Indian Journal of Law
ISSN: 3048-4936 | Vol. 3 Issue 2 | Mar– Apr 2025 | Peer Reviewed & Refereed

Redefining Intellectual Property Rights in a Globalized Digital Economy: Safeguarding Innovation for Sustainable Growth

Dr Renu sheokand
renusheokand26@gmail.com

DOI: https://doi.org/10.36676/ijl.v3.i2.92
Accepted 02/04/2025 Published:20/04/2025 * Corresponding author

How to Cite this Article:

Malik, P. (2025). Redefining Intellectual Property Rights in a Globalized Digital Economy: Safeguarding Innovation for Sustainable Growth. *Indian Journal of Law, 3(2), 45-54*.

Abstract

Globalisation and the digital economy's explosive growth have fundamentally changed how intellectual property is produced, distributed, and safeguarded. Intellectual Property Rights (IPR) are now essential to preserving the harmony between encouraging innovation and guaranteeing equitable access to data and technology in this linked world. The economic value of intangible assets including software, algorithms, data, and creative material has increased due to the growing dependence on digital platforms for communication, education, healthcare, entertainment, and commerce. These assets are now major forces behind global economic expansion, thus both developed and developing countries must prioritise protecting them via strong IPR laws.

Examining how conventional legal frameworks are adjusting to the intricacies of cross-border digital commerce and the difficulties presented by quick technical breakthroughs, this research paper explores the changing role of intellectual property rights in the digital age. It examines the conflict between the ideas of open innovation and private rights, especially as it relates to digital commons, open-source software, and cooperative content production. The study also emphasises how high-income and low-income nations differ in their ability to apply and enforce intellectual property rights, which often results in an unequal playing field in international marketplaces.

The study attempts to clarify how inclusive and successful IPR systems can serve as innovation accelerators, promote foreign direct investment, and permit fair participation in the global digital economy by utilising an interdisciplinary approach that integrates legal, economic, and technological viewpoints. Additionally, the report offers legislative suggestions for strengthening IPR governance while advancing sustainability and digital inclusion. By doing this, it emphasises the need of global collaboration, flexible laws, and a fair approach to intellectual property that takes into account the reality of a digitally connected world.

1. Overview

Digital revolution is quickly redefining the global economy of the twenty-first century. The digital economy has emerged as a result of the spread of technologies like artificial intelligence (AI), cloud computing, blockchain, and the Internet of Things (IoT), as well as the growth of digital platforms, e-commerce, and data-driven innovation. In this new paradigm, the economic significance of old physical commodities and manufacturing is being surpassed by intellectual capital, which includes anything from digital media and data to proprietary algorithms and software.

At the same time, globalisation has sped up cross-border integration of digital services, supply chains, and marketplaces. In addition to opening up a plethora of chances for business, innovation, and access to international markets, this has also brought out new difficulties, particularly with regard to legal regulation and enforcement. In this quickly changing environment, protecting and governing intellectual property rights (IPR) is one of the most urgent issues.

Since IPR systems were first created before the advent of digital technology, they often find it difficult to handle the intricate realities of borderless internet. In a world where a patented algorithm, copyrighted movie, or pirated software may be copied and spread across continents with a single click, traditional ideas of territorial jurisdiction are becoming less and less relevant. Furthermore, there are serious questions about how to properly and successfully enforce IPRs in a globalised digital setting since digital material and services are susceptible to widespread infringement, piracy, unauthorised use, and misappropriation.

Furthermore, there are significant ramifications for innovation policy and economic equality from the confluence of globalisation and digitalisation. On the one hand, robust intellectual property rights (IPR) laws may encourage innovation by safeguarding creators, inventors, and companies, which in turn promotes investment, research, and technological development. However, IPR regimes that are too strict or inconsistently applied may lead to monopolies, hinder competition, and exacerbate the digital divide, which disproportionately affects underdeveloped nations and underserved people who have little access to protected information and technology.

The purpose of this essay is to critically analyse how intellectual property rights are changing in the digital economy, with a focus on how globalisation affects intangible asset accessibility and protection. It examines the conflict between preserving innovation and guaranteeing equitable access, evaluates foreign legal systems, and makes suggestions for creating a more welcoming and innovative global intellectual property rights environment. In view of continuous technical breakthroughs and global interconnectedness, this analysis highlights the urgent necessity to reconsider and modify IPR regimes.

