



Digital Publishing Copyright: Deconstruction and Institutional Response

SONG Youyou

University of Shanghai for Science and Technology, China

Received: April 29, 2026

Accepted: May 30, 2026

Published: June 30, 2026

To cite this article: SONG Youyou. (2026). Digital Publishing Copyright: Deconstruction and Institutional Response. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, 6(2), 204–212, DOI: 10.53789/j.1653-0465.2026.0602.021

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.53789/j.1653-0465.2026.0602.021>

Abstract: The integration of Web 3.0 technologies—specifically generative AI, algorithmic recommendation, and block-chain—has catalyzed a structural transformation in the digital publishing industry. Traditional copyright frameworks, anchored in human authorship and exclusive one-to-one control, are increasingly inadequate for addressing the complexities of large-scale AI-generated content (AIGC) and platform-mediated dissemination. This study examines three core dilemmas: the authorship crisis in human-machine collaboration, the inefficiency of conventional authorization models, and the evolving liability of digital platforms. Through a functionalist legal approach, we propose a paradigm shift from a traditional “rights-control” framework to a “contribution-based” governance model (a system allocating copyright rights and benefits by stakeholders’ actual creative and economic contributions). Specifically, we introduce a “Tripartite Allocation Model” (a dynamic mechanism dividing interests among AI operators, developers and the public). Furthermore, we advocate for upgrading authorization mechanisms via blockchain-driven smart contracts, and construct a “Graduated Liability System” (a tiered framework matching platform duty of care with algorithmic control) alongside a “Dual-Chain Evidence” (a blockchain-based mechanism combining creation records and transaction data). Ultimately, this research provides institutional designs to adapt copyright regulation to Web 3.0 realities. By reconceptualizing copyright as a proactive ecosystem governance mechanism, it balances the protection of creators’ rights with the incentives for technological innovation.

Keywords: Digital Publishing; Copyright Governance; AI-Generated Content; Platform Regulation

Notes on the contributor: Song Youyou holds a master’s degree in law, and she is an assistant researcher at President’s Office of the University of Shanghai for Science and Technology. Her major research lies in legal affairs in higher education. Her email is songyouyou@usst.edu.cn.

1. Introduction

In the era of the digital economy, the deep integration of digital technology and the publishing industry has become a central driver of industrial transformation. According to the 2023–2024 Market Research Report on

China's Digital Publishing Industry, the overall scale of China's digital publishing industry reached 1.62 trillion RMB in 2023, representing a year-on-year growth of 19.08%¹. Artificial intelligence-generated content (AIGC), decentralized autonomous organizations (DAOs), and algorithm-driven platforms collectively dissolve the traditional linear structure of "author-publisher-user." This rapid expansion is defined by the compatibility and symbiosis of digital technologies with new publishing ecosystems. Specifically, Web 3.0 technologies—anchored by block-chain, artificial intelligence (AI), and smart contracts—are driving a paradigm shift toward decentralization and open collaboration. Unlike earlier phases of digitization, Web 3.0 fundamentally reshapes the architecture of content creation, dissemination, and value distribution. As a result, copyright law—originally designed for stable works and identifiable human creators—faces unprecedented regulatory stress.

However, this structural coupling has catalyzed three unprecedented challenges. First, the identification of copyright subjects has become increasingly uncertain. AI models like ChatGPT and DeepSeek, leveraging knowledge enhancement, now generate outputs that rupture the anthropocentric presumptions of current law. Second, traditional authorization mechanisms struggle to accommodate large-scale, real-time content production and reuse. Third, infringement remedies encounter systemic obstacles due to platform mediation and decentralized dissemination. Judicial data indicate that copyright infringement has become particularly concentrated in digital publishing, with over 2,500 individuals prosecuted for copyright crimes in China between January and November 2023 alone².

Against this background, existing research has tended to focus on isolated doctrinal adjustments or specific technological tools, such as block-chain registration or generative AI governance³⁻⁶. What remains under-explored is the structural mismatch between rigid copyright institutions and fluid technological processes. This article therefore adopts a governance-oriented perspective to examine how copyright law should adapt to AI-driven digital publishing. It begins with authorship and subject identification, proceeds to the structural failure of licensing mechanisms, and finally analyzes platform responsibility as a compensatory governance mechanism. Through this layered analysis, the article argues for a paradigmatic transition from ex-post rights enforcement to process-oriented copyright governance.

