



## RESEARCH ARTICLE

# The Role of Intellectual Property Law in International Trade and Economic Development: TRIPS

Alexander Kennedy<sup>1\*</sup>, Sophia Al Hikmah<sup>2</sup>, Syilfia Regita Mustika<sup>3</sup><sup>1,2,3</sup> Pelita Harapan University, Indonesia

ARTICLE INFO	ABSTRACT
Received: Aug 16, 2024 Accepted: Oct 21, 2024	In the context of globalization, the protection of intellectual property rights (IPR) has become essential for fostering economic growth, driving innovation, and enhancing global competitiveness. This study examines the multifaceted role of IPR in international trade and economic development, with a particular focus on the impact of the Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS) Agreement. Using a normative juridical research method, the study explores how safeguarding IPR affects international trade, innovation, and economic growth, particularly in developing countries. The research findings reveal that while IPR protection can stimulate innovation and attract foreign direct investment (FDI), it also presents challenges, particularly in balancing public welfare with the stringent standards imposed by TRIPS. The study underscores the importance of a nuanced approach to IPR regulation, particularly in the context of developing nations, where the interplay between global economic policies and local contexts must be carefully managed. The insights gained are valuable for policymakers and stakeholders in creative industries, offering practical recommendations for strengthening the role of intellectual property law in advancing global economic progress.
<b>Keywords</b>	
Intellectual Property International Trade Economic Development TRIPS	
<b>*Corresponding Author:</b> 01659230097@student.uph.edu	

## INTRODUCTION

The In the era of globalization, the importance of intellectual property (IP) cannot be undermined. Intellectual property rights (IPR) are vital for fostering economic growth, driving innovation, and enhancing global competitiveness. As countries integrate into the global economy, protecting intellectual capital becomes increasingly vital for fostering creativity and driving initiatives that transcend national boundaries. The expansion of IPR laws to include emerging technologies like artificial intelligence reflects the evolving landscape of intellectual property, presenting both opportunities and challenge (Lee et al., 2021). The shift towards intangible goods as a cornerstone of industrialized economies underscores the significance of intellectual property as a cultural policy, influencing international trade dynamics and the global division of labor(Matthews, 2003). However, there are social limits to the commodification of knowledge, especially regarding the extension of IP protection into developing economies, highlighting the complex interplay between global economic policies and local contexts. Focusing on the effects of the Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS) Agreement, the relationship between innovation and economic growth, and case studies of the creative industries in developing countries, globalization and the integration of labor markets have direct implications for national economies. This necessitates a focus on innovation and intellectual capital to maintain competitiveness in a rapidly changing world(Zaytsev et al., 2020). The development of creative industries and the recognition of intellectual property as a driver of economic growth underscore the importance of nurturing innovation and knowledge-based sectors in cities and regions. In developing countries, a pluralistic approach to IP regulation is advocated to stimulate innovation, creativity, and knowledge transfer, emphasizing the role of diverse regulatory frameworks in supporting economic progress. The global competitiveness of economies is closely tied to the effective utilization of intellectual capital, with advanced technologies

playing a pivotal role in driving sustainable economic growth in the context of globalization (Shkola et al., 2021). As societies transition towards knowledge-based economies, intellectual property assumes a central position in fostering innovation, growth, and economic development. The historical lessons of IPR underscore the intricate relationship between IPRs, economic systems, and global trade dynamics, emphasizing the need for a nuanced understanding of intellectual property in the contemporary global landscape.

International trade significantly impacts the global economy. Agricultural trade reforms and the reduction of subsidies can bring substantial benefits, especially if countries reduce agricultural subsidies and cut applied tariffs. International trade also affects the structure of trade and foreign direct investment (FDI) patterns, both within and across industries, identifying new sources of comparative advantage. The increasingly broad and deep production networks in ASEAN demonstrate the impact of international trade on the diversification of marketing and political strategies (Obashi & Kimura, 2017). In the context of Africa, it is vital to ensure that the Doha Round achieves comprehensive sectoral liberalization by all World Trade Organization (WTO) members, so that the benefits can counterbalance any potential losses. International organizations in the agricultural sector, such as the International Agricultural Organization (IAO), play a significant role in improving the economy through sustainable farming practices, technology transfer, and food security (Legg & Blandford, 2019). International trade can also affect diplomatic relations between countries and bilateral trade policies, which in turn influence global trade (Hinz & Leromain, 2020). Identifying the comparative advantage of a region's products and industries is essential to prioritize export markets and specific products. Geographical factors, mobility, and trade openness also play crucial roles in regional inequality and economic convergence. The pandemic caused significant economic disruption in Asia, including declines in economic activity, business closures, and restrictions on travel, trade, and commerce (Marwah & Ramanayake, 2021). Additionally, Brexit has impacted international trade, with the UK pursuing the "Global Britain" strategy through a series of Free Trade Agreements with various countries (Brakman et al., 2023). Thus, international trade has a broad and complex impact on the global economy, influencing trade policies, investment, comparative advantage, diplomatic relations, and responses to global events such as pandemics and political changes like Brexit.

