Intellectual Property Journal (I.P.J)
ISSN: 0824-7064
Indexed by ABDC Journal Quality List (A Category)

Intellectual Property Protection and Innovation Performance: A Systematic Review and Secondary Data Analysis of Global Trends

Dr. Elias M. Vestergaard[1]; Dr. Mirela A. Kovalenko[2]
[1] Department of Law and Innovation Studies, Northbridge Institute of Technology, Copenhagen, Denmark
[2] Centre for Intellectual Property and Digital Economy, Ravenhurst University, Edinburgh, United Kingdom

Corresponding Author: Dr. Elias M. Vestergaard

Submission: 28/12/2025 Acceptance: 29/03/2026 Publication: 23/04/2026

Abstract
Intellectual property rights have increasingly become an important component of national innovation systems, particularly as economies shift toward knowledge-intensive production, digital technologies, intangible assets and globally distributed research and development. Patents, trademarks and industrial designs perform different economic and institutional functions, yet they are frequently considered collectively as indicators of a country's innovative capacity. This study examines the relationship between intellectual property activity and innovation performance through a systematic literature review and secondary-data analysis of international intellectual property and innovation indicators. The study synthesizes academic and institutional literature concerning patents, trademarks, industrial designs, intellectual property institutions and innovation outcomes and supplements the literature review with descriptive analysis of internationally comparable secondary data. The empirical component draws primarily upon data reported by the World Intellectual Property Organization and its *World Intellectual Property Indicators* and *Global Innovation Index* publications. The analysis focuses on patent activity, trademark activity, industrial design activity, international patent filings and innovation performance across selected economies.

The findings indicate that intellectual property activity is associated with, but does not independently determine, innovation performance. Economies with strong innovation systems tend to exhibit substantial intellectual property activity, but the relationship differs considerably across countries and between forms of intellectual property. Patents appear particularly relevant to technology-intensive economies, while trademarks and industrial designs capture dimensions of commercialization, branding and product differentiation that are less directly reflected in conventional innovation measures. The study further demonstrates that institutional quality, research capacity, business investment, human capital and access to innovation

finance influence the extent to which intellectual property rights contribute to innovation. The findings therefore support a multidimensional understanding of intellectual property policy in which protection is treated not simply as a legal mechanism but as part of a broader innovation ecosystem.
Keywords: intellectual property; patents; trademarks; industrial designs; innovation; intellectual property rights; secondary data; knowledge economy; technology; systematic literature review

1. Introduction

The transformation of national economies from resource- and production-oriented systems toward knowledge-intensive economies has increased the strategic importance of intellectual property (IP). Technological knowledge, software, brands, industrial designs, creative works and other intangible assets increasingly constitute significant sources of competitive advantage for firms and economies. In such an environment, intellectual property law is no longer confined to the traditional protection of inventions and creative expression. It has become intertwined with innovation policy, entrepreneurship, international trade, technology transfer, investment and economic development.

The economic significance of intellectual property is particularly visible in the increasing volume and geographical diversification of patent, trademark and industrial design activity. The World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO) maintains extensive international statistics covering patents, utility models, trademarks, industrial designs, plant varieties, geographical indications and other forms of IP activity. Its statistical infrastructure incorporates information obtained from national and regional intellectual property offices as well as international registration systems.

The relationship between intellectual property protection and innovation, however, is not straightforward. Classical economic theories of patents suggest that temporary exclusivity can provide incentives for firms to invest in research and development by enabling innovators to appropriate some of the returns generated by their inventions. At the same time, excessive protection can potentially restrict follow-on innovation, increase transaction costs and create barriers to knowledge diffusion. Consequently, intellectual property policy involves a fundamental balancing exercise between private incentives and public access to knowledge.

The relationship becomes even more complex when different categories of IP are considered separately. Patents generally protect technological inventions and therefore have a relatively direct relationship with research and development. Trademarks, in contrast, primarily protect signs that distinguish goods and services and can therefore be more closely associated with commercialization, reputation and market differentiation. Industrial designs protect the visual appearance of products

and may provide competitive advantages in industries where aesthetic differentiation is important.

A major challenge in the existing literature is therefore the tendency to use aggregate intellectual property activity as a general proxy for innovation. Such an approach may obscure important differences among economies and between different forms of IP. An economy can have high trademark activity without being among the world's leading technological innovators. Similarly, a country may generate substantial patent activity while experiencing weaknesses in commercialization, venture financing or knowledge diffusion.

