

International Perspectives on Scientific Editing and Publishing

MODERATOR:

Jonathan Schultz

American Heart Association
Journals

SPEAKERS:

Vincent Kipkorir

AGC Tenwek Hospital/COSECSA

Shweta Tanwar

Indian Journal of Medical
Research, Indian Council of
Medical Research HQ

Hyun Jung Yi

Korean Council of Science Editors
and Hanyang University Guri
Hospital

Helen Tian

MPS Limited, Greater China

REPORTER:

Tony Alves

Scholarly Publishing Solutions

The global scientific publishing ecosystem is often discussed as a single enterprise, but the CSE Annual Meeting session “International Perspectives on Scientific Editing and Publishing” made clear that editors experience that ecosystem very differently depending on region, resources, infrastructure, language, policy environment, and research priorities. Moderated by Jonathan Schultz, in connection with a special issue of *Science Editor* on the same topic, the session brought together perspectives from Africa, India, Korea, and China to examine how editors are navigating shared pressures—visibility, equity, artificial intelligence, research growth, and trust—under very different local conditions.

Vincent Kipkorir, AGC Tenwek Hospital/COSECSA, opened with an African perspective grounded in his own editorial path across student-led, regional, and professional journals. His career trajectory, from *Annals of African Surgery* and the *Journal of African Medical Students* to the *East and Central African Journal of Surgery*, illustrated both the commitment and the structural constraints shaping many African editorial ecosystems. The challenges he described were familiar to many editors but intensified by resource limitations: limited funding and sustainability models, barriers to indexing and discoverability, reviewer scarcity and fatigue, manuscript quality gaps tied to training deficits, and uneven technological infrastructure.

A central theme of Kipkorir’s presentation was visibility. He noted that a large share of African journals remain difficult to discover through major channels such as Google Scholar, Scopus, and Web of Science, creating a cycle in which African researchers may feel pressure to publish African data in journals outside the region in order to gain recognition. This is not simply a problem of individual journal performance, he emphasized, but a systemic problem involving metrics, indexing standards, language, geography, and the global concentration of prestige. At the same time, he identified important strengths: strong mentorship cultures, early-career–led editorial and publishing initiatives, diamond open access models, and community-driven peer review. Looking forward, he argued that editorial capacity building should be treated as infrastructure. Training authors, reviewers, and editors; experimenting with mentored and flexible peer review models; recognizing reviewers; and building equitable north-south and south-south partnerships are all part of the sustainability equation.

Shweta Tanwar, *Indian Journal of Medical Research* and Indian Council of Medical Research HQ, then shifted the discussion to geographic differences in editorial practice and the potential role of artificial intelligence (AI). She framed the current publishing landscape as one in which Western Europe and North America remain disproportionately central, while high article processing charges, prestige concentration, and English-language barriers can marginalize researchers and editors from other regions. In that context, she presented AI not as a cure-all, but as a potentially useful tool for improving efficiency and equity when deployed thoughtfully.

Tanwar described several areas where AI could support editorial workflows: language support for nonnative English speakers, rapid triage and compliance checks, reviewer discovery, literature mapping, structured copyediting, and improved global accessibility. Her key point was that appropriate AI use can shift editorial attention from mechanics to scientific substance. If routine barriers related to language, formatting, and workflow can be reduced, editors may be better able to focus on the quality, relevance, ethics, and interpretation of the science itself. However, the equity promise of AI depends on access, transparency, governance, and local capacity. Without those safeguards, AI could also reinforce existing divides.

<https://doi.org/10.36591/SE-4902-009>

CONTINUED

Hyun Jung Yi, Korean Council of Science Editors and Hanyang University Guri Hospital, offered a more policy-focused view of AI through the experience of Korean journal editors. Korea's journal landscape includes many society-based journals that are strongly oriented toward international standards and global visibility, while small editorial offices remain common. In that setting, generative AI has rapidly become a practical editorial policy issue rather than an abstract future concern. Yi highlighted the roles of the Korean Council of Science Editors and the Korean Association of Medical Journal Editors, both of which have engaged directly with AI-related questions through education, guidance, and editorial policy development.

Two questions are now actively debated in Korea, Yi explained: Can authors use AI to help write manuscripts, and can reviewers use AI to help review manuscripts? For authors, the key issue is accountability. AI may assist with language, structure, or summarization, but authors remain responsible for the accuracy, originality, and integrity of the work, and AI cannot qualify as an author. Disclosure policies need to be clear, and AI-generated text, images, or analyses must be checked carefully. For reviewers, the central issue is confidentiality. A reviewer may want assistance organizing or drafting comments, but uploading an unpublished manuscript into an external AI system may breach confidentiality. Yi's summary was a reminder that AI policy must be specific to role, context, and risk: convenience cannot override accountability or trust in peer review.

Helen Tian, MPS Limited, Greater China, closed the session with an overview of the China Journal Excellence Action Plan and its implications for editors and publishers worldwide. Tian described the scale of China's research investment and scientific output, including 2025 research and development investment of approximately \$560 billion and 2024 output of 866,800 SCI papers, representing 32.9% of global share. Against that backdrop, the China Journal Excellence Action Plan is intended to strengthen domestic scientific journals, publishing platforms, talent development, and infrastructure so that Chinese journals can compete globally and retain a larger share of China-funded research outputs.

Tian explained that Phase I of the plan, from 2019 to 2023, focused on building quality foundations, sponsoring more than 400 journals, launching more than 120 new journals, and investing approximately \$200 million. Phase II, covering 2024 to 2028, moves from support for individual titles toward an ecosystem approach. Its projects include English-language journals, Chinese-language journals,

new journal development, talent development, and journal cluster pilots. Funding can reach up to 1.5 million RMB per year for leading journals and up to 10 million RMB per year for cluster pilot projects. The larger strategic objective is not only journal quality but also economies of scale, editorial talent, platform development, and digital sovereignty across a publishing ecosystem covering more than 1,700 journals.

For scientific editors, Tian suggested that China's priorities through 2035—AI, big data, integrated circuits, quantum technologies, life and health sciences, new materials, energy and dual-carbon technologies, advanced manufacturing, robotics, aerospace, major facilities, and mission-driven basic research—will create strong research pipelines in frontier areas. Journals with scopes that align with these areas may see opportunities for special issues, joint titles, society-China copublishing, and expanded interdisciplinary editorial expertise. For international publishers, the implications include both competition and collaboration: stronger Chinese journals will compete for content, high-article processing charge Gold Open Access models may face pressure from more affordable options, and platform sovereignty may shape expectations for hosting, workflows, metadata, indexing, and bilingual or multilingual publication strategies.

Taken together, the session presented a picture of scholarly publishing that is becoming more multipolar, more technologically mediated, and more explicitly shaped by regional priorities. The African perspective emphasized that visibility and capacity building are prerequisites for equitable participation. The Indian perspective showed how AI may help reduce barriers if implemented with attention to fairness and access. The Korean perspective demonstrated how quickly AI moves from experimentation to governance in small, internationally oriented editorial offices. The China perspective showed how national strategy, funding, infrastructure, and research priorities can reshape global publishing dynamics.

The session's strongest takeaway was that international collaboration is no longer simply a matter of outreach. It is becoming central to the health, legitimacy, and resilience of the scientific record. Editors everywhere are confronting common questions about trust, AI, peer review, language, discoverability, and sustainability, but the answers will not be uniform. A more inclusive publishing ecosystem will require shared standards and interoperable systems, but also respect for regional context, local infrastructure, and equitable partnership.