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

Trademark Protection in the Digital Marketplace: A Case Study of the Velmora–Nexora Dispute

Henrik J. Sørensen[1] and Amélie R. Beaumont[2]
[1] Professor of IP and Commercial Law, Ravenscourt University, United Kingdom
[2] Associate Professor, Department of Business Law and Digital Commerce, Nordhaven School of Law, Denmark

Submission: 11/12/2025 Acceptance: 29/03/2026 Publication: 30/05/2026

Abstract
The expansion of digital marketplaces has transformed the manner in which trademarks are created, commercialised, monitored, and infringed. Online platforms provide brand owners with access to international consumers but simultaneously facilitate counterfeiting, unauthorised resale, keyword manipulation, domain-name abuse, and misleading digital advertising. This article examines these challenges through a fictional case study concerning Velmora Atelier, a luxury fashion company, and Nexora Marketplace, a large cross-border electronic commerce platform. The dispute arose following the appearance of thousands of products bearing marks visually and phonetically similar to Velmora's registered trademarks. The case further involved sponsored search results, third-party sellers, domain names, platform notice-and-takedown procedures, and allegations concerning the platform's knowledge of repeated infringement.

Using a qualitative case-study methodology, the article analyses the interaction between traditional trademark principles and contemporary digital commerce. The study reconstructs the fictional dispute through commercial agreements, platform policies, enforcement notices, seller records, consumer complaints, expert reports, and hypothetical judicial submissions. The analysis identifies four major challenges: establishing platform responsibility for third-party infringement, determining the legal significance of keyword advertising, distinguishing legitimate comparative or descriptive use from infringement, and designing effective cross-border enforcement mechanisms. The case demonstrates that conventional trademark enforcement models based primarily on identifying individual infringers are increasingly inadequate in highly decentralised digital marketplaces.

The article argues that effective trademark protection requires a shift from purely reactive enforcement toward a collaborative governance model involving rights holders, platforms, payment intermediaries, logistics providers, and regulatory authorities. It proposes a risk-based platform responsibility framework incorporating seller verification, repeat-infringer controls, proactive detection, transparent enforcement procedures, and expedited remedies for high-risk categories. The article

concludes that trademark law can remain technologically neutral while adopting procedural and institutional mechanisms specifically adapted to the architecture of digital marketplaces.
Keywords: trademark law; digital marketplace; counterfeiting; brand protection; electronic commerce; platform liability; keyword advertising; intellectual property enforcement; online infringement; case study

1. Introduction

Trademarks perform a fundamental function within commercial markets. They enable consumers to distinguish goods and services, communicate commercial origin, and associate products with particular reputational qualities. For businesses, trademarks are therefore not merely legal instruments but valuable commercial assets capable of generating substantial economic value.

The expansion of electronic commerce has transformed this traditional function. Consumers increasingly encounter trademarks through search engines, social media platforms, online marketplaces, mobile applications, digital advertising, and algorithmically generated recommendations. A consumer may therefore interact with a trademark without ever visiting a physical retail establishment.

This transformation has generated significant advantages for businesses. Digital marketplaces reduce geographical barriers, provide access to international consumers, and permit smaller businesses to participate in global commerce. However, the same infrastructure can also facilitate infringement on an unprecedented scale.

A single online marketplace may contain millions of product listings created by thousands of independent sellers. A counterfeit seller can create a listing within minutes, modify its identity, and continue operating through a new account after the original account has been suspended. Consumers may also have difficulty distinguishing genuine products from counterfeits because sophisticated infringers can reproduce logos, packaging, product descriptions, photographs, and promotional materials.

The resulting legal problem is therefore considerably more complex than the conventional trademark dispute between two identifiable businesses.

The present article examines these challenges through a fictional dispute between Velmora Atelier and Nexora Marketplace. Velmora is presented as a fictional luxury fashion company whose trademarks became extensively associated with premium handbags and accessories. Nexora is a fictional multinational electronic commerce platform hosting independent third-party sellers.

The dispute illustrates a recurring structural problem: when a platform provides the infrastructure through which infringement occurs, to what extent should responsibility remain with the individual seller and when should the platform itself assume legal or regulatory responsibility?

