Received: 18 April 2026, Revised: 26 May 2026, Accepted: 29 June 2026, Available online: July 2026

Journal of Scholarly Communication
DOI: https://doi.org/10.62160/JSC77

RESEARCH ARTICLE

Sovereignty, Collaboration, and Capability: Three Dilemmas and a Transformation Framework for Sci-Tech Journal Editors in the Digital-Intelligence Era

Fan Sisi, Bai Xuefei, Huang Xiaoyi

Sichuan Center for Disease Control and Prevention, China

Abstract:

As generative artificial intelligence (GAI) is increasingly integrated into publishing workflows, sci-tech journal editors face practical difficulties, including unclear professional roles, pressure for skill restructuring, academic integrity challenges, and a lack of organizational support. Based on existing research and editorial practice, this paper analyzes the difficulties editors encounter in role perception, competency structure, ethical supervision, and governance mechanisms during AI adoption. Drawing on case studies and survey data, it proposes a transformation framework centered on "sovereignty–collaboration–capability." Sci-tech journal editors need to clarify their roles, strengthen human–machine collaboration, and keep updating their skills under AI empowerment. Through workflow improvement and organizational support, they can shift from being "text processors" to "compound knowledge service providers," and help drive sci-tech journals toward higher efficiency and rigor.

Keywords: AI empowerment; sci-tech journal editors; human–machine collaboration; professional challenges; digital transformation; editorial competency reconstruction

1 | Introduction

With the continued development of artificial intelligence (AI), especially large language models and Artificial Intelligence Generated Content (AIGC) tools, the publishing model of scholarly journals is changing rapidly. From the perspective of publishing institutions and editorial practice, AI tools are being embedded into the whole journal production process at an increasing speed. International surveys show that among small and medium-sized journal publishers, more than 50% have already deployed research verification software, and plan to significantly increase their investment in automated AIGC detection and plagiarism checking within the next two years [1]. Domestic surveys also indicate that intelligent retrieval and research integrity tools provided by platforms are widely used, and in some workflow stages, most editors already use these tools routinely [2]. Currently, academic publishers worldwide have broadly adopted AI in editorial workflows; applications such as intelligent proofreading, academic misconduct detection, and topic planning assistance are expanding in coverage.

This technological shift continues to bring quality improvements and efficiency gains. Studies show that AI-driven tools can efficiently handle repetitive work—for example, the DeepSeek-Editor system can complete a full technical review of a manuscript within 72 hours, with a recall rate reaching 98.6%. However, as technology evolves, traditional editorial skills and working habits are increasingly insufficient. In the context of scholarly publishing moving toward digitalization, editors are gradually facing a series of concerns: unclear professional roles, a weakened sense of professional value, declining social recognition, and anxiety about being replaced by AI. How to properly understand and respond to the professional impact of AI empowerment, and how to rebuild the role and competency structure of science and technology (sci-tech) journal editors, has become an important issue for both academia and the publishing industry.

Previous studies have mostly focused on the effects of AI on editorial work and the resulting competency requirements. Li et al. [3] analyzed AI applications in peer review, topic planning, and proofreading, and the challenges these bring in copyright review, ethical gatekeeping,

and new tool adoption. Liu et al. [4] used the Journal of Jilin University (Information Science Edition) as a case to study AI-assisted editing, confirming both the effectiveness and limitations of large language models. Liu pointed out that the editor's core function is shifting from "text proofreading" to "value judgment," and that editors need not only new skills like prompt engineering but also face dual pressures from technology adaptation anxiety and changes in academic evaluation standards Guan[5] emphasized that in the smart media era, publishing workflows have turned to a human–machine collaborative mode; journal editors need to transform from traditional text handlers into compound talents with full-media technical capabilities, while also reinforcing humanistic spirit and ethical awareness to keep publications both substantive and responsible.

These studies provide a basis for understanding how editorial work is changing in the AI era. However, there is still a lack of systematic analysis of the overall difficulties facing editors and discussion of practical, actionable transformation pathways. Building on prior work, this paper analyzes the practical dilemmas that sci-tech journal editors face under AI empowerment, and explores specific directions for transformation in terms of role positioning, capability building, workflow optimization, and talent development, with the hope of offering useful reference for the editorial community as it adapts to the AI age.