The present study addresses this issue by combining a systematic literature-based discussion with secondary-data analysis. Rather than attempting to establish a simple causal relationship between IP protection and innovation, the study examines how intellectual property activity corresponds with broader indicators of innovation performance.

The study has three principal objectives. First, it reviews the major theoretical and empirical arguments concerning the relationship between intellectual property and innovation. Second, it examines international secondary data relating to patents, trademarks, industrial designs and innovation performance. Third, it identifies the institutional and economic conditions under which intellectual property protection is more likely to contribute to innovation outcomes.

The contribution of the study is therefore conceptual as well as empirical. Conceptually, it emphasizes that intellectual property should be understood as one component of an innovation ecosystem rather than as an independent determinant of innovation. Empirically, it demonstrates how publicly available international IP statistics can be used to develop comparative evidence concerning innovation systems.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Intellectual Property as an Innovation Institution

The economic justification for intellectual property protection rests substantially on the existence of knowledge-related market failures. Knowledge can frequently be reproduced or imitated at a lower cost than the original investment required to create it. Without some mechanism for appropriating returns, firms may underinvest in research and development because competitors can potentially benefit from innovations without bearing equivalent development costs.

Patents address this problem by providing inventors with legally enforceable exclusive rights for a defined period, subject to statutory requirements. Patent systems therefore attempt to establish an incentive structure in which disclosure of technological information is exchanged for temporary exclusivity.

This exchange has two important dimensions. The first is incentive creation: firms and individuals may be more willing to undertake risky research when they anticipate the possibility of obtaining enforceable rights. The second is disclosure: patent systems make technological information publicly available, potentially enabling future researchers to build upon existing knowledge.

However, the economic effects of patents depend substantially on the characteristics of the industry. Pharmaceutical and biotechnology industries, for example, may rely heavily upon formal patent protection because research and development costs can be substantial while imitation can be comparatively inexpensive. Software and digital industries may employ a more complex combination of patents, copyright, trade secrets, trademarks and contractual arrangements.

This suggests that intellectual property protection should not be considered technologically neutral. The optimal combination of rights may differ across industries, firm sizes and stages of technological development.

2.2 Patents and Technological Innovation

Patents are perhaps the most frequently examined form of IP in the innovation literature. Patent applications are commonly used as an indicator of technological activity because they contain information about inventive activity and provide an internationally comparable measure.

Nevertheless, patent counts should be interpreted carefully. A patent application does not necessarily result in a commercially successful product, and the economic value of patents varies substantially. A single patent may be strategically important to a firm, whereas hundreds of low-value patents may generate limited commercial value. Patent activity is also influenced by national patenting practices, institutional incentives and corporate strategies. Firms may choose to patent inventions in multiple jurisdictions, while others may rely on trade secrets or speed-to-market strategies.

WIPO's international data demonstrate the substantial scale of global patenting activity. The organization's 2025 indicators report provides comparative statistics on patent applications, registrations and other forms of IP activity using data from national and regional offices.

International patent applications provide another useful measure. The Patent Cooperation Treaty (PCT) facilitates international patent protection through a centralized filing procedure. WIPO reported that PCT applications reached approximately 273,900 in 2024, representing modest growth compared with the previous year.

The geographical distribution of international patent activity is particularly relevant to understanding global innovation. Major technology-producing economies tend to account for significant proportions of international patent activity, although emerging economies have increasingly expanded their participation.

2.3 Trademarks and Commercial Innovation

Trademarks differ fundamentally from patents because their primary function is not to protect technological inventions. Instead, trademarks distinguish goods and services and help consumers associate products with particular producers.

Nevertheless, trademarks can provide an important indicator of commercialization and market-oriented innovation. A successful innovation ultimately requires adoption by consumers or businesses. Firms therefore invest not only in technological development but also in branding, reputation and market positioning.

Trademark activity may consequently capture aspects of innovation that patent statistics do not measure effectively. Digital businesses, consumer products, professional services and creative industries may rely heavily on trademarks even when patenting activity is limited.

The WIPO statistical framework recognizes trademarks as a major category of intellectual property activity and provides national and international data concerning applications and registrations.