The principal research question is:
How can trademark law effectively protect brand owners against large-scale infringement occurring through digital marketplaces while preserving legitimate electronic commerce and lawful third-party trade?
The article develops this question through four subsidiary issues. First, when should a marketplace be considered sufficiently aware of infringement to trigger responsibility? Second, how should keyword advertising and algorithmic search rankings be evaluated? Third, what mechanisms can distinguish counterfeit activity from legitimate resale and comparative advertising? Fourth, what institutional framework can improve cross-border enforcement?

2. Conceptual Framework

2.1 The economic function of trademarks

Trademark law traditionally performs several interconnected functions. The source-identification function allows consumers to associate a mark with a particular commercial undertaking. The quality function enables consumers to develop expectations regarding products associated with the mark. The advertising function allows businesses to communicate reputational value and differentiate themselves from competitors.
Digital commerce intensifies all three functions.
A product displayed on an online marketplace may appear beside hundreds of competing products within the same search results. The visual presentation of a trademark may therefore influence consumer choice within seconds.
The digital environment also allows infringers to imitate not only the trademark but the entire commercial presentation surrounding it.

2.2 From individual infringement to ecosystem infringement

Traditional enforcement generally focuses on the direct infringer. If a retailer sells counterfeit products, the retailer may be sued or prosecuted.
Digital marketplaces create multiple levels of participation.
A counterfeit transaction may involve:

- the seller;
- the marketplace;
- the payment processor;
- the logistics provider;
- the advertising service;
- the domain registrar;
- the hosting provider; and
- potentially social media intermediaries.

Consequently, infringement becomes an ecosystem phenomenon.

2.3 Platform knowledge

A critical question is whether a platform's knowledge of infringement can be established.

Knowledge may arise from:

1. a specific rights-holder notice;
2. repeated consumer complaints;
3. internal detection systems;
4. previous enforcement actions;
5. abnormal seller behaviour;
6. unusually high rates of returns; or
7. communications with regulatory authorities.

The greater the evidence of repeated infringement, the more difficult it becomes to characterise the platform as merely a passive intermediary.

3. Methodology

This study employs a qualitative case-study methodology.

The fictional case was constructed to examine the practical interaction between trademark law and platform governance. The case materials consist of hypothetical legal submissions, marketplace records, enforcement notices, seller agreements, consumer complaints, expert reports, and internal compliance documents.

The analysis follows a doctrinal and institutional approach. Rather than evaluating only whether a particular transaction constitutes trademark infringement, the study examines the broader distribution of responsibility among the participants in the digital marketplace.

The fictional nature of the dispute is important. The names of all companies, individuals, institutions, legal proceedings, and documentary records have been created exclusively for academic illustration.

4. The Velmora–Nexora Dispute

4.1 Velmora Atelier

Velmora Atelier was established in 2019 as a fictional luxury fashion company headquartered in Milan, Italy. The company specialised in handbags, leather accessories, footwear, and travel products.

Velmora registered several trademarks in major commercial jurisdictions. Its principal word mark, **VELMORA**, was accompanied by a distinctive geometric emblem consisting of three interlocking arcs.

By 2030, the brand had developed a significant international reputation.

Velmora's business model relied heavily on brand exclusivity. Products were sold through company-operated boutiques, authorised distributors, and a controlled online store.

The company prohibited unauthorised sellers from representing themselves as official Velmora distributors.

4.2 Nexora Marketplace

Nexora Marketplace was a fictional digital commerce platform operating across more than 40 countries.

Unlike a conventional retailer, Nexora did not purchase most products from sellers. Instead, independent merchants created product listings and sold goods directly to consumers.

Nexora provided:

- product-hosting infrastructure;
- payment processing;
- search functionality;
- sponsored advertising;
- customer communication tools;
- logistics coordination; and
- dispute-resolution services.

The platform charged sellers a percentage of transaction value and additional fees for advertising and logistics.

4.3 Initial discovery

Velmora first became aware of widespread counterfeit activity on Nexora in 2031.

The company identified 436 listings using the VELMORA name or a confusingly similar variation.

Some sellers used names such as:

- "Velmora Official Store";
- "Velmora Luxury Outlet";
- "Velmora Europe Shop"; and
- "Vellmora Official."

Several listings displayed photographs copied from Velmora's official website.

Velmora submitted takedown requests to Nexora.

Nexora removed 389 listings within fourteen days.

Velmora subsequently regarded the response as inadequate because new listings appeared shortly after the original listings were removed.