2 | Practical Dilemmas Facing Sci-Tech Journal Editors in the AI Era

2.1 | Professional role confusion and identity challenges

AI has already been applied in many editorial stages, including initial manuscript screening, plagiarism checking, language polishing, formatting, reviewer matching, and peer review assistance. For example, Frontiers uses its AIRA system to integrate third-party AI integrity screening tools for incoming submissions; ASCE has piloted NLP-based technical pre-screening in some engineering journals [6–7]. With AI deeply involved in scholarly publishing, the professional role of sci-tech journal editors is undergoing major change. Traditionally, editors have served as "gatekeepers" and "craftspeople of the written word," but under AI assistance, this role is becoming less clear. Intelligent systems now handle large amounts of mechanical work, reducing the editor's visible role in the publishing process.

A 2025 survey by Liu[8] found that in the digital-intelligence publishing era, multiple factors are causing editorial burnout and weakening role beliefs, making it harder for editors to build a professional identity. Some editors are now unsure about their own position: are they content gatekeepers, process managers, or technology supervisors? The expectations from publishing institutions and the academic community are also changing. Editors who stick to the traditional model risk being seen as mere "backstage staff." In many Chinese universities, for instance, journal offices consist of only a few people, hold an awkward position within the institution, and lack proper recognition [9]. *The Blue Book on the Development of China's Science and Technology Journals* (*2024*) reports that only 47.19% of personnel in Chinese sci-tech journals hold a master's or doctoral degree [10], a notable gap compared with the research community. Editors therefore have relatively weak academic influence, and their professional value has not been fully acknowledged.

When AI can assist with manuscript screening and language polishing, the question "are editors still necessary?" comes up from time to time. This blurring of role perception and reduced sense of presence has pushed editors into an identity crisis. If the core value of editors is not clarified soon, it may affect work motivation and the long-term development of the profession. Poor implementation of AI can also make things worse. One well-known journal publisher introduced an AI proofreading system without consulting the editors, but the frequent errors it produced actually added to the workload. After spending six months on remediation, the editorial team resigned collectively in protest [11]. This case shows that ignoring editors' roles and misusing AI can seriously damage professional identity.

2.2 | Skill restructuring and the technology gap between generations

The AI era requires editors to learn a whole new set of skills, which creates real pressure for competency restructuring. Traditional sci-tech journal editors have mainly relied on domain knowledge and editorial experience for tasks such as topic planning, reviewer communication, and text editing. But as AI and big data technologies penetrate more deeply, the existing skill set needs updating. On one hand, editors need basic technical literacy: understanding the principles of AI, machine learning, and natural language processing, and being able to use various intelligent tools [12]. Only by knowing the features and suitable scenarios of different large language models can editors choose the right AI platform for their journal; and only by learning to use text similarity detection, data visualization, grammar correction, and other AI functions can they improve manuscript processing efficiency and quality. These technical skills are entirely new territory for traditional editors. Editors of different ages also differ considerably in how fast they pick up new tools, which easily creates a "technology generation gap" that affects team coordination. On the other hand, even digitally literate editors face the ongoing challenge of AI tools being updated rapidly. Generative AI applications keep appearing and evolving; editors have to keep learning just to keep up. The deep use of AI also requires editors to widen their knowledge. Today's editors need to know not only their subject area but also data science, legal ethics, and even media operations, becoming "compound talents." Yet for a long time, many sci-tech journal editors, especially younger ones, have focused on science and engineering fields and lack training in publishing studies, communication, and humanities [13]. With heavy daily workloads and limited time for systematic learning, they struggle to find the theoretical support and methodological guidance needed to deal with the new problems brought by AI.

2.3 | Difficulties in academic gatekeeping and ethical oversight

Current AI detection tools still have notable limitations in identifying

Received: 18 April 2026, Revised: 26 May 2026, Accepted: 29 June 2026, Available online: July 2026

deeper forms of academic misconduct and determining the copyright status of AIGC content. AI's deep involvement in content production and peer review has made academic dishonesty harder to detect. Some authors use GAI technology to generate passages that closely resemble existing research, thereby bypassing plagiarism detection. Some reviewers use AI to write review comments, which may inadvertently reveal manuscript content or produce inaccurate judgments [14]. Editors used to rely on experience and conventional tools to detect plagiarism, but these traditional methods are increasingly inadequate against the volume and sophistication of AI-generated text. Existing AI detection tools have limited capability—they can mainly identify whether content was AI-generated, but deeper academic issues like citation compliance or data fabrication still largely escape automated detection.