An important implication is that a country's intellectual property ecosystem cannot be evaluated solely by its patent performance. Trademark activity may reveal the development of entrepreneurial and commercial capabilities, particularly among small and medium-sized enterprises.

2.4 Industrial Designs and Product Differentiation

Industrial designs provide another perspective on innovation. In sectors such as consumer electronics, automobiles, furniture, fashion and household products, visual appearance may be an important component of competitive advantage.

Design protection can therefore support innovation by allowing businesses to capture returns from investment in product appearance and usability. However, similar to trademarks, design activity should not be interpreted as equivalent to technological innovation.

Instead, industrial designs may represent a broader conception of innovation involving aesthetic, functional and user-oriented product development.

WIPO's international indicators separately report industrial design activity, allowing researchers to distinguish this form of intellectual property from patents and trademarks.

3. Theoretical Framework

The relationship between IP and innovation can be understood through three complementary perspectives.

First, the **appropriability perspective** argues that innovators require mechanisms through which they can capture returns from investment. Intellectual property provides such mechanisms by creating legally enforceable rights.

Second, the **knowledge diffusion perspective** emphasizes the disclosure function of intellectual property. Patent systems require sufficient disclosure of inventions, potentially increasing the stock of publicly accessible technological information.

Third, the **innovation ecosystem perspective** recognizes that IP operates alongside human capital, research institutions, finance, infrastructure, entrepreneurship and markets.

The third perspective is particularly important for interpreting international comparisons. Strong IP laws cannot compensate for an absence of research capacity or inadequate access to capital. Similarly, high levels of research expenditure may not produce commercially successful innovation if firms lack appropriate mechanisms for commercialization.

The conceptual framework adopted in this study is therefore:

IP institutions → IP activity → knowledge appropriation and commercialization → innovation outcomes

with the relationship influenced by:

R&D capacity + human capital + institutional quality + finance + market sophistication + international integration.

This framework implies that IP activity should be viewed as both an outcome of innovation capacity and a potential mechanism through which innovation is commercialized and protected.

4. Research Methodology

4.1 Research Design

The study adopts a systematic literature-based research design supplemented by descriptive secondary-data analysis. No primary survey, interview or experiment was conducted.

The literature component examines research addressing intellectual property protection, innovation, patenting, trademarks, industrial designs, knowledge commercialization and innovation policy.

The secondary-data component uses publicly available international data, particularly WIPO intellectual property statistics and WIPO's Global Innovation Index materials. WIPO describes its IP Statistics Data Center as a source of historical and current international IP statistics and provides data relating to patents, trademarks, industrial designs and other rights.

The 2025 *World Intellectual Property Indicators* publication provides data based primarily on 2024 filing, registration and renewal statistics.

The Global Innovation Index provides a complementary perspective because it incorporates numerous innovation-related indicators, including research and development, venture capital, high-technology production and intellectual property filings.

4.2 Data Sources

The principal secondary sources were:

1. WIPO *World Intellectual Property Indicators*;
2. WIPO IP Statistics Data Center;
3. WIPO *Global Innovation Index*;
4. World Bank development indicators where appropriate;
5. Peer-reviewed academic literature concerning IP and innovation.

The selection of WIPO as the principal data provider is justified by its extensive international coverage. WIPO reports that its IP statistics are collected from national and regional IP offices and processed through standardized international statistical systems.

4.3 Analytical Approach

The quantitative component is primarily descriptive. Comparative analysis is undertaken using patent, trademark and industrial-design indicators alongside innovation rankings.

Because differences in population and economic size can substantially influence absolute filing numbers, the study emphasizes ratios, rankings and relative patterns rather than interpreting absolute application counts as direct measures of innovation quality.

The study does not claim causal identification. Accordingly, relationships observed in the secondary data should be interpreted as associations rather than evidence that stronger IP protection independently causes higher innovation performance.

5. Secondary Data Analysis

Table 1. Selected Dimensions of the Global Intellectual Property System

Intellectual Property Type	Primary Function	Typical Economic Relevance	Relationship with Innovation
Patents	Protection of inventions	Technology appropriation and R&D incentives	High, particularly in technology-intensive industries
Trademarks	Protection of distinctive signs	Branding, reputation and market differentiation	Moderate to high through commercialization
Industrial designs	Protection of product appearance	Product differentiation and design investment	Moderate, especially in design-intensive industries

Intellectual Property Type	Primary Function	Typical Economic Relationship with Innovation
Utility models	Protection of certain technical innovations	Incremental innovation and SME innovation	Moderate
Geographical indications	Protection of product-origin associations	Regional branding and product differentiation	Indirect

Source: Compiled by the authors from WIPO intellectual property statistics and related literature.

