EDITORIAL

We as the Taiwan Vanguard of Journal with Open Peer Review

In the former Editorial of Issue 1, Volume 55 (2018), we have proposed three questions regarding the development of open peer review (OPR). What is the feasibility of applying OPR to journals in the field of social sciences, including library and information science? Do vendors of academic information value-added systems or databases have the willingness to get involved in the development and services of OPR systems? Are scholars in humanities and social sciences willing to change habits and break with tradition, and accept new challenges of OPR?

The OPR has not yet been given a unified name and a universally identical definition. OPR has also been termed as "public peer review", "transparent peer review", and "advanced open peer review". In terms of common features, OPR are termed as "signed review", "disclosed review", "transparent review", "editor-mediated review", and "crowd-sourced review". For another three attached features, OPR are also called "synchronous review", "pre-publication review", and even "post-publication review".[1] These features above indicate the innovative aspect of OPR in breaking with traditional modes, especially the new mode of "crowd-sourced review", suggesting that chief editors of journals can recruit numerous scholars and experts for undertaking the task of manuscript review, through a network platform that incorporates new media technologies and equips with a real-time, interactive and transparent mode of being able to verify all OPR tasks. However, not all of the features mentioned above are necessary to be included in one OPR system. The implementation of OPR varies with different management modes of journals. Each feature is allowed with a certain degree of creativity, and the implementation of OPR is allowed with differences of depths. When to open (timeliness) and how to open (democratic authorization and technical conditions)? These questions are for all of scholars and journal editors to contemplate. Solutions to problems should respond to calls for ideal and practical considerations, and people who take charge should select or design the most appropriate management mode for their own journals.

The general requirements for the OPR system of journals are described below.

---

[1] Emily Ford, "Defining and Characterizing Open Peer Review: A Review of the Literature," *Journal of Scholarly Publishing* 44, 4 (2013): 311-326. See also the information at https://pdxscholar.library.pdx. edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1000&context=ulib_fac.

1. The identity information of peer reviewers should be open, contrary to traditional double-blind or single-blind modes that hide identities of peer reviewers.

2. No matter it is a pre-publication or post-publication review mode, after the review procedure is terminated, contents of peer reviewers' opinions should be open together with published manuscripts.

3. The open access (OA) mode should be adopted, and articles should be published online for interested readers to add comments to articles. However, contents of readers' comments are not necessary to be regarded as the basis of formal reviews of academic contents of manuscripts. It is to provide a channel for authors and readers to communicate with each other.

It is worth noting that the three requirements mentioned above could be independently used, or applied with different combinations. No matter what the combination is, in a broad sense, it could be termed as "Open Peer Review". In addition, from the perspective of epoch revolution, OPR system is indeed highly relevant to the open access mode, but even profit-oriented journals with a non-open-access mode could possibly adopt partial features of OPR and develop their publishing strategies. In other words, the point of OPR lies in the open and blind aspects, not in presenting confronting thoughts. Any design mechanism that respects the free wills of authors and reviewers, makes the review process open and transparent, promotes positive academic talks with assistances of technologies and media, guards academic quality and takes responsibilities of academic communication, could be regarded as an open-minded and trust-worthy OPR system.

Our *JoEMLS* takes a positive and serious stance toward the development of OPR in future's academic journal publishing in Taiwan, and we will certainly be in the vanguard of the OPR trend. In the future if scholars and chief-editors of journals could apply various added values of open peer review, such as Digital Object Identifier (ODI), Open Researcher and Contributor ID (ORCID), and Altmetrics, we have good reasons to believe the academic field in Taiwan is certainly to generate or accept the development and application of this kind of new platforms. No matter from the literature review of domestic and overseas applications of OPR platforms, or from analysis of 2018 surveys conducted by *JoEMLS* team that sent to more than one hundred scholars who ever reviewed manuscripts in Chinese for *JoEMLS*, and results of interviews with chief-editors of journals in library and information science field in Taiwan, we obtained similar findings. In the premise of respecting the willingness of relevant authorities, it is expected and feasible to design OPR solutions that are with characteristics, human

nature, and expediency. There obviously has no fixed modes of OPR systems, and we found plenty of innovative measures. With the spirit of innovation, revolution and experiments, our journal will not hesitate to continually promote and improve application modes of OPR, and usher journals of humanities and social sciences in Taiwan toward a new epoch of OPR.