2. The Digital Economy and Intellectual Property

Intellectual property (IP) has become essential to economic development, innovation, and competitiveness as the world economy shifts to a more digital framework. New types of products and services that are only available in intangible representations may now be created and distributed thanks to digital technology. These days, software, databases, digital art, algorithms, and online branding are all covered by intellectual property protection, which is no longer limited to tangible goods or conventional copyright materials. The necessity for legal frameworks that not only protect rights holders but also encourage creativity, cooperation, and fair access is increased by the digital economy's dependence on innovation.

2.1 The Rise of Online Products and Services

One of the biggest changes to modern economic systems is the emergence of digital products and services. These products have a low marginal cost, are readily repeatable, and can be distributed internationally. Important instances consist of:

Mobile Applications (applications): With millions of applications accessible on sites like Google Play and Apple's App Store, intellectual property (IP) incorporated into user interfaces, code, and brand identification is susceptible to illegal copying and cloning.

Online Platforms: Complex software infrastructures that need to be protected by patents, copyrights, and trade secrets are found in social networking platforms, e-commerce websites, SaaS (Software-as-a-Service) systems, and content-hosting platforms.

Storage, compute, and platform services are examples of cloud-based services. These services all contain proprietary code, encryption techniques, and interfaces that are necessary for service delivery and must be protected against abuse or reverse engineering.

NFTs, or non-fungible tokens, are a combination of IP with blockchain technology. NFTs present concerns over copyright enforcement, particularly when material is created without the original creator's knowledge, even if they often attest ownership of digital art or music.

Technology-driven industries have seen a sharp increase in international patent applications under the Patent Cooperation Treaty (PCT), according to the World Intellectual Property Organisation (WIPO). The worldwide competition for exclusive rights to advancements in digital media, cloud computing, finance, and artificial intelligence is reflected in this trend.

Among the difficulties in this area are:

enforcement of cross-border intellectual property when digital goods are sold all over the world.

Ambiguity in jurisdiction about the location of violation.

Because of anonymity and decentralised platforms, it might be difficult to track down digital infringement or theft.

Governments and organisations are working to address these problems by promoting international legal harmonisation initiatives, the development of sui generis protections for digital breakthroughs, and changes to patentability criteria for software and artificial intelligence.

2.2 Digital Content and Copyright

The creation, consumption, and distribution of material have all undergone significant change in the digital era. This change has made it necessary to review and update copyright laws to take into account the new circumstances. A number of content categories have seen notable changes:

Streaming Services: Copyrighted content licensing is a major component of websites like YouTube, Spotify, and Netflix. They also have difficulties in preventing unapproved distribution and making sure that artists are fairly compensated. Although YouTube's Content ID and other takedown methods are automated, they have been criticised for either overblocking or not enforcing.

User-Generated Content (UGC): People who utilise social media often sample, parody, or remix previously published works that are protected by copyright. Although the fair use theory offers little flexibility, different jurisdictions apply it quite differently. It is unclear whether platform hosts or users are responsible for IP infringement.

MOOCs and online education: The growth of digital learning materials brings up concerns about open access, licensing, and pedagogical intellectual property protection. To distribute information while maintaining credit rights, educators are depending more and more on Creative Commons licensing.

Digital Rights Management (DRM): DRM systems are used to stop illegal distribution or duplication of digital assets, including software, movies, and eBooks. DRM is contentious, nevertheless, since some contend that it may go too far in restricting acceptable applications, such as format-shifting or accessibility for those with impairments.

Recent initiatives to hold platforms responsible and guarantee that content producers get fair compensation are reflected in legislative frameworks like the EU Copyright Directive (2019). For example, Article 17 of the directive places additional responsibilities on internet businesses by requiring content-sharing platforms to get licenses or delete information that violates the law.

But there has to be a careful balance made between:

defending the rights of artists and allowing them to make money off of their creations, and

preserving innovation and digital freedom, particularly when information that is transformed or derived contributes social or educational value.

In the academic and artistic areas, there is also a rising trend towards open access models and creative commons licenses, which provide the more open sharing of information while preserving author credit and specific use rights.