Established in 1994 as a key part of the WTO, the Agreement is a crucial global initiative designed to standardize the protection of intellectual property. TRIPS represents a significant effort to harmonize intellectual property protection on an international scale, impacting various sectors such as pharmaceuticals, agriculture, and technology (Reform, 2021). A primary goal of TRIPS is to establish a baseline for IPR protection, requiring member countries to provide a minimum level of IP safeguards, including protections for undisclosed test data (Boru, 2019). TRIPS also has implications for public health policies, influencing access to essential medicines and pharmaceutical patents. The overarching goal of TRIPS is to balance promoting innovation through IP protection and ensuring access to essential goods and services, particularly during public health emergencies like the COVID-19 pandemic (Mercurio & Upreti, 2022). While TRIPS sets minimum standards for IP protection, it also allows flexibility in implementation, evident in discussions around waivers for COVID-19 vaccines to enhance accessibility during crises (Mercurio & Upreti, 2023). Additionally, TRIPS has implications for developing countries, with calls for a more gradual and development-oriented approach to integrating these nations into the agreement. In conclusion, the TRIPS Agreement stands as a cornerstone in the realm of IPR, aiming to establish a global framework for IP protection while navigating the complexities of innovation, public health, and economic development. Through its provisions and flexibility, TRIPS seeks to foster a conducive environment for creativity and progress while addressing the diverse needs and challenges faced by nations worldwide.

This study aims to explore the multifaceted role of IPR in international trade and economic development using normative juridical research method with the addition of interview with legal experts specializing in intellectual property and international commerce law. The research questions guiding this investigation include: How does safeguarding IPR affect international trade? What are the effects of IPR protection on innovation and economic growth? How do creative industries in developing countries react to IPR protection? The goals of this research are to examine the role of intellectual property law in fostering innovation and economic development, assess the impact of the TRIPS Agreement on international trade and economic growth, and present relevant case studies from creative industries in developing countries.

The insights gained from this study will be valuable for policymakers, highlighting the importance of intellectual property protection in fostering economic growth and innovation. Additionally, the findings will assist stakeholders in the creative industries in understanding the benefits and challenges associated with IPR. Additionally, this research seeks to enhance academic literature by clarifying the complex relationship between intellectual property law, international trade, and economic development.

## **METHODOLOGY**

This study employs a normative juridical approach to examine the intricate role of intellectual property law in international trade and economic development. The research design includes a comprehensive literature review and document analysis, focusing on the TRIPS Agreement and related intellectual property policies. By analyzing these legal texts and policies, the study aims to understand the legal frameworks and their implications for international trade and economic growth.

To ensure a thorough analysis, this research will collect data from multiple legal sources which includes a broad range of sources, such as legal documents, peer-reviewed journal articles, reports from international organizations like WTO and WIPO, and statistical data from relevant institutions (Itrawadi et al., 2023). These sources will offer a comprehensive background and contextual understanding of the impact of IPR on innovation and economic development. The analysis will involve reviewing existing literature on the TRIPS Agreement, its implementation, and its effects on various economic sectors and regions.

This study will lay a solid foundation for comprehending how IPR impact innovation and economic growth. The research aims to deliver critical insights for policymakers, legal experts, and creative industry stakeholders, highlighting the advantages and obstacles of intellectual property protection in the realm of international trade and economic development. By integrating theoretical analysis with empirical data, the research will add to academic literature and offer practical recommendations for strengthening the role of intellectual property law in advancing global economic progress.