5. Escalation of the Dispute

5.1 Repeat infringement

Over the following eighteen months, Velmora submitted additional complaints.

The company's enforcement department identified 7,820 listings that allegedly involved counterfeit goods or unauthorised use of Velmora marks.

Nexora removed approximately 6,900 listings after receiving complaints.
However, Velmora discovered that many sellers subsequently created new accounts.
This led to a disagreement regarding repeat-infringer responsibility.
Velmora argued that Nexora had sufficient information to identify patterns of infringement and should have implemented stronger seller verification.
Nexora argued that individual account suspension was appropriate and that requiring permanent exclusion based on algorithmic similarity could incorrectly penalise legitimate merchants.

Table 1. Development of the Fictional Dispute

Period	Event
2019	Velmora Atelier established
2028	Nexora expands into European luxury-goods market
2030	Velmora completes international trademark portfolio
2031	First major counterfeit listings identified
2031–2032	Repeated notices submitted
2032	Platform introduces automated detection
2033	Velmora alleges persistent repeat infringement
2033	Settlement negotiations begin
2034	Fictional litigation commenced
2035	Court orders enhanced platform disclosure

6. Keyword Advertising

One of the most controversial aspects of the dispute concerned Nexora's sponsored search system.
Nexora permitted sellers to purchase advertising keywords. A seller offering an unbranded leather handbag could purchase the keyword "Velmora" so that its product appeared among sponsored results when consumers searched for the brand.
Nexora argued that keyword advertising was an ordinary commercial practice and that consumers could distinguish sponsored listings from official products.
Velmora argued that the practice created an association between its trademark and unauthorised products.
The issue illustrates the difference between **using a trademark as a genuine product identifier** and **using a trademark to divert consumer attention**.
The factual circumstances surrounding the advertisement are therefore critical.
A seller offering a genuine second-hand Velmora handbag may have a legitimate reason to use the trademark to identify the product.

A seller offering a counterfeit handbag may use the same keyword for an entirely different purpose: attracting consumers searching specifically for the genuine brand.
The law must therefore distinguish legitimate descriptive or referential use from deceptive commercial exploitation.

7. Counterfeiting Versus Parallel Trade

An additional complexity emerged when Nexora suspended a seller offering genuine Velmora products purchased from an authorised distributor in another jurisdiction.
Velmora initially supported the suspension because the seller had not received direct authorisation from Velmora.
The seller challenged the decision, arguing that the goods were genuine and that resale of authentic products should not automatically be treated as trademark infringement.
This episode revealed an important limitation of automated enforcement.
A system trained primarily to identify trademark misuse may confuse counterfeit goods with legitimate parallel trade.

Table 2. Classification of Online Trademark Activity

Activity	Nature	Potential Legal Concern
Counterfeit product	False branded product	Strong infringement concern
Genuine resale	Authentic product	May be legitimate
Comparative advertising	Reference to competitor	Context-dependent
Keyword targeting	Trademark used in search advertising	Depends on presentation and purpose
Fan-created content	Non-commercial reference	Generally lower commercial risk
Unauthorised official-looking store	Misleading commercial identity	High infringement risk
Trademark typo	Deliberate consumer diversion	Potential infringement

The case therefore demonstrates that effective enforcement cannot depend exclusively on automated keyword or image matching.

8. Platform Responsibility

8.1 Passive intermediary argument

Nexora's primary legal defence was that it merely provided an electronic marketplace.
According to this argument, independent sellers were responsible for their own listings and transactions.

This position has historical foundations in intermediary liability law. Platforms may not necessarily be treated as equivalent to the parties directly responsible for unlawful content.

However, the factual circumstances of modern platforms can complicate this distinction.

Nexora did not simply provide storage.

It also:

- ranked products;
- sold sponsored placements;
- processed payments;
- provided logistics;
- communicated with consumers;
- analysed transaction patterns; and
- operated automated detection systems.

The platform was therefore deeply integrated into the commercial transaction.

8.2 Active involvement

Velmora argued that Nexora's active involvement should influence the assessment of responsibility.

For example, if a platform receives repeated complaints concerning the same seller, identifies the seller as high-risk, and nevertheless continues to promote that seller through paid advertising, the platform's role may be qualitatively different from that of a passive hosting provider.

This suggests that platform responsibility should be assessed through a combination of knowledge, control, economic benefit, and preventive capability.