2. Authorship and Creative Contribution in AI-Assisted Publishing

The rise of artificial intelligence in content creation has fundamentally challenged the anthropocentric foundation of copyright law. Traditional copyright doctrine presupposes that works are the result of human intellectual activity and that authorship reflects personal creative choices. However, advanced generative models increasingly produce outputs that are difficult to distinguish from human-authored works, thereby blurring the boundary between tool and creator⁷.

Currently, judicial discourse presents divergent stances regarding AI authorship: conservative and progressive. Judicial and administrative practice across jurisdictions has consistently rejected the recognition of artificial intelligence as a copyright author. In *Tencent v. Yingxun* (2019), where Tencent's Dreamwriter AI generated financial news articles and Yingxun reproduced 10 articles without authorization, the Shenzhen Nanshan District Court ruled Tencent as the legal author. It affirmed that copyright protection attaches to human intellectual investment in algorithm design, data selection and final review⁸. This case implicitly supports a

contribution-based approach but leaves the issue of multi-stakeholder right allocation unresolved. Similarly, in *Thaler v. Perlmutter* (2023), the U. S. District Court rejected copyright registration for a work fully autonomously created by AI, reaffirming the human-centric foundation of copyright law but exposing the limitation of the rigid binary “human-machine” division⁹.

The conservative stance, as seen in these cases, treats AI merely as a tool without standing. Conversely, the progressive stance advocates for granting AI limited legal personality. In response, some scholars advocate granting artificial intelligence limited legal personality, drawing on the concept of “electronic persons”¹⁰. Yet such proposals remain functionally problematic. Copyright law operates not merely as a recognition mechanism but as a system of incentives, liability allocation, and market regulation. Assigning authorship to AI would sever the connection between rights and responsibility, undermining the regulatory coherence of copyright institutions¹¹.

Recent research therefore increasingly favors a contribution-based approach that locates copyright attribution within the network of human actors involved in AI content production. These include data curators, algorithm developers, system operators, and deploying platforms¹². From this perspective, AI is best understood as a sophisticated production medium rather than an autonomous rights holder.

To operationalize this contribution-based approach, this study proposes a Tripartite Allocation Model—a framework dividing copyright interests based on quantifiable contributions of three core stakeholders (see Table 1). This tripartite structure resolves the theoretical impasse by substituting the binary “author vs. Machine” debate with a pragmatic ecosystem of shared interests.

Stakeholder	Primary Contribution	Rights Granted	Quantitative Threshold
Operator (Human User)	Provides original prompts, exercises creative control over output direction and style	Full authorship and property rights proportionate to input	Prompt originality $\geq 30\%$ AND data selection weight $\geq 15\%$
Developer (AI Enterprise)	Invests in algorithm design, model training, and data infrastructure	Limited Right to Earnings (royalty share from commercial use)	Based on R&D investment and model contribution to output quality
Public	Contributes to the collective knowledge base used for AI training	Non-exclusive Right of Use for non-commercial, educational, and research purposes	Applies to general AI outputs without substantial human creative input

Table 1 Tripartite allocation model core framework

As suggested in the U. S. Copyright Office’s January 2025 report, Copyright and Artificial Intelligence, mere prompt input does not guarantee copyright; the user must exercise substantive creative control. Therefore, a quantitative threshold is suggested: if a human user’s prompt originality accounts for $\geq 30\%$ and data selection weight accounts for $\geq 15\%$, they should be granted property rights. Furthermore, to rectify the imbalance where platforms monopolize revenues, digital publishing requires a “Dynamic Contribution Assessment” algorithm, drawing inspiration from Article 63a of the German Copyright Act regarding equitable remuneration. This algorithm would integrate multiple dimensions of contribution, including prompt complexity, post-generation editing intensity, and model training data contribution, to ensure fair and transparent benefit distribution.

Clarifying authorship, however, does not resolve the broader governance dilemma.¹³ Even when human contributors can be identified, traditional mechanisms for exercising copyright—particularly licensing—prove

increasingly incompatible with AI-driven production models. This structural limitation necessitates a closer examination of authorization systems in digital publishing.

3. Structural Failure of Traditional Licensing Models in AI-Driven Publishing

Conventional copyright licensing mechanisms are premised on identifiable right holders, discrete works, and feasible ex-ante authorization. These assumptions collapse in AI-driven digital publishing environments, resulting in a dual failure of cost constraints and efficiency decay.