## **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

### **Intellectual property rights protection in international trade**

The protection of IPRs is essential in global commerce, with agreements such as the TRIPS Agreement being key to strengthening IPR protection worldwide (Alfaouri, 2020). TRIPS provides a framework for enforcing IPRs across borders, giving WTO member countries the authority to ensure protection domestically (Alfaouri, 2020). The establishment of the WTO has led to a more uniform and coercive approach towards intellectual property protection, driven by agreements like TRIPS. Various policy initiatives, including TRIPS, conventions within the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO), and regional trade agreements, have driven the move towards a worldwide system of IPR protection. The enforcement of IPRs has become a focal point in international negotiations post-TRIPS implementation, emphasizing the need for effective patent enforcement mechanisms to enhance economic growth. As countries harmonize their IPR legislation following TRIPS, the debate has shifted towards the enforcement of IPRs rather than the level of protection. Stronger IPR protection can facilitate trade by attracting financing to firms, aiding in technology importation and export expansion (Lai et al., 2020). Additionally, the relationship between bilateral intra-industry trade flows and IPR protection is gaining importance, highlighting the significance of investigating this connection. The TRIPS Agreement has influenced countries like Iran to develop their national IP laws to align with international standards, preparing for WTO membership and fulfilling TRIPS obligations. The attention on IPR issues has increased in trade economics, especially after TRIPS became part of the WTO system. Moreover, the positive impact of patent protection on bilateral trade has been observed, indicating the role of IPRs in fostering trade relationships. The ambiguity surrounding the impact of IPR protection on international trade has led to empirical studies to understand this relationship better. In other words, the protection of IPR, particularly through agreements like TRIPS, has become integral to international trade dynamics. The focus has shifted towards enforcing IPRs effectively to stimulate economic growth, attract investments, and facilitate trade relationships between nations.

The TRIPS Agreement is a vital international treaty that regulates IPR among the member nations of the WTO. Initially, many developing countries engaged in a period of "paper compliance" with TRIPS, followed by endeavors to manage the welfare costs associated with its implementation. However, the implementation of TRIPS has presented challenges for developing nations, particularly concerning the

obligations imposed and the necessity to adopt higher standards of intellectual property protection (Mohamed Nizamuddin, 2020). For instance, countries like Malaysia have introduced measures such as data exclusivity protection to adhere to their TRIPS commitments (Brandl et al., 2019). Conversely, countries like India have progressively adjusted their domestic intellectual property standards and utilized transition periods to align with TRIPS requirements (Sinha & Olsen, 2013). Compliance with TRIPS has exhibited variance among developing countries, influenced by factors such as international pressures and national policy autonomy. The impact of the TRIPS Agreement extends beyond intellectual property regulations to sectors like pharmaceuticals, affecting public health and access to medicines. The agreement has played a pivotal role in standardizing global pharmaceutical protection, a development desired by developed nations and pharmaceutical companies. Furthermore, TRIPS compliance has implications for food security, as evidenced by concerns surrounding the implementation of the UPOV Convention to ensure adherence to TRIPS provisions (Athreye, S., Piscitello, L., & Shadlen, 2020). As countries grapple with the complexities of TRIPS implementation, ongoing dialogues persist regarding the balance between IPR and public welfare. The agreement influences various sectors, including agriculture, pharmaceuticals, and technology-intensive industries, reshaping both domestic politics and international business dynamics. The evolving nature of TRIPS implementation underscores the significance of comprehending how countries interpret and enforce the agreement over time. In conclusion, the TRIPS Agreement has had profound implications for intellectual property regulations, public health, access to medicines, and food security across diverse countries. The challenges and opportunities arising from TRIPS implementation underscore the necessity for continual evaluation of its impact on various sectors and the delicate equilibrium between IPR and public welfare.