Table 1 demonstrates why aggregate IP indicators should be interpreted cautiously. Each form of intellectual property performs a distinct institutional function. Patents have a comparatively direct relationship with technological invention, whereas trademarks and designs are more closely associated with commercialization and differentiation.

5.1 Global Patent Activity

The global patent landscape demonstrates the continuing concentration of technological activity among a relatively limited number of economies. At the same time, emerging economies have increased their participation in international patent systems.

The 2025 WIPO Global Innovation Index reports that China entered the top ten innovation economies for the first time and that it leads globally in knowledge and technology outputs. The same report identifies significant patent activity in several leading innovation economies.

WIPO's global innovation analysis also indicates that patent activity has not expanded uniformly. International PCT applications grew modestly in 2024, while major patent jurisdictions experienced differing trajectories.

These developments suggest that the geographical distribution of technological innovation is becoming more diversified, although leading innovation ecosystems continue to maintain significant advantages.

Table 2. Illustrative Comparative Profile of Selected Innovation Economies

Economy	Innovation Position*	Patent Activity	Trademark Activity	Industrial Design Activity	General Innovation Profile
Switzerland	Very high	High	High	Moderate	Strong institutions, research and commercialization

Economy	Innovation Position*	Patent Activity	Trademark Activity	Industrial Design Activity	General Innovation Profile
United States	Very high	Very high	Very high	High	Strong private R&D, VC and technology ecosystem
Republic of Korea	Very high	Very high	High	High	Strong business R&D and manufacturing
Singapore	Very high	High	High	High	Strong institutions, FDI and high-tech production
China	High	Very high	Very high	Very high	Large-scale technology and manufacturing ecosystem
Japan	Very high	Very high	High	High	Advanced manufacturing and research capabilities
Germany	Very high	Very high	High	High	Industrial and engineering-intensive innovation
Canada	High	High	High	Moderate	Strong research and venture ecosystem
Australia	High	Moderate	High	Moderate	Strong research and institutional environment

Note: "Innovation Position" is expressed qualitatively for demonstration purposes and should not be interpreted as a numerical ranking. The GII 2025 ranks Switzerland first, the United States third, the Republic of Korea fourth, Singapore fifth, Japan twelfth, Canada seventeenth and Australia twenty-second. China entered the top ten at tenth place.

The comparative profile indicates that leading innovation economies generally demonstrate substantial activity across multiple forms of IP rather than relying exclusively on patents.

An important observation is the position of China. WIPO's 2025 analysis identifies China as the leading economy in knowledge and technology outputs and reports that it leads globally in patents as well as trademarks, utility models and industrial designs in several relevant indicators.

This demonstrates that high IP activity can coexist with different institutional and economic models of innovation.

5.2 International Patent Filings

International patent filings are particularly useful because they reflect the willingness of applicants to seek protection beyond their domestic markets. The PCT system provides an important mechanism through which businesses can pursue international patent strategies.

WIPO reports that approximately 273,900 PCT applications were filed in 2024, representing a 0.5% increase over 2023. China accounted for approximately one-quarter of global applications, while the Republic of Korea experienced particularly strong growth.

The significance of international patenting extends beyond the number of applications. International filing can indicate that firms expect their technologies to have commercial relevance across multiple markets.

Table 3. Illustrative Relationship Between IP Activity and Innovation-System Characteristics

Dimension	Strong IP/Innovation Ecosystem	Developing IP Ecosystem	Potential Policy Implication
Patent activity	High and diversified	Concentrated in limited sectors	Improve R&D capability and patent quality
Trademark activity	Broad private-sector participation	Primarily established firms	Promote SME formalization and branding
Industrial designs	Strong design-intensive industries	Limited formal protection	Improve design registration awareness
R&D expenditure	Relatively high	Relatively low	Increase public and private R&D
Venture capital	Deep financing ecosystem	Limited early-stage funding	Strengthen innovation finance
University–industry collaboration	Strong	Fragmented	Develop technology-transfer institutions

Dimension	Strong IP/Innovation Ecosystem	Developing Ecosystem	IP Potential Policy Implication
Human capital	Advanced research skills	Skill shortages	Invest in technical and research education
IP enforcement	Predictable	Variable	Improve judicial and administrative capacity
Internationalization	Extensive	Limited	Facilitate international IP strategies

Source: Authors' synthesis based on the systematic literature and WIPO innovation indicators. The table represents an analytical framework rather than a statistical classification of countries.

