 106-109.
- [28] Guo Zhemin. Exploration of innovative models for sharing literature resources in the new era—Resource construction and service optimization at the National Center for Philosophy and Social Sciences Documentation[J]. *Journal of Information Resources Management*, 2019, 9(1): 114-121.
- [29] Xu Tiancai, Feng Tingting, Pan Yuting, et al. Investigation and analysis of compound evaluation of representative works for library-assisted theses in universities[J]. *Library and Information Service*, 2022, 66(14): 49-57.
- [30] Zhang Rui. Practices and implications of academic publishing services in libraries of German U15 university alliance members[J]. *Library Work and Study*, 2021, (7): 25-33.
- [31] Redkina S N. Impact of Open Science Infrastructure on the Development of the World Information Resources Market[J]. *Scientific and Technical Information Processing*, 2024, 51(2): 161-172.
- [32] Amaral D J C, Sarich N, Hensley M K, et al. Librarians at the Center of Peer Review Training: Increasing Collaboration Among Scholarly Communication Stakeholders[J]. *Learned Publishing*, 2025, 38(2): e1657.
- [33] B17 Final Statement[EB/OL]. (2025-06) [2026-7-2]. <https://oa2020.org/b17-conference/final-statement/>.
- [34] Arning U. Scholar-led publishing and diamond open access: The professionalised role of libraries[J]. *IFLA Journal*, 2025, 51(1): 61-66.

- [35] Shen Yaqi, Zhang Tiehua, Guo Jing, et al. Countermeasures for transforming subscription to literature and information resources in university libraries in the open-access transition environment[J]. *Library and Information Service*, 2024, 68(21): 45–53.
- [36] Xian Weihong, Zhan Zhaozong. Open publishing (OAP) policies of foreign university library alliances and their implementation strategies[J]. *New Century Library*, 2024, (12): 76–85.
- [37] Zhang Lin, Chen Guoliang. From outcome quantification to process empowerment: Paradigm transformation and practical pathways of research evaluation driven by AI technology[J]. *Think Tank: Theory & Practice*, 2025, 10(4): 46–50.
- [38] Cai Yingchun, Wu Yubi, Wang Runyi. AI ethics education in university libraries: Connotations, progress, and strategies[J]. *Journal of Library Science in China*, 2025, 51(4): 78–94.
- [39] Zeng Jianxun. Research on the construction of a high-end exchange platform for national scientific research papers and scientific and technological information[J]. *Journal of Library Science in China*, 2024, 50(1): 66–78.
- [40] Wang Yanli, Xie Lijiao, Zhai Xi, et al. Research on the development history and evolutionary laws of AI for Sciences[J]. *Social Sciences Front*, 2025, (3): 50–63.
- [41] Guo Jinlong, Mao Yanyan, Su Linwei, et al. Research on the innovative development of knowledge services in research-oriented libraries in the era of scientific intelligence[J]. *Journal of Library and Data*, 2025, 7(1): 60–71.
- [42] Lu Cainü. Preprint peer review and post-review preprints: Current status, impacts, and library countermeasures[J]. *Library and Information Service*, 2025, 69(9): 122–135.

Author biographies:

Zhang Yuxiang: Male, born in 1984; master's degree; librarian. Research interests: open access and digital libraries. Email: yxzhang84@163.com. Mailing address: No. 4655 Daxue Road, Changqing District, Jinan, Shandong Province, 250355.

Zhao Xiaoya: Female, born in 2002; currently a master's student. Research interests: information analysis and data management. Email: plmzxy0208@163.com. Mailing address: No. 3501 Daxue Road, Changqing District, Jinan, Shandong Province, 250353.

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

Source: ChinaXiv. Machine translation. Verify with the original.