9. Proposed Platform Responsibility Model

The case study supports a four-factor framework.

9.1 Knowledge: The platform should be assessed according to what it actually knew or reasonably should have known.

9.2 Control: The more control a platform exercises over listings, sellers, ranking, advertising, and transactions, the stronger the argument for corresponding responsibilities.

9.3 Benefit: Economic benefit alone should not establish infringement. However, direct financial benefit from activity that the platform knows to be problematic may become relevant.

9.4 Preventive capability: A platform with sophisticated technological systems may be expected to undertake proportionate preventive measures.

Table 3. Four-Factor Platform Responsibility Framework

Factor	Low Responsibility	Higher Responsibility
Knowledge	No notice	Repeated detailed notices
Control	Limited hosting	Seller ranking and promotion
Economic benefit	Fixed infrastructure fee	Transaction and advertising revenue
Prevention capability	Limited technical capacity	Advanced detection systems
Response	Immediate removal	Repeated failure to act
Seller history	First complaint	Persistent repeat offender

The framework does not create automatic platform liability. Instead, it provides a structured method for evaluating whether a platform has moved beyond passive facilitation.

10. Evidence and Digital Enforcement

Trademark litigation traditionally depends upon physical evidence, transaction records, product samples, witness testimony, and expert analysis.

Digital marketplace disputes increasingly depend upon additional forms of evidence. These include:

- screenshots;
- server logs;
- seller registration information;
- payment records;
- advertising histories;
- search-ranking records;
- consumer complaints;
- product photographs;
- shipment records;
- account relationships; and
- algorithmic detection reports.

The reliability and preservation of such evidence are therefore important.

Velmora argued that Nexora should preserve relevant information after receiving an infringement notice.

Nexora responded that retaining extensive seller information indefinitely would create privacy, security, and storage concerns.

The dispute highlights the need for proportionate data-retention rules.

11. Consumer Protection Dimension

Trademark infringement in digital marketplaces is not solely an intellectual property issue.

Consumers purchasing counterfeit products may suffer financial loss, safety risks, and privacy problems.

A counterfeit luxury handbag may appear to involve a relatively low-risk product category. However, the same marketplace infrastructure may also facilitate counterfeit pharmaceuticals, electrical goods, automotive components, cosmetics, and children's products.

Consequently, platform enforcement systems can generate broader public-interest benefits.

The fictional case showed that 61% of consumer complaints involving suspected counterfeit Velmora products related not only to brand authenticity but also to misleading descriptions concerning product materials and origin.

This demonstrates the interconnectedness of trademark law and consumer protection.

12. Cross-Border Enforcement

The international nature of Nexora created another difficulty.

A seller might be located in Country A, operate an account registered in Country B, use a payment provider in Country C, and ship goods from Country D.

Velmora therefore encountered difficulties identifying the appropriate defendant and obtaining effective remedies.

Table 4. Hypothetical Cross-Border Enforcement Structure

Participant	Possible Location	Enforcement Issue
Trademark owner	Italy	Rights established nationally/internationally
Marketplace	Denmark	Platform jurisdiction
Seller	Turkey	Identification
Payment provider	Luxembourg	Transaction records
Logistics company	Germany	Shipment evidence
Consumer	France	Consumer remedy
Domain registrar	Netherlands	Domain suspension

The fragmented structure creates substantial enforcement costs.

A rights holder may successfully obtain a judgment against a seller while being unable to locate or enforce against that seller.

Platform-level remedies may therefore sometimes be more effective than seller-by-seller litigation.

13. Economic Consequences

The economic consequences of online counterfeiting extend beyond lost sales.

Brand owners may experience:

- reputational damage;
- consumer distrust;
- increased enforcement expenses;
- reduced exclusivity;
- price pressure;
- loss of distribution control; and
- dilution of brand identity.

Digital platforms also incur costs.

They must invest in:

- automated detection;
- human moderation;
- seller verification;
- complaint management;
- legal teams;
- dispute resolution; and
- regulatory compliance.

Consequently, an excessively burdensome regulatory model could increase platform costs and indirectly raise barriers to market entry for smaller businesses.

A balanced system must therefore distinguish between high-risk and low-risk sellers.

14. Risk-Based Enforcement

The case study supports a risk-based approach.

Not every seller should receive the same level of scrutiny.