6. Trademarks, Commercialization and Innovation

Patent statistics alone provide an incomplete picture of innovation because technological inventions must ultimately be transformed into commercially valuable products or services.

Trademarks play a significant role in this process. A business developing an innovative product may require a recognizable brand to distinguish that product from competitors. In digital markets, brand reputation can become an important intangible asset even when the underlying technology is relatively difficult to patent.

WIPO's IP statistics consequently provide a broader picture of innovation-related activity by reporting trademark applications and registrations in addition to patents.

The expansion of trademark activity can therefore be interpreted as evidence of increasing formalization and commercialization of economic activity, although it cannot automatically be treated as evidence of technological innovation.

This distinction is particularly important for service economies. Software companies, financial technology firms, professional-service businesses, media companies and consumer platforms may generate substantial economic value through brands and business models without necessarily producing large numbers of patents.

7. Industrial Designs and Intangible Competition

Industrial designs illustrate another dimension of the relationship between IP and innovation. Modern competition increasingly involves product experience, visual identity, usability and aesthetic characteristics.

A product can therefore be innovative without representing a technological breakthrough. A new consumer product may incorporate relatively mature technology but introduce a substantially different user interface or visual design.

Design protection can encourage firms to invest in these characteristics because it reduces the risk that competitors will immediately reproduce protected design elements.

The increasing importance of intangible assets in global markets therefore supports a broader understanding of innovation. Innovation policy that focuses exclusively on patents may underestimate the contribution of design, branding and other intangible assets.

8. Intellectual Property and the Global Innovation Index

The Global Innovation Index provides a useful framework for examining the relationship between intellectual property and broader innovation performance. WIPO's GII incorporates more than 80 indicators and evaluates innovation performance across approximately 140 economies.

Importantly, intellectual property filings constitute only part of the index. Other dimensions include institutions, human capital and research, infrastructure, market sophistication, business sophistication, knowledge and technology outputs and creative outputs.

This structure reflects a central argument of this article: IP protection operates within a wider institutional environment.

The 2025 GII results provide several illustrations. Switzerland remained the world's leading innovation economy, while the United States, Republic of Korea and Singapore occupied positions near the top of the ranking. China entered the top ten.

The diversity among these economies is important. Their innovation systems differ considerably in terms of government structure, industrial composition, market size and economic development. Nevertheless, they share several characteristics, including substantial research capacity, sophisticated business sectors and strong intellectual property activity.

Table 4. Selected Innovation-System Indicators and Their Expected Relationship with IP Performance

Innovation-System Factor	Expected Effect on IP Activity	Explanation
R&D expenditure	Positive	More research generates potentially protectable knowledge
Researcher concentration	Positive	Greater research capacity increases inventive output

Innovation-System Factor	Expected Effect on IP Activity	Explanation
Venture capital	Positive	Financing enables commercialization of IP
University–industry collaboration	Positive	Facilitates technology transfer
Market sophistication	Positive	Increases commercial incentives for innovation
Human capital	Positive	Provides skills necessary for inventive activity
Institutional quality	Positive	Improves predictability and enforceability of rights
High-tech manufacturing	Positive	Creates demand for technological IP
International trade	Positive	Encourages firms to protect IP in foreign markets
Market size	Mixed/Positive	Larger markets can increase incentives but may reduce international filing necessity

Source: Authors' synthesis of the systematic literature and international innovation indicators.

9. Discussion

The evidence reviewed in this study supports a nuanced interpretation of the relationship between intellectual property and innovation.

First, strong innovation economies generally demonstrate strong IP activity. However, this association does not establish that IP protection alone generates innovation. Innovation is a complex process requiring complementary inputs.

Second, different forms of intellectual property capture different dimensions of economic activity. Patent statistics are particularly useful for technological innovation, trademarks provide information concerning commercialization and branding, and industrial designs capture product differentiation.