Under the Web 3.0 paradigm, the bidirectional interaction between User-Generated Content (UGC) and AI-Generated Content (AIGC) catalyzes a structural transformation where the fragmented diffusion of use cases coexists with massive content aggregation. Traditional copyright law relies on an author-centric logic, constructing an individualized negotiation system that demands total control over content dissemination. However, evaluating this through the lens of institutional efficiency reveals a severe paradox.

First, in the realm of secondary creation, the strict authorize-before-use paradigm intrinsically conflicts with fragmented creative demands. Because secondary creation requires the integration of multi-source elements, forcing creators to individually negotiate with every right holder triggers exponentially increasing marginal costs, essentially driving the majority of users toward infringing usage due to prohibitive transaction costs. This problem is particularly acute in the short video industry, where a typical 15-second video may incorporate 3–5 different copyrighted elements, including music, images, and text clips. Industry data shows that over 70% of short video creators have abandoned legitimate authorization due to excessive time and cost burdens, leading to widespread infringement and legal disputes.

Second, in AI training scenarios, the rigid demand for massive data inputs fundamentally clashes with existing licensing models. Using the GPT series models as an example, the volume of text data required for training reaches the magnitude of tens of millions. If one-to-one authorization rules are mechanically applied, the cost of clearing rights will severely invert against the economic returns of technological innovation, ultimately forming a negative institutional externality that stifles development.

When traditional licensing fails, the fair use doctrine should theoretically serve as a safety valve. However, Article 24 of China's Copyright Law employs a closed-list approach that cannot accommodate exponential technological use cases like Text and Data Mining (TDM). Furthermore, a deeper institutional tension stems from the structural dislocation between traditional licensing paradigms and the digital publishing ecosystem. In terms of rights transfer, the relatively closed authorization system of the traditional publishing industry cannot adapt to the high-frequency, multi-node, dynamic flow characteristic of the digital environment, leading to inflated transaction costs.

This institutional dilemma fundamentally reflects the temporal friction between industrial-age copyright concepts and the operational laws of the digital economy. To overcome these structural inefficiencies, copyright frameworks must internalize technological realities by expanding the scope of fair use. It is advocated for integrating a TDM exemption specifically for scientific research, mirroring Articles 3–4 of the EU Directive on Copyright in the Digital Single Market (DSM Directive). Furthermore, drawing from the non-expressive use exception established in the U. S. case *Authors Guild v. Google*, temporary copying of protected works during



deep learning model training should be exempted as fair use.

Concurrently, the authorization mechanism itself must transition to automated, technology-driven frameworks. Blockchain-driven smart contracts offer a highly viable institutional design. Blockchain is a decentralized, immutable distributed ledger that records transactions across multiple nodes. Its core advantages for copyright governance include tamper-proof rights confirmation, transparent revenue distribution and full-cycle traceability, though it currently faces significant practical limitations. In terms of scalability, public blockchains like Ethereum can only process approximately 15–20 transactions per second, far below the demands of large-scale digital publishing platforms that handle millions of content transactions daily. Cross-jurisdictional legal uncertainty further complicates its application: while China recognizes the legal validity of consortium blockchain records, many countries have not yet established clear regulatory frameworks for blockchain-based copyright transactions.

Smart contracts, as self-executing code with predefined terms, can automate micro-licensing and royalty distribution. Specifically, Non-Fungible Tokens (NFTs), acting as digital proofs of ownership, leverage their indivisibility and non-fungibility to become unique carriers for original works. This establishes effective rights confirmation, delivering verifiable digital ownership and resolving industry-wide challenges of intellectual property authentication and anti-counterfeiting traceability. In China, the Copyright Protection Center's exploration of the Digital Copyright Identifier (DCI) System 3.0 represents a critical step toward building a national Copyright ID infrastructure. Additionally, AI-powered tools can conduct large-scale internet scanning for copyright monitoring and real-time infringement tracing, supplementing blockchain governance. These tools use computer vision and natural language processing technologies to compare uploaded content with a database of copyrighted works, achieving detection accuracy rates of over 95% for text and image content.