3. Issues with Cross-Border IPR and Globalisation

The complexity of intellectual property rights (IPR) has increased due to the integration of global markets and the development of digital technology. As the digital economy grows internationally, concerns are raised about how intellectual property rules, which are historically based on territorial sovereignty, can continue to be relevant in a world that is more linked and globalised. This section explores two main areas: the conflict between the territorial character of intellectual property protection and the worldwide accessibility of digital material, as well as the harmonisation of laws between countries.

3.1 Law Harmonisation

The process by which nations align their legal norms and enforcement strategies to establish a uniform worldwide intellectual property framework is known as harmonisation of IPR laws. Efforts to standardise IPR protections in order to promote easier cross-border investment, commerce, and innovation have been sparked by globalisation.

The World Trade Organisation (WTO) adopted the Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS) in 1995, marking one of the most important steps towards harmonisation. TRIPS compels all WTO members to abide by minimal levels of protection for a variety of intellectual property, including trade secrets, industrial designs, geographical indications, patents, copyrights, and trademarks. IPR's crucial importance in the contemporary economy was reflected in this agreement, which for the first time included it in the framework of international commerce.

The Paris Convention for the Protection of Industrial Property and the Berne Convention for the Protection of Literary and Artistic Works are two treaties run by the World Intellectual Property Organisation (WIPO) that, in addition to TRIPS, seek to standardise how signatory nations handle intellectual property rights. IPR in the digital sphere is covered by more recent agreements such as the WIPO Copyright Treaty (WCT) and the WIPO Performances and Phonograms Treaty (WPPT).

Even with these structures, enforcement is nevertheless difficult and uneven, especially in underdeveloped countries. The institutional ability, legal framework, and technical know-how necessary to successfully enforce IP rules are lacking in many low- and middle-income nations. Furthermore, cultural perspectives on ownership, creativity, and copying may be quite different from those of the West. For example, in several Southeast Asian and African nations, software piracy rates are still high owing to a combination of economic limitations, access-related problems, and lax enforcement.

The goals of harmonisation are undermined by this inconsistent enforcement, which results in differences in protection and makes managing intellectual property across borders expensive and uncertain. Furthermore, wealthy nations often advocate for more robust protections that may not be in line with the socioeconomic reality or development objectives of poorer nations, which feeds into discussions about the inclusivity and fairness of international IPR regimes.

3.2 Global Access vs. Territoriality

Territoriality, which asserts that IPRs are issued and enforced inside the borders of specific governments, is one of the most essential concepts of intellectual property law. Unless specifically registered there, a patent or trademark granted in one nation has no legal validity in another. Although this idea was effective before the advent of digital technology, it currently conflicts with the global reach of the internet and digital trade.

Content is produced, shared, and consumed worldwide at a never-before-seen rate and scale in the digital era. One may instantly access a digital artwork, software program, video stream, or online article from any location in the globe. However, legal uncertainties arise when a work is protected by copyright law in one country but not in another. Rights holders find it difficult to defend their rights internationally as a consequence of this separation, which leads to jurisdictional issues.

For example, digital piracy of software, music, and movies is still a major problem. It may be difficult for rights holders to take legal action against websites that contain pirated material since they may be based in nations with lax IPR enforcement. Territorial restrictions make it difficult to enforce IPR globally, as shown by torrenting websites, mirror websites, and streaming services that get around license agreements.

Additionally, patent trolling, in which companies file patents to sue or collect royalties rather than for invention, has expanded internationally. To sue or threaten legal action against businesses in many nations, patent trolls take use of differences in patent laws across jurisdictions. It is expensive and ineffective to navigate patent applications and protections in a patchwork environment caused by the absence of a unified worldwide patent system.

Cloud computing and cross-border data flows are further hampered by the territorial character of IPR. For instance, when data is kept on servers spread across many nations, pinpointing the "location" of an infringement becomes difficult. In a similar vein, authorship and ownership definitions become more difficult when AI-generated work is developed and used across borders.

These problems bring up significant difficulties about how to update IPR regimes to take into account the reality of digital change and globalisation. While some academics and decision-makers advocate for the establishment of supranational IPR enforcement structures, others suggest adaptable, flexible legal instruments like as international dispute resolution forums and mutual recognition agreements.

4. Consequences for the Economy

Innovation, investment, and fair access to technology are all significantly impacted by the relationship between intellectual property rights (IPR) and the digital global economy. In addition to encouraging creativity and invention, a well-designed IPR framework is essential for trade dynamics, economic development, and international competitiveness.