Copyright and intellectual property review has also become harder. The legal status of AIGC output remains unclear: whether AI-generated text is protected by copyright law largely depends on whether the human prompt has originality [15]. When reviewing manuscripts, editors must judge which parts were AI-generated, determine the attribution of authorship, and check for possible copyright infringement. But since different editors understand the originality of AI-generated works differently, review standards are hard to unify. Generated content also draws on large amounts of training data that may include unauthorized material, raising potential copyright dispute risks [16]. Traditional copyright review processes cannot handle this volume efficiently. Editors therefore need both solid copyright law knowledge and the technical ability to predict infringement risks, such as tracing the legality of training data or comparing generated content with existing works. At present, many editors feel inadequately prepared in these areas.

AI involvement also raises new ethical problems. AI-generated content may contain fabricated data, biases, or inappropriate framing, which places higher demands on the editor's ethical judgment. Models like ChatGPT sometimes produce "factual hallucinations"—outputs that look plausible but are actually made up. Editors need to be able to spot these, checking content authenticity from logical, numerical, and visual angles. Because biases in training data can cause generated text to contain hidden discrimination, editors need to upgrade their review systems by integrating multi-modal bias detection tools alongside human judgment to keep content fair [17]. The spread of "AI writing assistants" has also made authorship attribution and ethical boundaries more complicated. To what degree must AI-assisted writing be disclosed? Can AI be listed as an author? Is AI participation allowed in peer review? There are no uniform standards for these questions. Although there is broad international consensus that AI cannot be an author and that authors should disclose AI use, in practice, many authors do not keep AI output records, or the data volume is too large to provide, making it harder for editors to judge. The lag in ethical norms puts editors in a difficult position when handling AI-related manuscripts—worried about both missing problems and overcorrecting. If academic integrity standards are breached, the consequences for scholarly reputation can be serious.

In this context, a clearer distinction should also be made between AI-assisted review and AI peer review. The former refers to the limited use of AI tools by reviewers or editors to support specific tasks such as language polishing of comments, integrity screening, or extracting key information, while substantive scholarly judgment remains with human reviewers. The latter, by contrast, involves delegating evaluative judgment itself to an AI system. This distinction is not merely technical but ethical. Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE) and International Committee of Medical Journal Editors (ICMJE) have both made clear that AI tools cannot assume responsibility for review recommendations or be treated as independent reviewers [18-19]. In practice, however, the boundary is often blurred. When reviewers upload full manuscripts or unpublished arguments to public AI tools in order to draft review reports, confidentiality may be compromised and unverified machine-generated evaluations may effectively substitute for human review. In such cases, AI assistance risks crossing the line into unauthorized AI peer review.

2.4 | Weak governance mechanisms and insufficient organizational support

Faced with the various challenges brought by AI, many journals have shown a lack of preparedness in editorial governance and organizational support, leaving individual editors in a passive position during this industry change. This problem appears in several areas.

First, talent development mechanisms are insufficient. Many publishing units have not built systematic continuing education and training programs for editors; skill upgrading largely depends on individual effort. Research indicates that in the "AI+" era, the digital transformation of China's scholarly journals is still relatively slow, which is closely related to the shortage of technically skilled editorial talent [20]. Some units have not set up AI-specific training plans, leaving editors without formal channels for learning about the latest tools or sharing experience. The institutional framework for editorial talent development urgently needs improvement, including diverse mechanisms such as job-specific training, advanced study programs, and skills competitions.

Second, career development and incentive mechanisms are weak. Under the current system, editors generally lack clear promotion pathways and have relatively little academic influence. Many editorial offices run by universities, hospitals, or research institutes hold a low position within their institutions, with limited staffing; editors are often treated as support or administrative staff, and their creative work is not properly recognized. Institutions need to formally acknowledge the editorial team's value and provide real support for professional growth.