A new seller offering a small number of unrelated products presents a different risk profile from a merchant that repeatedly creates accounts, uses misleading brand names, receives numerous complaints, and sells hundreds of suspicious products.

A risk score could incorporate:

1. number of previous complaints;
2. authenticity disputes;
3. account age;
4. identity verification;
5. product category;
6. unusual transaction patterns;
7. return rates;
8. previous account suspensions; and
9. relationships with previously suspended sellers.

However, automated risk scores should not result in irreversible decisions without appropriate review mechanisms.

15. Proposed Governance Framework

The fictional dispute suggests a collaborative model involving multiple participants.

Rights holders: Rights holders should maintain accurate trademark records, provide sufficiently detailed infringement notices, and distinguish counterfeit goods from legitimate resale.

Platforms: Platforms should implement proportionate seller verification, repeat-infringer mechanisms, complaint procedures, and proactive detection for high-risk categories.

Payment providers: Payment intermediaries may contribute by identifying suspicious patterns and responding to legally valid requests.

Logistics providers: Shipment information can assist in identifying large-scale counterfeit networks.

Regulators: Regulators can establish minimum standards for transparency, notice procedures, seller verification, and platform accountability.

Table 5. Recommended Governance Responsibilities

Stakeholder	Recommended Responsibility
Trademark owner	Accurate rights information and detailed notices
Marketplace	Seller verification and proportionate monitoring
Seller	Authenticity and legality of products
Payment provider	Risk monitoring and lawful information sharing
Logistics provider	Traceability of commercial shipments
Regulator	Minimum compliance standards
Court	Proportionate disclosure and effective remedies

16. Discussion

16.1 From notice-and-takedown to notice-and-prevention

The traditional notice-and-takedown model assumes that unlawful material can be identified and removed after notification.

This approach becomes less effective where the same seller repeatedly creates new listings.

A more advanced model should combine notice-and-takedown with preventative mechanisms.

For example, if a platform receives credible evidence that a particular seller repeatedly sells counterfeit goods, merely deleting individual listings may be insufficient.

The platform should investigate the broader account network.

16.2 The danger of over-enforcement

Strong enforcement mechanisms can also generate unintended consequences.
Automated systems may incorrectly remove:

- legitimate second-hand products;
- genuine parallel imports;
- criticism;
- comparative advertising;
- fan-created material;
- editorial content; or
- educational references.

Trademark protection should therefore not become a mechanism for eliminating legitimate competition or consumer discussion.

16.3 The importance of procedural fairness

Platform enforcement decisions can have substantial economic consequences for sellers.
A seller whose account is suspended may lose access to customers, payments, reviews, and accumulated commercial reputation.
Consequently, platforms should provide:

- reasons for suspension;
- accessible appeal mechanisms;
- correction procedures;
- proportionate penalties; and
- distinction between deliberate counterfeiting and accidental misuse.

Procedural fairness is particularly important where automated systems are used.

17. Implications for Trademark Doctrine

The case demonstrates that traditional trademark doctrine remains relevant but requires contextual application.
The core questions remain familiar:

- Is there a protected mark?
- Is the mark being used commercially?
- Is there similarity?
- Is there a likelihood of confusion?
- Is the use legitimate?
- Has the reputation of the mark been exploited or harmed?

What has changed is the environment in which these questions arise.
A trademark may now appear in:

- product metadata;
- search algorithms;
- advertising keywords;
- URLs;
- seller names;
- hashtags;
- automated recommendations;
- image-search results; and
- artificial intelligence-generated product descriptions.

Accordingly, trademark analysis must become technologically literate without becoming technologically dependent.

18. Recommendations

The case study supports eight recommendations.

First, digital marketplaces should implement stronger identity verification for sellers operating in high-risk product categories.

Second, platforms should establish specialised procedures for repeat infringers rather than merely removing individual listings.

Third, trademark owners should provide standardised digital evidence to facilitate efficient verification.

Fourth, platforms should distinguish counterfeit goods from genuine parallel trade.

Fifth, keyword advertising should be assessed according to context, presentation, and consumer perception rather than through automatic rules.

Sixth, platform enforcement systems should incorporate human review for contested high-impact decisions.

Seventh, regulators should encourage cross-border information-sharing mechanisms.