4.1 Investment and Innovation

An essential component of the innovation economy is intellectual property rights. Strong IPR protection lets businesses and investors know that their innovations, trademarks, and creative products will be protected by the law. Increased investment in R&D is encouraged by this guarantee, especially in industries like digital services, biotechnology, pharmaceuticals, and information technology.

The protection offered by patent systems, trademarks, and copyrights has contributed to the significant expansion of high-tech businesses in nations with well-established IPR systems, like the US, South Korea, Japan, and Germany. For example, the United States' strong copyright and patent laws, which enable companies like Apple, Netflix, and Microsoft to profit from their inventions all over the world, are largely responsible for the country's supremacy in the software and entertainment industries.

Furthermore, research shows that IPR protection and foreign direct investment (FDI) are positively correlated. Global firms prefer investing in nations that provide legal protection against the theft of their intellectual assets, including software, trade secrets, private data, and algorithms. Particularly in industries where information is the main input, changes to IP laws have often come before increases in foreign direct investment in emerging nations.

Accessibility and protection must be balanced, however. Particularly in industries where invention accumulates over time, like software and electronics, excessive protection may impede incremental innovation, diminish market competition, and result in monopolistic behaviour. For instance, overlapping patents or "patent thickets" may make it more difficult for new businesses and inventors to enter the market, which inhibits the very innovation that intellectual property rights (IPR) are meant to encourage.

4.2 The Digital Divide and Technology Access

Strong IPR laws may increase the technical and digital gap between rich and poor countries, even while they also encourage innovation and draw investment. Strict IPR enforcement often results in high prices and restricted accessibility in low- and middle-income nations, particularly when it comes to life-saving technology, medical treatments, and educational material.

During the COVID-19 epidemic, one of the most contentious instances of this split surfaced. The urgency of vaccine research throughout the world brought to light the shortcomings of the existing IPR regimes in guaranteeing fair access. Due of pharmaceutical companies' exclusive patents on mRNA technology and antiviral medications, high-income nations hoarded vaccines while the Global South had delayed access. Global advocacy organisations and nations like South Africa and India responded by requesting a temporary relaxation of certain TRIPS requirements at the World Trade Organisation. However, a number of wealthier nations opposed this idea.

Alternatives including technology transfer agreements, open-source licensing, and mandatory licensing have drawn interest as means of closing this gap. To democratise access to information and innovation, the public health and education sectors may adopt open-source methods, which have shown to be very effective in the software industry (e.g., Linux, Apache). Another way to guarantee public benefit is by compulsory licensing, in which governments permit local manufacturing of patented goods under certain restrictions without the patent holder's approval. WTO members' rights to put public health ahead of IPR enforcement in times of emergency were reiterated in the Doha Declaration on the TRIPS Agreement and Public Health (2001).

Access to high-end software, copyrighted instructional materials, and proprietary platforms is still biassed in favour of richer countries in the fields of digital education and artificial intelligence. Global inequality may worsen as a result of developing nations' limited ability to innovate and acquire digital skills due to the cost barrier imposed by IPRs.

A "development-oriented IPR framework"—one that takes into account the various technical capabilities and socioeconomic requirements of countries—is increasingly being called for in order to solve these issues. International organisations and policymakers must make sure that inclusive economic and human development are not sacrificed for IPR protection.

5. Obstacles and Remarks

5.1 Law Enforcement in Online Environments

There are particular and enduring difficulties in enforcing intellectual property rights in the digital environment. Traditional law enforcement methods are less successful on the internet because of its decentralised and international character. Every day, enormous amounts of user-generated content—which often includes copyrighted music, photos, movies, and software—are hosted on websites like YouTube, Instagram, TikTok, and others. Although the Digital Millennium Copyright Act (DMCA) gives copyright holders a way to ask for the removal of information that violates their rights, it is almost difficult to keep an eye on this in real time due to the sheer number and speed of uploads.

Enforcement is further hampered by the use of encryption technology and digital anonymity. Without centralised management, copyrighted information is transferred directly between users via peer-to-peer (P2P) networks like BitTorrent, making it difficult to spot infringers or stop distribution. Because of jurisdictional overlaps, these networks operate in a grey area where what is deemed infringement in one nation may be considered fair use or public domain in another. IPR rules are applied and enforced unevenly throughout the world as a result of this legal fragmentation.