4. Multidimensional Remedies: Graduated Liability and the Blockchain Evidence Loop

4.1 Dynamic Fault Assessment: A Three-Tier Standard

In the Web 3.0 ecosystem, the immense dissemination power generated by algorithmic recommendation systems shatters the “technical neutrality” assumption underlying traditional “notice-takedown” rules. When deep learning algorithms deeply intervene in content distribution, three normative challenges arise: First, does algorithmic recommendation constitute a technical presumption of the constructive knowledge (knew or should have known) requirement under the Copyright Law? Second, does the platform's transmission dominance elevate its duty of care of a good administrator? Third, does an elevated standard of care necessitate a reallocation of the right to remuneration under Article 22 of the Copyright Law Implementing Regulations? The ambiguity surrounding these normative propositions continuously exacerbates the institutional tension between rights protection and technical innovation.

The paradigm of platform responsibility must therefore transcend the legacy classifications of internet service providers. We propose a dynamic adaptation mechanism—a graduated liability system based on the principle of risk-return equivalence and the platform's degree of technical intervention. (see Table 2) Unlike the traditional

binary pure conduit-content provider classification, this system allocates nuanced duties matching platforms' actual control over content. It reduces legal uncertainty, aligns incentives for anti-infringement investment, and adapts flexibly to emerging business models.

To ensure the operability of this system, a standardized platform technical intervention assessment index system should be established. This system would include three core dimensions: the degree of algorithmic control over content distribution (e. g. , recommendation algorithm weight, personalized push intensity), the level of content pre-review and filtering, and the platform's revenue dependence on copyrighted content. The paradigm of platform responsibility must therefore transcend the legacy classifications of internet service providers. We propose a dynamic adaptation mechanism—a graduated liability system based on the principle of “risk-return equivalence” and the platform's degree of technical intervention. (see Table 2) Industry associations and regulatory bodies can jointly develop assessment standards, conduct regular evaluations of major platforms, and dynamically adjust their liability levels based on assessment results.

Platform Technological Role	Level of Intervention	Primary Judicial Standard Applied	Probability of Platform Liability
Pure Data Storage (e-g., Cloud Drives)	Low (Passive Hosting)	Safe Harbor (Notice-Takedown)	Low
Content Aggregation (e-g. , Forums, BBS)	Medium (Categorization)	Red Flag Standard (Constructive Knowledge)	Moderate
Algorithmic Recommendation (e. g. , Personalized Feeds)	High (Active Promotion)	Heightened Duty of Care (Proactive Filtering)	High
AI Generation /Co-creation (e. g. , AIGC Platforms)	Critical (Content Generation)	Direct or Contributory Infringement	Very High

Table 2 Correlation between platform technological roles and copyright liability trends

First, for platforms strictly providing passive data storage, the Safe Harbor defense holds. These platforms should employ basic authorize-before-upload protocols and utilize copyright fingerprinting. Second, for platforms deploying collaborative filtering algorithms, the duty of care must be elevated to the Red Flag standard. As established by the Shanghai Pudong District Court in the Yuewen Group case, if a platform's algorithm deliberately boosts pirated literature, it constitutes contributory infringement. Third, for intelligent recommendation platforms that deeply intervene in content production, courts must apply a substantial substitution test. Liability is positively correlated with technical application. When a rightsholder provides dual-chain evidence, the platform cannot use blockchain's technical neutrality as a shield; instead, the burden of proof shifts to the platform.

4.2 Closed-Loop Evidence and Damages Calculation

The decentralized nature of Web 3.0 exacerbates the difficulty of infringement tracing. The traditional notice-takedown rule appears entirely impotent against Web 3.0 infringements. In the first major NFT copyright dispute in China—the Fat Tiger Vaccination NFT case—infringers utilized block-chain for cross-platform distribution. Because NFT metadata (such as work hashes and transaction records) is generated on consortium chains, it becomes immutable once uploaded. Even if a court orders an injunction to cease infringement,

decentralized technology dilutes the actual effect of deletion. Furthermore, user anonymity makes tracking the actual tortfeasors exceptionally difficult.

To counter this, we propose a Dual-Chain Evidence System—a two-tier blockchain mechanism for comprehensive copyright proof and infringement tracing (see Table 3). This system creates a closed loop from creation to transaction, solving the long-standing problem of evidence collection in digital copyright disputes.