Third, guidelines for AI use in editorial work remain insufficiently developed. The scholarly publishing field has not yet reached broad agreement on the specific boundaries for using generative AI in editorial work [21]. Which stages can use AI, to what extent, and under what ethical rules—these questions lack clear, unified answers, and this has become a major bottleneck for standardizing AI use and protecting scholarly innovation. Although some domestic industry associations and publishers have already issued guidance documents, a more recent development is the release of the *Guideline on the Boundaries of AIGC Usage in Academic Publishing 3.0.* Compared

with earlier versions, Version 3.0 further standardizes terminology and expression, refines disclosure and declaration requirements at the submission stage, and places greater emphasis on the responsibilities of different actors during manuscript review, including journals, publishers, reviewers, and authors. It also provides updated templates for disclosure and declaration of AIGC use[22]. These revisions improve the practicality and forward-looking value of the guideline, and show that governance of AI use in academic publishing is moving from general principle-setting toward more detailed role-based regulation. Even so, many operational details still need further refinement in practice. In the absence of well-developed industry norms, individual journals can only feel their way forward, and inconsistencies and mistakes are difficult to avoid. Organizations such as the Association of American Publishers have also emphasized that AI should not replace the editor's professional judgment, but should only serve as an auxiliary tool, while editorial oversight of content quality must be preserved [23].

Fourth, staffing and collaboration mechanisms are behind the times. Publishing in the AI era needs close cooperation among multidisciplinary teams, but many journal editorial offices still follow a "small but all-inclusive" traditional model in which one editor handles multiple tasks, with obvious gaps in specialization and teamwork. Ideally, an "editor + technologist + domain expert" collaborative structure should be set up, bringing algorithm engineers, data analysts, and other technical staff into the journal's team. In reality, however, most journals have not created such positions. Editors applying AI have no dedicated IT support and have to figure things out on their own or rely on temporary outside help. This limits the deep application of intelligent technology and increases the editor's personal workload and risk. Some leading journals have tried bringing in part-time young scholars as editors to strengthen subject-matter quality control, but this approach has not yet spread across the industry.

3 | Strategies for Sci-Tech Journal Editors in the AI Era

With generative AI deeply embedded in the publishing ecosystem, sci-tech journal editors face the dual challenge of "using technology" and "keeping their role." While AI takes on mechanical work and improves publishing efficiency, it also creates new demands on editors' agency, collaboration patterns, and core skills. By upholding editorial sovereignty as the foundation, deepening human–machine collaboration as the support, and continuously updating core capabilities as the guarantee, a "sovereignty–collaboration–capability" transformation framework can be built. This framework can help editors avoid being sidelined by technology, and instead use it to enhance their professional value, thereby supporting the quality development of scholarly publishing.

3.1 | Upholding editorial sovereignty and the value of human judgment

The editor's agency and human judgment are something intelligent technology cannot replace—this is at the heart of editorial sovereignty in the AI era. By combining AI tools with their work, editors can move from behind the scenes to the front, becoming the directors and planners in a "human–machine collaborative publishing" model. For example, since 2021, AACR has used Proofig for image duplication detection [24]; the editorial office of New Medicine has used AI to assist topic planning, with final decisions always made by editors [25]. These cases show that although algorithms can efficiently handle repetitive tasks like manuscript screening, image checking, and typesetting, the editor's professional knowledge and human care remain essential in core areas—judging scholarly value, managing ethical risks, and guiding topic direction. Every good academic paper reflects the editor's commitment to academic standards and their insight into what is truly innovative—a kind of "warmth and depth" that technology does not have.

The key to upholding editorial sovereignty is to draw a clear line: "technology assists, the editor leads." Specific suggestions include: (1) Formulating AI usage rules for the editorial office: based on the journal's positioning, draft detailed rules for AI application—for example, explicitly prohibiting AI from independently making decisions on topic planning or manuscript acceptance, and clarifying responsibility allocation in line with the position statement of the COPE [18]. Authors bear full responsibility for the integrity, accuracy, and originality of their submitted work, including any portion produced with AI tools, and must transparently disclose AI use. Editors are responsible for editorial judgment, gatekeeping, and the integrity of the review process. (2) Strengthening ethical and review mechanisms: set up a manual review process for AI-generated content; use detection tools to help identify "AI traces" or logical problems in manuscripts; and establish a three-level review mechanism for AI outputs: Level 1 (AI self-check), Level 2 (responsible editor verification), Level 3 (expert spot-check), to make sure machine assistance does not compromise the authenticity and rigor of academic papers. When AI recommends reviewers or screens literature, editors should check the reasonableness and accuracy of those recommendations. For manuscripts flagged by AI as "highly similar," editors need to manually verify whether the matching parts are "legitimate citation" rather than simply relying on similarity scores, using the criteria of "whether copyright is infringed" and "whether originality is compromised." For AI-generated content or reports, editors should verify that key points are true, accurate, and complete; for manuscripts tagged as "low originality" by AI, a second human evaluation should be done, maintaining the principle that human judgment has the final say at every stage. (3) Keeping value-driven topic planning: using the editor's disciplinary insight and experience, building on the trending data and author profiles provided by AI, focus on important questions in the field and societal needs, plan forward-looking special issues, and avoid being led astray by algorithmic popularity at the expense of the journal's identity. Domestic editors have already explored AI-assisted topic planning; one experiment showed that when an academic editor and the DeepSeek model each independently generated five candidate topics, these closely matched ten topics proposed by domain experts [26].