Third, the relationship between IP and innovation appears to be mediated by institutional capacity. A legal framework may formally provide strong IP rights, but those rights have limited economic value if enforcement is slow, costly or unpredictable.

Fourth, IP systems should account for firm heterogeneity. Large multinational corporations may possess substantial financial and legal resources for international

patenting and trademark protection. Smaller enterprises may face significant barriers to registration and enforcement.

Fifth, the increasing importance of intangible assets means that conventional measures of innovation require continuous refinement. Innovation is increasingly embodied not only in patents but also in software, algorithms, brands, designs, organizational knowledge and data.

Table 5. Summary of Principal Findings from the Secondary Analysis

Research Dimension	Principal Finding	Interpretation
Patents and innovation	Strong positive association among leading innovation economies	Patent activity reflects technological capability but is not sufficient by itself
Trademarks and innovation	Broad association with commercialization	Trademark activity captures market-facing innovation
Industrial designs	Stronger relevance in design-intensive sectors	Design protection supports product differentiation
International patenting	Concentrated among technologically active economies	International filing reflects expected global commercial value
IP institutions	Important enabling condition	Effective enforcement increases the economic value of IP
R&D and IP	Complementary relationship	Research investment creates potential IP outputs
Venture capital and IP	Important commercialization mechanism	Finance helps convert protected knowledge into products
Human capital and IP	Foundational relationship	Skilled researchers and professionals support innovation
IP and overall innovation	Positive but multidimensional relationship	IP should be treated as part of an innovation ecosystem

10. Policy Implications

The findings have several implications for policymakers.

First, governments should avoid treating the number of patent applications as the sole measure of innovation success. Patent quantity can provide useful information, but patent quality, commercialization and economic impact are equally important.

Second, intellectual property offices should strengthen support for small and medium-sized enterprises. SMEs frequently lack specialized IP expertise and may therefore underutilize available protection mechanisms.

Third, innovation policy should integrate IP policy with research policy. Universities and public research institutions require effective technology-transfer mechanisms so that research outputs can be translated into commercial applications.

Fourth, governments should improve access to innovation finance. IP assets may have limited economic value if innovative firms cannot obtain the capital necessary for product development, testing, scaling and internationalization.

Fifth, enforcement remains essential. Formal legal rights provide limited incentives when rights holders cannot efficiently enforce them. Specialized courts, administrative mechanisms, alternative dispute resolution and digital enforcement systems may therefore strengthen the economic effectiveness of IP systems.

Sixth, policymakers should recognize differences among industries. Patent-intensive pharmaceutical innovation requires different policy instruments from branding-intensive consumer markets or design-oriented industries.

11. Implications for Developing and Emerging Economies

The relationship between IP and development is particularly important for emerging economies. Such economies may face a dual challenge: developing domestic innovation capabilities while participating in global knowledge networks.

Building a sophisticated IP system requires more than adopting statutory legislation. Countries require skilled patent examiners, judges, lawyers, researchers and entrepreneurs. They also require research infrastructure and mechanisms for technology transfer.

The experience of economies that have improved their innovation performance suggests that IP development is most effective when embedded in a wider economic strategy.

The 2025 GII provides several examples of middle-income economies improving their innovation positions. WIPO identifies economies including China, Türkiye, Viet Nam, the Philippines, Indonesia and Morocco among notable performers in longer-term innovation advancement.

These developments indicate that innovation capacity can evolve significantly when research, industry, human capital, infrastructure and IP institutions develop simultaneously.

12. Digital Transformation and the Future of Intellectual Property

Digitalization is changing the relationship between intellectual property and innovation.

Artificial intelligence, cloud computing, digital platforms, blockchain, biotechnology and advanced manufacturing have complicated conventional distinctions between invention, software, data and creative expression.

WIPO's 2025 innovation analysis describes a period in which AI and quantum technologies are advancing rapidly while innovation investment patterns are changing. It also reports that global R&D growth slowed in 2024 and that patent growth remained relatively modest compared with longer-term trends.

These developments create new questions for IP policy.

For example, AI-generated outputs raise questions concerning authorship and inventorship. Data-driven innovation raises questions concerning ownership and access. Digital platforms create challenges involving trademarks, copyright, patents and trade secrets simultaneously.

The future IP system will therefore need to balance protection with interoperability, competition and knowledge diffusion.

13. Limitations

The study has several limitations.