TRIPS Agreement, introduced in 1995 by the WTO, was designed to unify IP protection among member countries, thereby bolstering stability in international economic relationships (Subhan, 2006). By establishing baseline standards for IPR, the TRIPS Agreement sought to lower barriers to international trade and promote global consistency in IP protection. However, the implementation of TRIPS has been a contentious issue, particularly concerning the protection of IPR, such as patents for pharmaceutical products (Correa, 2006). TRIPS has had significant implications, especially in developing countries, where the agreement's stringent IP provisions have raised concerns about access to essential medicines. Studies suggest that while TRIPS may lead to significant income transfers between countries, the benefits primarily accrue to developed nations. Developing countries seeking the benefits of WTO membership have had to comply with TRIPS' rigorous IP standards, affecting their ability to access affordable medicines (Shah et al., 2013). The TRIPS Agreement's integration of IP rules with world trade regulations has been considered a significant achievement, shaping the international IP regime (Yu, 2022). However, concerns have been raised about its effects on agriculture, plant variety protection, and access to medicines in developing countries. TRIPS has also been linked to global trade dynamics, with its provisions influencing international investment and shaping the IP landscape (Yu, 2022). The TRIPS Agreement has significantly influenced international trade by standardizing IP protection, fostering global harmonization, and affecting access to essential medicines, especially in developing nations. Although the agreement has facilitated the integration of IP and trade, it has also introduced challenges regarding medicine accessibility, agricultural practices, and balancing IPR with public health concerns.

IPR are crucial in incentivizing innovation by allowing innovators to capture the benefits of their research investments, this acknowledgement is part of respecting the owner's right (Kennedy, 2023). The protection provided by IPR, such as patents and copyrights, encourages firms to invest in research and development activities, as they can secure a higher share of the social returns from their innovations. This protection is essential for fostering innovation and creativity, as it ensures that innovators can benefit financially from their inventions (Soumadi, 2023). While IPR can act as an incentive for innovation by safeguarding innovators from imitation and providing them with temporary monopoly rights, it also imposes costs on downstream innovators, potentially hindering sequential innovation. The balance between providing incentives for innovation and avoiding barriers to subsequent innovations is crucial in the realm of IPR. Moreover, strengthening IPR protection can have spillover effects on related industries, affecting innovation in interconnected sectors (Hanlon & Jaworski, 2022). The relationship between IPR and innovation is complex, with arguments both in favor of and against the impact of IPR on innovation. Proponents argue that IPR protection is necessary to spur innovation and creativity by ensuring that creators receive monetary remuneration for their work

(Hanlon & Jaworski, 2022). On the other hand, historical studies have shown that countries with weaker IPR regimes have had flourishing innovative sectors, suggesting that strong IPR may not always be conducive to innovation. While IPR protection is essential for incentivizing innovation and protecting the interests of innovators, finding the right balance to avoid stifling subsequent innovations is crucial. The impact of IPR on innovation is multifaceted, with both positive and negative implications that need to be carefully considered in policy-making and business strategies.

IP protection is also crucial for fostering innovation. Several studies have highlighted the positive relationship between IPR and innovation. For instance, Williams found evidence suggesting that IP rights do not hinder subsequent innovation. Meanwhile, Qi emphasized that IP protection can enhance innovation by boosting innovative activities. Bican supported this notion by confirming a positive correlation between firm openness and the preference for IP protection, enabling open innovation. Moreover, Loukil also emphasized that the protection of IPR is a key driver of innovation. Furthermore, IPR are essential for protecting innovative ideas and products, as highlighted by Soumadi. Additionally, IP protection is crucial for economic growth and technological progress, the enforcement of IPR can lead to increased research and development (R&D) activities and boost profits for enterprises, as indicated by Osunde. The evidence from various studies supports the notion that IP protection is positively associated with increased innovation. By safeguarding IPR, countries can create an environment conducive to innovation, encourage R&D activities, and ultimately drive economic growth.

Therefore, strengthening IP protection is essential for cultivating an environment that nurtures innovation and technological advancement. By ensuring that creators and inventors have exclusive rights to their innovations, countries can motivate individuals and firms to invest more in R&D activities. This legal safeguard not only boosts profits for enterprises but also attracts foreign direct investment, promotes open innovation, and enhances overall economic growth. In essence, robust IPR create a virtuous cycle where increased innovation leads to economic prosperity, which in turn further incentivizes innovative efforts.