In this issue (Issue 1, Volume 56), thirteen manuscripts have been reviewed, and four of them are accepted and published, with a rejection rate of 69.2%. The articles published in this issue include "The Maturity Assessment of the Recent Open Data Development in the Context of Taiwan E-Government" by Tung-Mou Yang and Yi-Jung Wu, "Does the Learning of Computational Thinking Concepts Interact with the Practice of Digital Curation in Children? A Preliminary Case Study" by Chun-Hao Chang, "An Application of ePUB3 eBooks to the Design and Teaching of Flipped 'Applied Writing' Courses: An Example of 'Abstract Writing' " by Tina Pingting Tsai, Chingsheng Hsu, and Jyhjong Lin, and "Quality Discussion and High-Level Comprehension: An Analysis of Taiwanese College Students" by Hsiao-Ling Hsu, Hao-Jan Howard Chen, and Wei-Tin Lin. There are many good articles left out. There are also many wonderful contents of academic criticism, reflections and debates that are not able to be shared. Some of these non-published academic publishing processes and debates are not less thought-provoking than published contents. If not with the clever application of OPR system, these wonderful insights can be only left in the memories of involved parties and archives of chief-editors of journals. We thank all of the authors who submitted manuscripts. No matter the manuscript is accepted or rejected, each author is a respectable scholar.

Jeong-Yeou Chiu
JoEMLS Chief Editor

編者言

期刊「開放式同儕評閱」從我們做起

　　本刊曾在2018年55卷1期「編者言」，特別就期刊「開放式同儕評閱」（Open Peer Review，以下簡稱OPR）之發展問題，有以下三提問：未來OPR應用在人文社會學（含圖書資訊學）期刊領域的可行性如何？台灣的學術資訊加值廠商或資料庫商是否有意願涉入OPR系統之開發與服務？以及人文社會科學學者是否願意改變習性並突破傳統，接受OPR的創新挑戰？

　　OPR制度發展至今，其名稱並未獲明確統一，甚至其定義也有所差異。通常OPR也被稱為「公開的同儕評閱」（Public Peer Review）、「透明的同儕評閱」（Transparent Peer Review）、「進階的同儕評閱」（Advanced Open Peer Review）。而就其共通特性而言，則展現在「評閱署名」（signed review）、「評閱揭露」（disclosed review）、「評閱透明」（transparent review）、「主編幹旋」（editor-mediated review）、「群眾外包」（crowdsourced review）；以及另三項附帶特質，即「評閱同步」（synchronous review）、「出版前評閱」（pre-publication review）和「出版後評閱」（post-publication review）上。[1] 這些特質更進一步清楚說明了「開放同儕評閱」突破傳統模式的新作為，尤其「群眾外包」的精神更是一種新的運作模式，意味著期刊主編利用網路平台將稿件評閱工作，以整合新媒體科技、即時、互動、公開透明的模式與可以驗證的任務，召集大量學者專家志願執行。然而，上述特質並不一定要全數具備，所謂的OPR模式的執行因各個期刊經營機構而異，並且每項特質亦可另有巧思，貫徹深淺程度也容有不同，何時「開放」（時效性）？如何「開放」（民主授權、技術性）？這些問題乃是留待所有學者或期刊編務工作者思考，而其解決方法都可兼具理想與務實之需，由各主事者選擇或設計出最適合自己期刊的經營模式。