"Editorial–pedagogical integration" is another important approach for strengthening editorial sovereignty. Through long-term work with manuscripts and authors, editors build up rich experience in research norms and academic writing. This advantage can be used by

Received: 18 April 2026, Revised: 26 May 2026, Accepted: 29 June 2026, Available online: July 2026

encouraging editors to participate more in guiding researchers and students in academic writing. For example, an associate editor gave a lecture at a university on editorial office management and AI-assisted digital transformation of scholarly journals; her teaching helped students learn about publishing and also demonstrated the professional value of editors [27]. It is suggested that universities and research institutions invite experienced journal editors to teach academic writing and publishing courses for graduate students, sharing practical knowledge on journal selection, citation standards, academic integrity, and the appropriate use of AI assistants. Sharing cases and standards in the classroom can improve the academic integrity awareness of junior researchers and also expand the editor's influence and sense of accomplishment. Academic societies and research institutions that run integrity training and author workshops may also invite editors as teachers. From international experience, journals such as the *Journal of Planning Education and Research* and the *South African Journal of Science* [28–29] show that editorial involvement in research ethics and writing training is already common. This serves both as a way for editors to fulfill social responsibility and as a means of reducing low-quality and non-compliant submissions, easing the pressure on peer review. Through this integration of editing and teaching, editors can build a professional image as "academic mentors" and play a more active role in the scholarly ecosystem. This improved image, in turn, reinforces editors' professional identity and pride, forming a positive feedback loop.

3.2 | Deepening human–machine collaboration to improve publishing efficiency

Once the principle of "editor-led, AI-assisted" is established, sci-tech journals need to put human–machine collaboration into practice through workflow redesign and team building, while also advancing editorial capability development to make sure the collaborative model is both efficient and true to academic principles. This requires effort on two fronts: building a human–machine collaboration platform and assembling a collaborative professional team.

1) **From scattered pilots to full-process intelligent transformation.** Research shows that AI can be applied across manuscript pre-screening, content editing, expert solicitation, typesetting, and journal promotion. Sci-tech journal editors are indeed trying new technologies, but the practical experience is that introducing AI tools at individual points is easy; the real challenge is integrating AI into the entire workflow so that it handles repetitive, data-heavy tasks while editors focus on directional and creative decisions, achieving both efficiency and quality in an "AI pre-processing + human deep-decision" model. Editorial offices with sufficient resources may try deploying a localized intelligent collaboration platform, designing collaborative workflows based on editorial habits to achieve real complementarity between machine and human strengths.

Some domestic journals have already carried out intelligent workflow experiments. *The Journal of Beijing University of Posts and Telecommunications* provides a concrete case. Its platform, built on data-stream integration, includes modules for process management, multi-agent systems, intelligent proofreading, frontier assessment, hotspot prediction, and text-to-video, covering the operational needs of authors, readers, editors, reviewers, researchers, and science communicators. The results: review turnaround reduced by 30%, copy-editing errors down by 25%, and misconduct detection rate raised to 98%, achieving gains in both efficiency and quality [30]. *Chinese Journal of Ship Research* offers a lighter approach: without building a large platform, it uses existing XML typesetting, intelligent proofreading, plagiarism checking, and AI writing detection systems, supplemented by AIGC translation and polishing, to do "linked optimization" across peer review, editorial processing, and content production. The journal gradually developed a set of operating procedures suited to its own needs, and steadily improved editorial efficiency despite limited resources [31]. This step-by-step approach is particularly relevant for resource-limited small and medium journals. Human–machine collaboration should also include interactive feedback. When using AI tools, editors should continuously provide feedback—correcting errors, adjusting prompts, improving training data—so that the tools keep getting better and more aligned with journal needs. The resulting positive cycle allows AI to grow smarter and editors to use it more effectively.