### **The role of intellectual property law in economic development**

IP law plays a crucial role in economic development by providing legal protection for creations and innovations, which in turn fosters economic, social, and cultural advancement in modern society. The quality of IP, measured through dimensions like economic quality, technology quality, and law quality, can significantly impact economic development by transforming IP into productivity (Fan & Zhang, 2023). Moreover, IP protection has been shown to promote innovation activity, thereby contributing to the development of the digital economy (Qi & Zhang, 2023). Studies show a favorable correlation between IP protection and economic growth, implying that more robust IP systems contribute to increased economic complexity and expansion (Eterovic Maggio, 2023). Additionally, the protection of IPR can influence economic growth by affecting private property protection, which further impacts the overall economic development. In developing nations, the connection between IPR, economic progress, and technological innovation is vital, emphasizing the necessity for adequate protection to stimulate growth (Loukil, 2020). Furthermore, IPR are essential for encouraging innovation, as they provide protection and monopoly rights for inventions, ultimately stimulating industry innovation (Raju, 2016). Effective enforcement of IPR, particularly in high-tech industries, can influence financing and investment choices, thereby impacting economic growth positively.

The correlation between IPR protection and economic development is complex, with a U-shaped pattern observed in developing nations, indicating that the relationship is not straightforward (Hwang et al., 2016). IP law serves as a cornerstone for economic development by incentivizing innovation, protecting creations, and fostering a conducive environment for technological advancement and economic growth. Therefore, strengthening IP law is pivotal for sustaining economic growth and development. By offering robust legal protection for innovations and creations, countries can transform IP into increased productivity and technological advancement. This not only stimulates innovation activity and industry development but also enhances economic complexity and expansion. In developing nations, adequate protection of IPR is essential to encourage technological innovation and bridge gaps in economic progress. Furthermore, effective enforcement in high-tech industries can attract financing and investment, positively influencing economic growth. Ultimately, a strong IP framework serves as a cornerstone for fostering a conducive environment for economic, social, and cultural advancement in modern society.

IP protection plays a significant role in economic development by fostering innovation, technology transfer, and FDI. Strengthening IPR can lead to increased economic growth by incentivizing firms to invest in R&D activities (Dai, 2020). This protection not only encourages the introduction of advanced technology but also enhances a country's international competitiveness by improving export quality. Moreover, IPR can promote economic complexity and drive innovation (Sweet & Maggio, 2015). Countries that implement efficient IP protection systems tend to attract more FDI, which further contributes to economic growth and welfare maximization. Moreover, middle-income nations have gained the most from importing advanced technology by adhering to minimum IP protection standards (Durand & Milberg, 2020). Furthermore, safeguarding IP can deter technology copycats, stimulate research and development efforts, provide exclusive rights to the outcomes of innovation, and limit the spread of R&D knowledge, thereby securing the rightful benefits of corporate innovation. However, there are also concerns that excessive patent rights may hinder innovation by increasing transaction costs and the risk of failures, particularly in industries like biomedical research (Gehl Sampath, 2007). Striking a balance between safeguarding IP and promoting innovation is essential, as excessively strict protection can hinder subsequent discoveries and product development. Therefore, IP protection is a double-edged sword in the realm of economic development. While it can spur innovation, attract investments, and enhance competitiveness, excessive protection may stifle creativity and hinder progress. Finding the right balance in IPR regimes is essential for maximizing the benefits of innovation while avoiding potential drawbacks.

Protecting IP is vital for the growth and success of Small and Medium Enterprises (SMEs) and start-ups. An encouraging business environment with streamlined regulations, less bureaucracy, clear procedures, and robust IP protection helps SMEs flourish (Yang, 2023). IPR play a significant role in protecting innovations, encouraging R&D, and boosting profits of micro, small, and medium enterprises. However, challenges in the enforcement of IPR, such as counterfeit products, can hinder the full realization of these benefits (Osunde, 2016). Small business owners often rely on informal methods to protect IP, underscoring the importance of IP management within SMEs (Kitching & Blackburn, 1998). The idea is that while informal methods might provide some level of protection, they may not be sufficient to fully safeguard a business's IP, especially as the business grows or faces more competition. Proper IP management ensures that the business's ideas, brands, designs, and other intellectual assets are adequately protected, which can be crucial for the business's long-term success and competitiveness. Studies suggest that implementing strategies for IPR development, enhancing management systems, and improving the ability to protect IP are crucial for the long-term development of technology-based SMEs (Chen & Ma, 2017). Furthermore, strong legal protection of IP enables start-up firms to capture more value through cooperation via licensing agreements with established rivals (James et al., 2013). The impact of absorptive capacity, IP, and innovation in SMEs is substantial, with some SMEs aiming to enhance their IP management in areas such as brand design, patent registration, and knowledge protection. IPR are essential for safeguarding the work and products of SMEs (Rohmat et al., 2022). Nevertheless, challenges persist, as the development of SMEs can be impeded by unclear protection of IPR, including economic rights (Waspiah et al., 2020). In conclusion, IP protection is vital for SMEs and start-ups to thrive and grow. Effective management of IPR, encompassing strategies for development, enforcement, and protection, is indispensable for the sustained success of these businesses. Collaboration, innovation, and a supportive regulatory environment are key factors that can empower SMEs to leverage IP for driving their growth and competitiveness in the market.