　　一般而言，期刊OPR制度要件，主要認定在於：

　　㈠公開的評閱者身份資訊，不再是採傳統雙盲或單盲模式將評閱者身份隱匿；

　　㈡不論「出版前」或「出版後」之評閱模式，在終結評閱程序後，評閱者意見內容將與受刊登稿件同時公開；

　　㈢文章採用開放取用（Open Access; OA）模式將文章公諸網路，對於文章主題有興趣的讀者都能對文章加入評論。但讀者評論內容，並非必然成為文章學術內容正式評閱把關之依據，而係作為文章作者與讀者對話交流之模式。

---

[1] Emily Ford, "Defining and Characterizing Open Peer Review: A Review of the Literature," *Journal of Scholarly Publishing* 44, 4 (2013): 311-326. 同份資料亦可得自https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1000&context=ulib_fac.

　　值得留意的是：前述三項要件可各自獨立、各種相排列組合應用，不論組合如何，現時在廣義應用上皆足以稱作「開放式同儕評閱」。此外，從時代演進的觀點而言，OPR制度的確與OA關係密切，但即使營利性的「非OA」期刊亦有可能採取OPR之部分特點而發展其出版策略。易言之，OPR精神在所謂的「開放」（open）與「盲審」（blind）議題並非呈現對立的概念，凡能落實多多尊重作者與評閱者的自由意願，而將評閱流程「公開且透明」化，在科技與媒體的協助下，促進良性的學術對話，並為學術品質把關以及善盡學術傳播責任的設計機制，都足堪稱作開明、信實的OPR制度。

　　本刊 教育資料與圖書館學（*JoEMLS*）非常正面與嚴肅地看待OPR未來在台灣學術期刊出版界的發展。也勢必從自身做起。未來若在學者與主編對於OPR可以形成之各種附加價值，例如：DOI、ORCID、Altmetrics等工具應用下，我們絕對有理由相信，台灣學界必定能產生或接受這類新平台的開發及應用。不論從OPR文獻的爬梳來掌握各國外知名OPR平台的應用；或是我們曾經在2018年針對曾為*JoEMLS*擔任中文審稿者的百多位學者發出問卷，並由訪談台灣圖資學主要期刊主編的訪談結果，都得到近似的答案：在尊重相關權益人「意願」的前提下，借助科技之賜、以創新應用的精神與作為，設計出具特色、人性的、權宜的OPR解決方案仍將是可期、可為的。OPR制度迄今顯然也並無一定的「模式」，我們所發現的卻是更多的「創新」作為。而本刊也將毫無遲疑地以創新、改革、試驗的精神，持續推動並改善OPR的應用模式，引領台灣人文社會學期刊邁向新的OPR時代。

　　語末，本刊此卷期（56卷1期）共計處理完成13篇稿件，僅接受其中4篇文章之刊登，退稿率來到百分之69.2。本卷期刊登大作包括：楊東謀、吳怡融的「台灣政府開放資料推行之近況調查與探討」、Chun-Hao Chang發表 "Does the Learning of Computational Thinking Concepts Interact with the Practice of Digital Curation in Children? A Preliminary Case Study"；還有蔡娉婷、許慶昇、林至中三位發表的「應用ePUB3電子書於翻轉式寫作課程設計與教學實務：以摘要寫作為例」，以及Hsiao-Ling Hsu、Hao-Jan Howard Chen、Wei-Tin Lin的大作 "Quality Discussion and High-Level Comprehension: An Analysis of Taiwanese College Students"。除了這四篇大作之外，更有許多的遺珠之憾；也有許多來自作者與評閱者雙方精彩的學術批判、反思、答辯內容，卻無緣分享於眾。這些無法公開的學術發表過程與辯證，有時甚至不亞於發表內容之發人深省，若無OPR制度設計的巧妙運用，就只能塵封於當事人的記憶與期刊主編的歷史檔案裡。我們非常感謝所有的賜稿者，無論投稿成功或失敗，大家都是可敬的學者。

<div align="right">

邱　炯友

教育資料與圖書館學 主編

</div>