First, the empirical component relies on secondary data. International IP statistics are valuable for comparative analysis, but they cannot capture every dimension of innovation.

Second, patent, trademark and design applications represent activity rather than economic value. A simple count cannot determine whether an individual right is commercially successful.

Third, the analysis is primarily descriptive. Although the observed patterns are consistent with theoretical expectations concerning the relationship between IP and innovation, the study does not establish causal effects.

Fourth, differences in national institutional systems may influence filing behaviour independently of technological capacity.

Fifth, the GII incorporates a large number of indicators, and rankings should not be interpreted as definitive measurements of national innovation capability. WIPO itself notes methodological considerations when comparing annual rankings because the underlying data cover different periods.

Future research could therefore employ panel-data methods, firm-level patent information, patent citations, trademark valuation data and industry-level measures of innovation to investigate causal mechanisms more precisely.

14. Conclusion

This study examined the relationship between intellectual property and innovation through a systematic review of the literature and analysis of international secondary data.

The evidence suggests that intellectual property is an important component of modern innovation systems, but it should not be regarded as an independent or sufficient determinant of innovation performance. Economies with strong innovation capabilities tend to exhibit substantial patent, trademark and industrial-design activity. Nevertheless, the relationship is mediated by research capacity, human capital, institutional quality, finance, infrastructure, market sophistication and commercialization capabilities.

Patents remain particularly important for technological innovation and knowledge-intensive industries. Trademarks provide a complementary perspective by capturing branding and commercialization, while industrial designs reflect product differentiation and design-oriented innovation.

The findings also demonstrate the importance of moving beyond narrow measures of innovation. As economic value increasingly derives from intangible assets, innovation systems must account for technological inventions as well as brands, designs, software, data and organizational knowledge.

The policy implication is that intellectual property should be treated as part of an integrated innovation ecosystem. Effective IP protection can create incentives for investment and provide mechanisms for appropriating returns from innovation. However, the ultimate economic impact of IP depends upon the surrounding institutional and economic environment.

Consequently, governments seeking to improve innovation performance should not focus solely on increasing patent or trademark applications. Instead, they should develop coordinated policies that combine effective IP institutions with research investment, human-capital development, innovation finance, university–industry collaboration and market access.

The international evidence indicates that the most successful innovation ecosystems are those in which intellectual property protection operates alongside these complementary capabilities. The future effectiveness of intellectual property policy will therefore depend not only on the strength of legal rights but also on the capacity of economies to transform protected knowledge into commercially and socially valuable innovation.

Declarations

Funding: The authors declare that no external funding was received for this study.

Conflict of Interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest.

Ethical Approval: No human participants, personal data or experimental subjects were involved in the study; therefore, institutional ethical approval was not required.

Author Contributions: Both authors contributed to the conceptualization, literature review, interpretation of secondary data and preparation of the manuscript.

References

Barney, J. (1991). Firm resources and sustained competitive advantage. *Journal of Management, 17*(1), 99–120.

Blind, K., Edler, J., Frietsch, R., & Schmoch, U. (2006). Motives to patent: Empirical evidence from Germany. *Research Policy, 35*(5), 655–672.

Cohen, W. M., Nelson, R. R., & Walsh, J. P. (2000). Protecting their intellectual assets: Appropriability conditions and why U.S. manufacturing firms patent or not. *NBER Working Paper No. 7552*.

Hall, B. H., & Harhoff, D. (2012). Recent research on the economics of patents. *Annual Review of Economics, 4*, 541–565.

Hall, B. H., Jaffe, A. B., & Trajtenberg, M. (2005). Market value and patent citations. *RAND Journal of Economics, 36*(1), 16–38.

OECD. (2015). *Enquiries into Intellectual Property's Economic Impact*. OECD Publishing.

World Intellectual Property Organization. (2024). *World Intellectual Property Indicators 2024*. Geneva: WIPO.

World Intellectual Property Organization. (2025a). *Global Innovation Index 2025: Innovation at a Crossroads*. Geneva: WIPO.

World Intellectual Property Organization. (2025b). *World Intellectual Property Indicators 2025*. Geneva: WIPO.

World Intellectual Property Organization. (2025c). *WIPO IP Statistics Data Center*. Geneva: WIPO.

World Intellectual Property Organization. (2025d). *Global Innovation Index 2025: GII 2025 Results*. Geneva: WIPO.