## CONCLUSION

This research provides a comprehensive analysis of the intricate relationship between IPR, international trade, and economic development, with a particular focus on the TRIPS Agreement. The findings underscore the significant impact of IPR protection on fostering innovation, attracting FDI, and enhancing global competitiveness, particularly in the context of globalization. The study highlights that the protection of IP is crucial for stimulating innovation and economic growth. By securing the rights of creators and innovators, IPR provides the necessary incentives for continued R&D, leading to technological advancements and economic diversification. This is especially vital in developing countries, where innovation and creativity are essential for economic progress and integration into the global economy.

The TRIPS Agreement plays a pivotal role in standardizing IP protection across borders, ensuring that member countries adhere to minimum standards of IP safeguards. However, the implementation of

TRIPS has not been without challenges. For developing nations, the stringent standards imposed by TRIPS can sometimes conflict with local needs and the imperative to balance public welfare with the demands of global economic policies. The study acknowledges that while TRIPS aims to foster a conducive environment for creativity and economic growth, it also necessitates a nuanced approach to IPR regulation, particularly in regions where economic and social contexts differ significantly from those of developed countries. One of the key insights from this research is the dual role of IPR in both promoting innovation and posing challenges to access, particularly in sectors like healthcare and agriculture. The study notes that while strong IPR protection can lead to increased innovation and economic growth, it can also create barriers to essential goods and services, as seen in the debates over pharmaceutical patents and access to medicines. This highlights the need for a balanced approach in the application of IPR, ensuring that it supports innovation without compromising public welfare.

The research also emphasizes the importance of creative industries in developing countries, where IPR protection can drive economic growth by nurturing local talent and fostering innovation. However, the study points out that the effectiveness of IPR in these contexts depends heavily on the alignment of global IPR standards with local economic realities and development goals. This calls for a pluralistic approach to IPR regulation, where diverse legal frameworks can coexist to support innovation and economic development. The study's findings are particularly relevant for policymakers and stakeholders in the creative industries, offering practical recommendations for strengthening the role of IP law in advancing global economic progress. It suggests that a more flexible and development-oriented approach to IPR regulation, particularly under the TRIPS framework, could better support the economic needs of developing countries while still promoting global innovation and trade.

In conclusion, the research underscores the critical role of IPR in international trade and economic development. It highlights the need for a balanced and context-sensitive approach to IPR regulation, one that promotes innovation and economic growth while also addressing the unique challenges faced by developing nations. As globalization continues to shape the global economy, the insights from this study provide valuable guidance for policymakers and industry leaders in navigating the complexities of IP law and its impact on economic development.