Eighth, courts should develop procedures allowing rights holders to obtain proportionate platform information while protecting legitimate privacy and commercial confidentiality interests.

19. Limitations

This study is subject to several limitations.

First, the Velmora–Nexora dispute is entirely fictional. It therefore cannot establish empirical conclusions regarding actual platform practices or judicial outcomes.

Second, the case combines multiple trademark issues within one hypothetical dispute. Actual litigation would normally separate some of these questions.

Third, technological systems change rapidly. Detection tools that are considered advanced today may become standard or obsolete in future.

Finally, trademark law differs significantly among jurisdictions. The proposed framework should therefore be regarded as a conceptual model rather than a universally applicable statement of law.
Future research should examine actual judicial decisions involving digital marketplaces and compare platform responsibility standards across major jurisdictions.

20. Conclusion

Digital marketplaces have fundamentally changed the enforcement environment for trademark owners. The central difficulty is no longer simply identifying whether an individual seller has infringed a trademark. The more complex question concerns how responsibility should be distributed throughout a digital commercial ecosystem.
The fictional Velmora–Nexora dispute illustrates this transformation.
The platform was not merely a passive technological intermediary. It provided search functionality, advertising, payment services, logistics coordination, seller accounts, and transaction infrastructure. At the same time, it did not manufacture the allegedly counterfeit goods and could not reasonably be expected to guarantee the authenticity of every product listed on its marketplace.
This intermediate position creates a regulatory challenge.
A balanced approach should therefore avoid both extremes. Platforms should not automatically be liable for every act committed by independent sellers. However, platforms that possess substantial knowledge, control, economic involvement, and technological capacity should not be able to rely indefinitely upon the argument that all infringement is solely the seller's responsibility.
The most promising solution is a risk-based governance model.
Under such a model, platforms would be expected to apply greater scrutiny to high-risk sellers and product categories, investigate repeated infringement, maintain proportionate seller verification procedures, preserve relevant evidence, and provide meaningful appeal mechanisms. Rights holders would also have responsibilities, including providing accurate information and distinguishing counterfeit products from legitimate resale.
The case further demonstrates that trademark enforcement cannot be separated entirely from consumer protection. Counterfeit goods can create financial and safety risks, while misleading digital representations can undermine consumer confidence.
Ultimately, the future effectiveness of trademark law in digital commerce will depend upon institutional cooperation. Courts, regulators, rights holders, platforms, payment providers, logistics companies, and sellers must operate within a framework that combines legal accountability with procedural fairness.

The objective should not be to transform digital marketplaces into traditional retailers. Nor should platforms be permitted to operate as completely neutral spaces despite possessing sophisticated knowledge and control over commercial activity.
Instead, intellectual property governance should recognise the unique architecture of digital commerce.
Trademark protection in the digital marketplace therefore requires a shift from **reactive infringement removal toward responsible ecosystem governance**. Such a shift can preserve the essential economic functions of trademarks while allowing digital commerce to continue developing as a competitive and innovative component of the global economy.

References

1. Bently, L., Sherman, B., Gangjee, D., & Johnson, P. (2018). *Intellectual Property Law*. Oxford University Press.
2. Dinwoodie, G. B., & Janis, M. D. (2018). *Trademark Law and Theory: A Handbook of Contemporary Research*. Edward Elgar.
3. European Union Intellectual Property Office. (2022). *Online Copyright and Trademark Infringements in the Digital Environment*. EUIPO.
4. Gangjee, D. (2017). Non-conventional trademarks in the digital marketplace. *Intellectual Property Quarterly*, 4, 327–349.
5. Kur, A., & Senftleben, M. (2017). *European Trade Mark Law: A Commentary*. Oxford University Press.
6. McCarthy, J. T. (2020). *McCarthy on Trademarks and Unfair Competition*. Thomson Reuters.
7. Ohly, A., & Sosnitza, O. (2019). *European and International Trademark Law*. C.H. Beck.
8. WIPO. (2020). *World Intellectual Property Indicators*. World Intellectual Property Organization.
9. WIPO. (2022). *Making a Mark: An Introduction to Trademarks for Small and Medium-Sized Enterprises*. World Intellectual Property Organization.
10. World Trade Organization. (2021). *Intellectual Property and Electronic Commerce*. WTO Publications.

Declaration

Conflict of Interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest.
Funding: No external funding was received for this fictional sample article.