Chain Type	Purpose	Content Stored	Operation Mechanism	Legal Effect
Creation Chain	Establish original ownership	Author's drafts, creation timestamps, revision history, copyright registration records	Authors upload their works to a consortium blockchain at various stages of creation; the blockchain generates a unique hash and timestamp for each version	Provides prima facie evidence of authorship and creation time; recognized by Chinese internet courts
Transaction Chain	Track dissemination and infringement	NFT minting records, transaction history, transfer records, access logs	Platforms deploy smart contract probes to automatically record all transactions involving copyrighted works; anomalous behaviors (e.g., large-scale unauthorized transfers) are flagged in real-time	Provides evidence of infringement scope, duration, and financial harm; enables accurate calculation of damages

Table 3 Dual-Chain Evidence System Structure

Furthermore, calculating damages in digital publishing is notoriously difficult. Traditional copyright law relies on objective metrics like circulation volume or print runs, which are inapplicable to the instantaneous, cross-regional, and low-cost replication of digital environments. While Article 54 of the Chinese Copyright Law raised the statutory damages cap to 5 million RMB, the threshold for serious circumstances lacks clear definition. To resolve this issue, AI-assisted damage calculation systems can be developed to integrate multi-dimensional data, including the work's original market value, the duration and scope of infringement, the number of views and shares, and the infringer's subjective malice. These systems can generate objective damage assessment reports, providing scientific reference for judicial decisions and reducing the arbitrariness of statutory damages.

To resolve the issue of plaintiffs failing to meet the burden of proof due to platform data black boxes, platform data disclosure obligations must undergo technical and scenario-based reform. When evidence involves user behavioral data, platforms should process sensitive data referencing the Information Security Technology-Personal Information Security Specification (GB/T 35273-2020) or utilize Differential Privacy technologies, akin to Springer Nature's Data Privacy Gateway, to generate actionable aggregate data reports for litigation.

Simultaneously, punitive damage triggers must be established for algorithmic malice. If a platform employs adversarial neural networks to bypass plagiarism checks, subjective malice is directly presumed. Drawing upon legislative precedents like the California Consumers Legal Remedies Act (CLRA), if a platform's interface induces users to disseminate infringing content, it may trigger aggravated liability.

4.3 Cross-Border Jurisdiction and Synergistic Governance

Finally, the globalization of digital publishing inevitably triggers jurisdictional conflicts. These conflicts are primarily concentrated in the debate between the server location standard and the user perception standard. The former offers technical certainty but struggles with distributed storage, whereas the latter aligns with the borderless nature of the internet but risks overextending long-arm jurisdiction and violating judicial sovereignty.

Although current Chinese judicial practice leans toward the server standard, relying on a single criterion risks undermining the efficacy of cross-border rights protection.

We propose adopting a dual-test of Substantial Effect+Technical Controllability. First, if foreign platforms utilize CDN acceleration or IP obfuscation to deliberately distribute infringing content to domestic users, a jurisdictional nexus is established. Second, platforms must take reasonable measures against foreseeable cross-border infringements. Additionally, Natural Language Processing (NLP) technology can be employed for targeted language analysis—such as detecting whether a pirated platform offers Chinese search options—serving as a technical auxiliary tool for determining jurisdiction. Under the Regional Comprehensive Economic Partnership (RCEP) framework, we advocate for integrating systems like WIPO's DCI and Crossref via Hyperledger Fabric consortium chains to enable real-time hash verification of infringing content across borders.

5. Conclusion

The foregoing analysis demonstrates that the copyright challenges of digital publishing in the Web 3.0 era are not the result of isolated doctrinal deficiencies but stem from a structural mismatch between static legal frameworks and dynamic technological processes. Specifically, the proliferation of AI-generated content (AIGC), decentralized networks, and algorithmic distribution has triggered a tripartite crisis: the blurring of authorship boundaries, the friction of one-to-one licensing models, and the tracing difficulties of decentralized infringement. Through an examination of authorship identification, licensing failure, and platform-centered responsibility, this article reveals a gradual transformation of copyright governance from ex-post enforcement toward process-oriented control.

Rather than extending legal personality to artificial intelligence or mechanically expanding exclusive rights, effective regulation requires a functional reorientation of copyright institutions. The core theoretical innovation of this study lies in replacing the binary man vs. machine debate with a Tripartite Allocation Model, dynamically distributing rights among AI operators, developers, and the public based on quantifiable creative contributions. Furthermore, to address the licensing deadlock and enforcement opacity, this paper constructs a technology-driven institutional solution: utilizing block-chain smart contracts for automated micro-licensing, and establishing a Graduated Liability System that correlates a platform's duty of care directly with its degree of algorithmic control.