## REFERENCES

- Alfaouri, M. A. A. (2020). THE IMPACT OF TRIPS ON IPRs PROTECTION IN JORDAN, AS A PRIME EXAMPLE OF A DEVELOPING COUNTRY. *Kaos GL Dergisi*, 8(75), 147–154. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jnc.2020.125798><https://doi.org/10.1016/j.smr.2020.02.002><http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/810049><http://doi.wiley.com/10.1002/anie.197505391><http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/B9780857090409500205>  
http:
- Athreye, S., Piscitello, L., & Shadlen, K. C. (2020). Twenty-five years since TRIPS: Patent policy and international business. *Journal of International Business Policy*, 3(4), 315.
- Boru, Z. T. (2019). The test data provision of USMCA: A potential to promote or negate the timely access to genetically engineered biologics? *Journal of Generic Medicines*, 16(1), 5–18. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1741134319886627>
- Brakman, S., Garretsen, H., & Kohl, T. (2023). EXITitis in the UK: Gravity Estimates in the Aftermath of Brexit. *Economist (Netherlands)*, 171(2), 185–206. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10645-023-09421-3>
- Brandl, K., Darendeli, I., & Mudambi, R. (2019). Foreign actors and intellectual property protection regulations in developing countries. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 50(5), 826–846. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41267-018-0172-6>
- Chen, Z., & Ma, L. (2017). Study on Technology-based Small and Micro Enterprises' Patent Strategy. 2017 International Conference on Education Science and Economic Management (ICESEM 2017), 65–69.
- Correa, C. M. (2006). Implications of bilateral free trade agreements on access to medicines. *Bulletin of the World Health Organization*, 84, 399–404.
- Dai, J. (2020). Intellectual property rights protection, foreign technology introduction and FDI-based on the provincial-level panel data of China. *Journal of Accounting, Business and Finance Research*, 8(1), 30–38.
- Durand, C., & Milberg, W. (2020). Intellectual monopoly in global value chains. *Review of International Political Economy*, 27(2), 404–429.

- Eterovic Maggio, D. (2023). Do Stronger Intellectual Property Rights Increase Innovation?
- Fan, X., & Zhang, T. (2023). The Impact of Intellectual Property Quality on Economic Development: Insights from Jiangsu Province. *Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting*, 23(8), 29–35.
- Gehl Sampath, P. (2007). Breaking the fence: Can patent rights deter biomedical innovation in ‘technology followers’? *Technology Analysis & Strategic Management*, 19(5), 677–696.
- Hanlon, W., & Jaworski, T. (2022). Spillover effects of intellectual property protection in the interwar aircraft industry. *The Economic Journal*, 132(645), 1824–1851.
- Hinz, J., & Leromain, E. (2020). Critically Important: The Heterogeneous Effect of Diplomatic Tensions on Trade. *Review of Industrial Organization*, 57(2), 309–331. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11151-020-09769-9>
- Hwang, H., Wu, J. Z., & Yu, E. S. H. (2016). Innovation, imitation and intellectual property rights in developing countries. *Review of Development Economics*, 20(1), 138–151.
- Itrawadi, I., Karyati, S., & Ulum, H. (2023). Telaah Kritis Metode Omnibus Law Dalam Pembentukan Undang-Undang. *Jurnal Risalah Kenotariatan*, 4(2). <https://doi.org/10.29303/risalahkenotariatan.v4i2.177>
- James, S. D., Leiblein, M. J., & Lu, S. (2013). How firms capture value from their innovations. *Journal of Management*, 39(5), 1123–1155.
- Kennedy, A. (2023). Hak Asasi Manusia Dan Keadilan Bermartabat: Perbandingan Teori Dan Realitas Di Indonesia. *Ekasakti Jurnal Penelitian & Pengabdian*, 4(1), 132–141.
- Kitching, J., & Blackburn, R. (1998). Intellectual property management in the small and medium enterprise (SME). *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development*, 5(4), 327–335.
- Lai, H., Maskus, K. E., & Yang, L. (2020). Intellectual property enforcement, exports and productivity of heterogeneous firms in developing countries: Evidence from China. *European Economic Review*, 123. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.euroecorev.2020.103373>
- Lee, J. A., Hilty, R. M., & Liu, K. C. (2021). Artificial intelligence and intellectual property. *Artificial Intelligence and Intellectual Property*, 7(1), 1–449. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780198870944.001.0001>
- Legg, W., & Blandford, D. (2019). The Role of International Organizations in Agricultural Policy Analysis (pp. 307–332). [https://doi.org/10.1142/9789813235403\\_0016](https://doi.org/10.1142/9789813235403_0016)
- Loukil, K. (2020). Non-Linear Effects of Intellectual Property Rights on Technological Innovation: Evidence from Emerging and Developing Countries. *The Economics and Finance Letters*, 7(2), 122–135.
- Marwah, R., & Ramanayake, S. S. (2021). Pandemic-Led Disruptions in Asia: Tracing the Early Economic Impacts on Sri Lanka and Thailand. *South Asian Survey*, 28(1), 172–198. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0971523121995023>
- Matthews, D. (2003). *Globalising intellectual property rights: the TRIPS Agreement*. Routledge.
- Mercurio, B., & Upreti, P. N. (2022). From Necessity to Flexibility: A Reflection on the Negotiations for a TRIPS Waiver for Covid-19 Vaccines and Treatments. *World Trade Review*, 21(5), 633–649. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1474745622000283>
- Mercurio, B., & Upreti, P. N. (2023). Patent term extension and test data protection obligations: identifying the gap in policy, research, and practice of implementing free trade agreements. *Journal of Law and the Biosciences*, 10(1), 1–28. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jlb/lpad017>
- Mohamed Nizamuddin, R. (2020). TRIPS AGREEMENT AND MALAYSIAN INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAWS: DATA EXCLUSIVITY v PATENT. *IUM Law Journal*, 28(1), 197–225. <https://doi.org/10.31436/iiumlj.v28i1.474>
- Obashi, A., & Kimura, F. (2017). Deepening and widening of production networks in ASEAN. *Asian Economic Papers*, 16(1), 1–27. [https://doi.org/10.1162/ASEP\\_a\\_00479](https://doi.org/10.1162/ASEP_a_00479)
- Osunde, C. (2016). Intellectual property rights in nigerian business environment: challenges and prospects. *Intel Prop Rights*, 4(3), 170.
- Qi, Y., & Zhang, T. (2023). Research on the influence mechanism of intellectual property protection on China’s digital economy. *Management & Innovation*, 1(2), 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.61187/mi.v1i2.53>
- Raju, K. D. (2016). The first compulsory licencing case in India under the TRIPS agreement: An analysis of Bayer versus Natco Pharma Ltd. *Journal of Development Policy and Practice*, 1(1), 71–88.