Furthermore, in order to identify copyrighted content, platforms often depend on automated methods like YouTube's Content ID. But because of their flaws, these systems may produce false negatives, in which infringing content is overlooked, and false positives, in which non-infringing content is reported. These tools may be abused by rivals looking to censor legal material or by rights holders misusing the takedown procedure.

Businesses and content producers are nonetheless at risk of infringement due to the absence of a coordinated worldwide digital IPR enforcement strategy, particularly in regions with lax regulatory oversight or a weak rule of law. As a result, there is less motivation to develop and distribute digital goods globally.

5.2 Issues with Monopolies and Innovation Suppression

Although intellectual property rights (IPR) are intended to encourage innovation by giving artists and inventors exclusive rights, their overuse or strategic use may result in monopolistic behaviour that inhibits rather than promotes innovation. The practice of "over-patenting," in which businesses get several patents, sometimes on little or incremental inventions, in an effort to build "patent thickets," is a major worry. Because they do not have the means to negotiate or license the current IP environment, smaller businesses and new entrants may be discouraged by these intricate webs of overlapping patents.

In sectors where innovation often accumulates over time, such as software, telecommunications, and biotechnology, this poses serious obstacles to entrance. For fear of expensive lawsuits, new researchers and developers can be discouraged from experimenting with or expanding upon current technology. Essentially, patents are used as a weapon to restrict competition rather than to foster innovation.

"Evergreening" is another contentious tactic that is especially common in the pharmaceutical sector. Here, businesses prolong a drug's patent life by making minor adjustments to its formulation, dosage, or mode of administration without providing a meaningful therapeutic breakthrough. This keeps costs high and restricts access to necessary medications, particularly in low- and middle-income nations, by delaying the release of generic medications.

For instance, detractors have brought up the issue of Novartis's cancer medication Gleevec, in which the corporation attempted to patent a significantly altered version in India. In 2013, the Indian Supreme Court rejected the patent, arguing that it was an effort at evergreening since the updated version did not significantly improve upon the original.

Additionally, a concentration of market power is facilitated by the acquisition of intellectual property rights by major tech companies, such as Apple, Google, and Microsoft. These companies often use patent hoarding or strategic litigation to stave off would-be innovators and disruptors. As a consequence, the economy's general variety and vibrancy are diminished in a digital marketplace where a few number of powerful companies dominate innovation.

6. Policy Suggestions

A systematic and well-rounded approach to intellectual property rights is necessary to meet the difficulties presented by the changing digital economy and globalisation. The following policy suggestions seek to foster innovation while guaranteeing accessibility, diversity, and equitable enforcement internationally:

6.1 International Collaboration

Intellectual property infringement may happen instantly across countries in today's globalised digital world. This fact emphasises how urgently international cooperation is required to create and implement IPR legislation. Although the foundation has been established by agreements like as TRIPS and WIPO treaties, there is still a lack of consistent enforcement and conflict resolution. Countries should make investments to fortify multilateral institutions including pooled databases for registered patents, trademarks, and copyrights, cross-border enforcement treaties, and cooperative IP task forces. In order to provide a fair, easily accessible, and prompt settlement process, international arbitration venues should also be prepared to handle IPR issues that span many nations. Improved efficiency, increased investor trust, and a decrease in forum shopping would result from greater congruence between legal requirements and enforcement procedures.

6.2 Knowledge of Digital Technology

An essential foundation for efficient IPR administration is widespread digital literacy. Particularly in developing countries, a large number of customers, businesses, and inventors are ignorant about their intellectual property rights and responsibilities. This ignorance raises the possibility of inadvertent infringement in addition to causing underutilisation of IP safeguards. To educate stakeholders about the importance of intellectual property rights (IPR) in the digital economy, governments and trade associations should fund national educational campaigns, seminars, and online resources. This entails being aware of what constitutes infringement, how to license intellectual property, and how to register it. Since they often lack access to official IP resources, educational institutions, inventors in the unorganised sector, and microbusinesses should get special attention. An educated public may help create a digital environment that is more civil, moral, and compatible with the law.