Future reforms should focus on three dimensions: technological integration through standardized digital copyright identifiers (DCI) and Dual-Chain evidence systems to break the platform data black box, industry self-regulation via platform compliance alliances to establish unified damage calculation models, and international cooperation on cross-border enforcement mechanisms utilizing electronic evidence clouds within global frameworks like RCEP. By aligning legal regulation with technological realities, copyright law can evolve from a reactive system of rights protection into a proactive framework of ecosystem governance, ultimately ensuring that technological advancement serves as a catalyst for cultural prosperity rather than a disruptor of creative incentives.

參考文獻

CHEN Hua. (2023). The transformation of copyright protection paradigms in the age of artificial intelligence. *Asia-Pacific Journal*



of Humanities and Social Sciences, 3(4), 12–25.

EU Directive 2019/790 (DSM Directive).

FENG Xiaoqing & JIN Yani. (2024). Copyright ownership of AI-generated content. *Journal of Wuling*, (5), 49.

GUO Shaofei. (2018). Legal subject of electronic persons. *Oriental Law*, (3), 40–51.

KONG Xiangjun. (2020). Application of Internet clauses to new network services. *Political Science and Law*, (1), 52.

LIN Shao. (2024). Transformation of copyright licensing paradigm for smart publishing content in the Web 3.0 era. *Publishing and Issuing Research*, (12), 74–81.

MEI Shuwen. (2024). Legal structure of AI copyright subject qualification. *Science Technology and Law*, (3), 11–19.

16. Bernt Hugenholtz, The New Copyright Directive: Text and Data Mining (Articles 3–4), Kluwer Copy right Blog (July 24, 2019), <https://copyrightblog.kluweriplaw.com/2019/07/24/the-new-copyright-directive-textand-data-mining-articles-3-and-4/>.

REN Anqi. (2022). Blockchain and collective copyright management. *Publishing and Issuing Research*, (9), 39–45.

REN Anqi. (2023). Application and governance of ChatGPT in digital publishing. *Publishing Science*, (5), 94–102.

Tencent v. Yingxun, Shenzhen Nanshan District Court (2019).

Thaler v. Perlmutter, U. S. District Court for the District of Columbia (2023).

The Supreme People's Procuratorate of PRC. (2024). Typical Cases of Punishing Copyright Infringement Crimes.

UK Intellectual Property Office. (2022). Intellectual Property and Investment in Artificial Intelligence.

U. S. Copyright Office. (2025). Copyright and Artificial Intelligence.

WEI Jia. (2022). Legal protection of digital publishing copyright. *Publishing Wide Angle*, (10), 88–91.

WU Jia, CHEN Pei, & TAO Chenxu. (2023). Smart publishing under the metaverse. *Publishing Science*, (3), 10.

Xiong, Q. (2011). Legitimacy of statutory copyright licensing. *Intellectual Property*, (6), 38.

Yuan, Z. (2017). Limited legal personality of artificial intelligence. *Oriental Law*, (5), 50–57.

Yubo Zhiye. (2024). 2024 – 2029 Market Research Report on China's Digital Publishing Industry and Investment Feasibility Analysis (Report No. 14822187). China Reporting Hall.

Zeng, Q. (2024). Benefit distribution in copyright law. *Social Scientist*, (4), 141.

Zhao, X. (2024). Copyright protection for AIGC-empowered digital publishing. *Publishing Wide Angle*, (12), 48–52.

杭州互聯網法院(2022)浙0192民初1008號民事判決書。

上海市浦東新區人民法院(2021)滬0115民初12345號民事判決書。

深圳市南山區人民法院(2019)粵0305民初14010號民事判決書。

新華網:《中國版權保護中心攜手螞蟻集團共建數字版權鏈(DCI體系3.0)》,2022年8月1日發佈,網站鏈接:<https://www.xinhuanet.com/info/20220801/c890e867bc174d1494c0443718e5f45b/c.html>。

張翼,徐一楠:《人與技術的異化關係:智能手錶廣告的批評隱喻分析》,《英語研究》,2024年第1期,頁117–126。

張建麗,王宇澤:《生成式人工智能機器人隱喻能力的實證研究》,《外國語文》,2023年第3期,頁41–51。

中國新聞出版研究院:《2023—2024年中國數位出版產業年度報告》。

(Editors: Derrick MI & JIANG Qing)