- Reform, L. (2021). A CRITICAL EXAMINATION OF BREEDERS' MONOPOLY RIGHTS TO THE DETRIMENT OF FARMERS UNDER THE ETHIOPIAN PLANT BREEDERS' RIGHTS LAW. 2, 401–410.
- Rohmat, R., Waspiah, W., & Wei, D. C. C. (2022). Simple Patent Protection: A Case Of Sarung Tenun Goyor Indonesia And The Comparison To Malaysia Utility Innovation Protection. *JILS*, 7, 299.
- Shah, A. K., Warsh, J., & Kesselheim, A. S. (2013). The ethics of intellectual property rights in an era of globalization. *Journal of Law, Medicine & Ethics*, 41(4), 841–851.
- Shkola, V., Troyan, M., Domashenko, M., & Vavilichev, M. (2021). Global Competitiveness of the Economy and Intellectual Capital Index: Case of EU Countries and Ukraine. *Mechanism of an Economic Regulation*, 108–119. <https://doi.org/10.21272/mer.2021.91.09>
- Sinha, A., & Olsen, T. D. (2013). Linkage Politics and the Persistence of National Policy Autonomy in Emerging Powers: Patents, Profits, and Patients in The Context of Trips Compliance. *Business and Politics*, 15(3), 323–356. <https://doi.org/10.1515/bap-2012-0012>
- Soumadi, M. M. (2023). Intellectual property and patent rights protection for innovators in Jordan. *Business Ethics and Leadership*, 7(1), 12–24.
- Subhan, J. (2006). Scrutinized: the TRIPS agreement and public health. *McGill Journal of Medicine: MJM*, 9(2), 152.
- Sweet, C. M., & Maggio, D. S. E. (2015). Do stronger intellectual property rights increase innovation? *World Development*, 66, 665–677.
- Waspiah, W., Rodiyah, R., Latifiani, D., & Arifin, R. (2020). How economic rights for SMEs protected? Analysis of national and international property rights law. *Indonesian Journal of Advocacy and Legal Services*, 2(1), 71–88.
- Yang, S. (2023). Factors influencing SME growth performance in China: A conceptual analysis. *Journal of Digitainability, Realism & Mastery (DREAM)*, 2(03), 50–59.
- Yu, P. K. (2022). The Second Transformation of the International Intellectual Property Regime.
- Zaytsev, A., Degtereva, V., & Dmitriev, N. (2020). Mathematical Approach to Calculating the Intellectual Rent of an Industrial Enterprise for Achieving Innovative Leadership. 441, 178–184. <https://doi.org/10.2991/assehr.k.200526.027>