2) **Introducing technical support and building a collaborative team**. Deepening human–machine collaboration requires a multidisciplinary team. Journals should create conditions for recruiting technical talent to help with workflow optimization—for example, by adding data analysis or AI engineer positions in the editorial office, responsible for maintaining, upgrading, and customizing AI systems. When editors raise operational needs, technical staff can adjust algorithm settings to better fit actual scenarios. Where possible, institutions may partner with university research teams or technology companies to jointly develop or improve intelligent editorial platforms. Communication mechanisms among editors, technical staff, and domain experts should also be strengthened—for example, through regular "human–machine collaboration meetings" where editors share usage experiences, technologists introduce new features, and experts suggest quality improvements, with all three parties working together to refine processes. Institutional policies to support smooth collaboration are also important: for example, specifying the technical team's confidentiality obligations and AI operation standards, and preparing contingency plans. Through these steps, a working structure can take shape where editors lead, technology provides support, and experts participate—ensuring that every step of AI integration is backed by reliable people and institutional rules. Only when the team works well together can the intelligent workflow be sustained.

3.3 | Building a capability development system for editors

In the AI era, editors are no longer simply "text processors" but "compound knowledge service providers" who combine scholarly judgment, technical skills, and an interdisciplinary perspective. The core of capability development is to close the technology gap and broaden knowledge while preserving professional identity, so that editors remain leaders in human–machine collaboration. This can be approached from several directions.

1) **Strengthening digital technology literacy.** Editors can follow an "observe–understand–internalize" pathway to build a personal

"technology radar," tracking AI developments from organizations like OpenAI, iFlytek, and Baidu during their spare time, and following technology reports from leading international publishers (Elsevier, Springer, Wiley, etc.), the International Association of Scientific, Technical and Medical Publishers (STM), and domestic platforms like CNKI and the Chinese Medical Association. Through online courses, industry workshops, case discussions, and project-based exercises, editors can learn the core functions and limitations of intelligent tools while keeping up with updates. To address possible digital skill gaps within teams, organized training and experience sharing are essential; practice shows that cross-generational knowledge sharing is key to improving overall team efficiency.

2) **Broadening interdisciplinary knowledge.** Besides deep expertise in their subject field, editors today also need knowledge in editorial science, media studies, and legal ethics [32], and should develop a habit of lifelong learning. They should read editorial and publishing research literature, follow developments in scholarly evaluation reform and publishing ethics, learn science communication and new media techniques, and study intellectual property law, data security regulations, and the *Measures for the Management of Generative AI Services* and similar regulations to sharpen copyright and data ethics awareness. With a combined "technology + law" knowledge base, editors can better handle the copyright and privacy issues raised by AI.

3) **Developing innovative and critical thinking.** AI is good at pattern recognition and summarization, but innovation and critical judgment are distinctly human strengths. Editors should maintain this advantage by questioning AI outputs and avoiding over-reliance. When AI suggests trending topics, editors should assess whether the novelty and scholarly significance truly fit the journal's mission. When reviewing AI-generated editing suggestions, they should verify each one to prevent erasing an article's distinctive features. Editors should also use AI to explore new editorial approaches—such as building AI-powered reader interaction columns or developing intelligent writing guidance platforms for early-career authors. This requires editors to participate in industry forums and innovation projects, putting ideas into practice and sharpening their thinking through learning and experimentation.

4) Learning human–machine interaction skills. In the AI era, prompt engineering should be treated as an essential editorial skill. By using a "scenario + requirement + tone" template to guide AI output, and by practicing prompt design, result evaluation, and feedback adjustment, editors can gradually find the best ways to communicate with AI and develop efficient interaction techniques. Only when editors and AI form a genuine working partnership can they achieve greater productivity, and the experience editors build up in this process will become a valuable new professional asset.