6.3 Juxtapose Protection and Access

Even though IPR is meant to encourage innovation, monopolistic or too strict IP laws may make it more difficult for people to get essential technology, medications, and educational resources, particularly in low-income nations. Policymakers need to strike a balance between encouraging equitable development and supporting innovation. Flexible licensing arrangements, mandatory licensing during public health emergencies (like the COVID-19 pandemic), and support for open-source and innovative commons models may all help strike this balance. Governments may also encourage companies to adopt socially conscious IP policies and share non-core technology. These well-rounded approaches would benefit both the public at large and rights holders, bringing IP regulations into line with social justice ideals and more general developmental objectives.

6.4 Assistance for Global South Entrepreneurs and SMEs

Startups, independent producers, and small and medium-sized businesses (SMEs) are often in the vanguard of digital innovation, but they encounter several obstacles when attempting to navigate complex IPR systems. In the Global South, where institutional capabilities are constrained and registration procedures are often costly, time-consuming, and opaque, these obstacles are much more noticeable. Improving access to IP registration and enforcement is crucial for promoting equitable economic growth. Simplified processes, reduced costs, online filing platforms, and the creation of regional IP support centres may all help accomplish this. To help under-resourced inventors comprehend and safeguard their intellectual property, governments and international organisations should also provide mentorship programs, legal aid, and technical support. Encouraging these organisations will increase local entrepreneurship, innovation, and involvement in global value chains. These policy suggestions together seek to establish a more dynamic, egalitarian, and innovation-friendly global digital economy. Countries may fully use intellectual property in the twenty-first century by filling enforcement loopholes, raising awareness, guaranteeing fair access, and assisting up-and-coming inventors.

7. Conclusion

The role of intellectual property rights (IPR) has become more dynamic, complicated, and essential to economic growth as globalisation and digital technologies continue to change the landscape of communication, trade, and innovation. Effective IPR frameworks are crucial for promoting creativity, supporting innovation, and safeguarding the rights of artists and inventors worldwide at a time when intangible assets such as software, data, and digital content drive considerable value.

But there are serious drawbacks to the growth of the digital economy as well. Digital piracy, cross-border enforcement, access to critical information and technology, and the widening gaps in how various groups and areas might profit from IPR restrictions are a few of these concerns. In order to maintain strong protection for creators and inventors while simultaneously defending the public's right to information, education, and vital innovations like life-saving medications and green technologies, governments, international organisations, and private sector stakeholders must cooperate.

In order to ensure that under-represented groups, developing nations, and up-and-coming innovators do not fall behind in the global innovation race, future IPR policies need to be more inclusive. Additionally, policies need to be flexible enough to change with the quickly advancing technologies, including blockchain, artificial intelligence, and the metaverse. Furthermore, maintaining public confidence and encouraging fair competition depend heavily on the openness of IPR legislation formulation and enforcement.

In the end, promoting sustainable economic development, scientific innovation, and social progress in the linked digital world will need an innovative, egalitarian, and internationally coordinated approach to intellectual property rights.

References

1. Drahos, P. (2016). *Intellectual property, human rights and the knowledge commons*. In T. Pogge & K. Rimmer (Eds.), *Incentives for Global Public Health: Patent Law and Access to Essential Medicines* (pp. 29–49). Cambridge University Press.
2. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511845382.004
3. Maskus, K. E. (2000). *Intellectual property rights in the global economy*. Peterson Institute for International Economics.
4. https://piie.com/bookstore/intellectual-property-rights-global-economy
5. World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO). (2020). *World Intellectual Property Report 2020: Innovation in a crisis – The role of intellectual property during the COVID-19 pandemic*.
6. https://www.wipo.int/publications/en/details.jsp?id=4526
7. Kapczynski, A. (2010). Access to knowledge and the intellectual property system: Toward a new legal paradigm. In G. Krikorian & A. Kapczynski (Eds.), *Access to Knowledge in the Age of Intellectual Property* (pp. 21–56). Zone Books.
8. Bently, L., & Sherman, B. (2014). *Intellectual property law* (4th ed.). Oxford University Press.
9. Gervais, D. (2021). The machine as author. *Iowa Law Review, 105*(5), 2053–2090.
10. https://ilr.law.uiowa.edu/print/volume-105-issue-5/the-machine-as-author/
11. World Trade Organization (WTO). (2023). *TRIPS and public health*.
12. https://www.wto.org/english/tratop_e/trips_e/pharmpatent_e.htm