Beyond individual capability building, innovative talent cultivation and deployment mechanisms are needed to address structural problems in editorial teams, such as credential gaps and limited career development. On one hand, career-progression and academic-development support should be put in place: publishing units should chart clear career paths for editors, treating pursuit of advanced degrees and participation in research projects as investments in editorial capacity. Performance evaluation should be updated with contribution-centered indicators—such as digitalization project outcomes, journal impact improvement, and adherence to scholarly norms and ethics—and editorial research achievements should be recognized in professional title reviews and performance rewards, fostering an editorial culture that values scholarship and strengthens editors' academic standing and voice in the field [12]. Incentive schemes should also be improved through awards for outstanding editors and special grants to motivate academic growth and operational innovation. On the other hand, flexible talent recruitment and partnership approaches should be explored: drawing on the practice of journals that use part-time editors, selected active young researchers may be appointed as part-time editors or editorial board members. With their dual identity as both authors and editors, they can bring disciplinary frontiers insights into topic planning and content quality control [33]. A staffing model combining "full-time editors + part-time scholars" should be promoted, attracting outside academic talent to support journal operations while encouraging full-time editors to engage in two-way exchanges with the research front line, broadly improving team quality and the journal's academic level.

Acknowledgement

The authors declare that no funding was received for this work.

Ethical Statement

This study does not contain any studies with human or animal subjects performed by the author.

Conflicts of Interest

The authors declare that there are no conflicts of interest related to this work.

Author Contribution Statement

Fan Sisi developed the research framework, designed the research approach, constructed the arguments, and wrote the original draft. Other authors revised and polished the manuscript.

Data Availability Statement

Not applicable.

References

[1] Scholastica & Maverick Publishing Specialists. (2025). *Technology needs of small and medium journal publishers: 2025 report*. Retrieved December 24, 2025, from https://lp.scholasticahq.com/technology-needs-small-medium-journal-publishers/

[2] Tang, X. L., Shu, A. Q., Zhang, Y. Y., Zou, X. Y., & Leng, H. M. (2025). Survey and analysis of sci-tech journal editors'

awareness and use of intelligent tools. *Communication and Copyright,* (3), 5–8.

[3] Li, L., Zhou, C.M., & Jiang, Q.Y. (2025). Challenges and key competency reconstruction for sci-tech journal editors in the AIGC era. *Communication and Copyright*, (15), 10–13.

[4] Liu, Q.L., Liu, D.L., & Zhang, J. (2025). Research on AI-based reference editing using DeepSeek: a case study of *Journal of Jilin University (Information Science Edition*). *Acta Editologica, 37*(4), 431–436.

[5] Guan, Q.W. (2025). Research on the pathway for enhancing the comprehensive competencies of journal editors in the AIGC era. *Communication and Copyright*, (12), 24–27.

[6] Frontiers. (2025). *Frontiers broadens AI-driven integrity checks with integration of Cactus' Paperpal Preflight and Clear Skies' Papermill Alarm and Oversight into AIRA*. Retrieved December 23, 2025, from https://www.frontiersin.org/news/2025/07/07/frontiers-broadens-ai-driven-integrity-checks-with-integration-of-cactus

[7] Lazarus, E.F. (2021). Artificial intelligence-assisted editorial tools: case studies. *Science Editor*, *44*(4), e5-e6.

[8] Liu, Y.Y. (2025). Construction and analysis of professional cognition among sci-tech journal editors. *Journal of News Research, 16*(11), 165–169.

[9] Zhang, A.P., & Li, S. (2025). Discussion on editorial talent-team building for academic journals in the AI era. *Journalism & Media Studies*, (7), 7–10.

[10] China Association for Science and Technology. (2024). *Blue Book on the Development of China's Science and Technology Journals (2024)*. Beijing: Science Press.

[11] Retraction Watch. (2024). *Evolution journal editors resign en masse to protest Elsevier changes.* Retrieved December 24, 2025, from https://retractionwatch.com/2024/12/27/evolution-journal-editors-resign-en-masse-to-protest-elsevier-changes/.

[12] Cao, B., Li, J., Jiang, W., & Guo Y.L. (2025). Competency requirements for sci-tech journal editors in the AIGC era. *China Metallurgical Education*, (2), 110–112.

[13] Liu, B.J., & Li, X.L. (2025). Reflections and practice on editorial-science paper writing by sci-tech journal editors. *Journal of Harbin University, 46*(5), 141–144.

[14] Olson, P.J. (2024). Artificial intelligence in scholarly publishing: responding to opportunities and risks. *Science Editor, 47*(3), 107–109.

[15] Sun, S. (2024). The key to determining the attributes of AI-generated content lies in originality. *Procuratorate Daily.* Retrieved December 7, 2025, from https://www.spp.gov.cn/spp/llyj/202401/t20240126_641459.shtml

[16] Zhang, J., Tan, C.L., & Chen, Y.M. (2025). Manifestations of AIGC ethical deviance in academic research and publishing and identification strategies. *Acta Editologica, 37*(5), 517–523.

[17] Xu, T.T. (2024). The "EDIT" scheme for editorial-publishing ethics to address the "chaos" of AI applications. *Acta Editologica, 36*(5), 479–484.

[18] Committee on Publication Ethics. (2023). *Authorship and AI tools*. https://publicationethics.org/guidance/cope-position/authorship-and-ai-tools

[19] International Committee of Medical Journal Editors. (2024). *Use of artificial intelligence in publishing.* https://www.icmje.org/ recommendations/browse/artificial-intelligence/

[20] Chen, X.F., & Shen, X.B. (2024). Application trends, risk mitigation, and policy recommendations for AI in sci-tech journal editing and publishing. *Chinese Journal of Scientific and Technical Periodicals, 35*(7), 890–898.

[21] Xue, Y. (2025). AI's deep involvement in scholarly publishing brings new challenges; experts recommend: clarify application boundaries and refine guidelines. *Science and Technology Daily*.

[22] Institute of Scientific and Technical Information of China, Elsevier, Springer Nature, Wiley, Taylor & Francis, Wolters Kluwer, & Cambridge University Press. (2025). *Guideline on the Boundaries of AIGC Usage in Academic Publishing 3.0.*

[23] Zhang, D., & Guan, X. (2025). Insights from the rise of generative AI (GAI) for academic journals. *Acta Editologica, 37*(5), 507–511.

[24] Van Noorden, R. (2022). Journals adopt AI to spot duplicated images in manuscripts. *Nature.* https://doi.org/10.1038/d41586-021-03807-6

[25] Hong, Y.M., & Wang, J.Z. (2024). Application and reflections on GenAI in sci-tech journal topic planning: A case study of *New Medicine*. *Acta Editologica, 36*(4), 439–443.

[26] Wang, N. (2025). Empowerment and reconstruction: A new model for AI-assisted topic planning in sci-tech journals. *Journal of News Research, 16*(21), 225–229.

[27] Su, Y. H. (2025). "*Expert Practice in Classroom*": *Yu Jing, Executive Associate Editor of Chinese Journal of Ship Research, Invited to Deliver a Special Lecture at the School.* School of Law and Humanities, Wuhan University of Technology. Retrieved from http://wenfa.whut.edu.cn/bksjy/202504/t20250414_1325005.shtml

[28] Association of Collegiate Schools of Planning (ACSP). JPER Writing Workshop for New Scholars. https://www.acsp.org/page/ WritingWorkshop.

[29] South African Journal of Science. Writing workshop "Writing with integrity". https://sajs.co.za/writing-workshop-2024.

[30] Ai, L.S., Sun, Y.T., Jin, H.L., Ma X.Y., Zhong, Y., Li, B., Li, Y., Huang, C., Yang, P., & Li, Z. (2025). Analysis of innovative solutions and empirical results in building digital intelligence platforms for scientific journals; Taking *Journal of Beijing University of Posts and Telecommunications* as an example. *Chinese Journal of Scientific and Technical Periodicals*, *36*(10), 1327–1328.

[31] Yu, J., & Hu, W.L. (2025). Digital transformation of scientific and technological journals enable by artificial intelligence: applications and explorations of *Chinese Journal of Ship Research*. *Acta Editologica, 37*(sup.1), 157–161.

[32] Yu, F.K. (2025). Analysis of and countermeasures for publishing-ethics responsibilities of sci-tech journals under generative AI. *Communication and Copyright*, (21), 27–29+33.

[33] Sun, J.N., & Ding, Z.Q. (2024). Practical pitfalls and solutions for the establishment of young editorial boards in sci-tech journals. *Acta Editologica, 36*(2), 166–169.