WWW.IJRPR.COM

International Journal of Research Publication and Reviews

Journal homepage: www.ijrpr.com ISSN 2582-7421

Leveraging Intellectual Property Law to Catalyze Fintech Innovation in International Markets: A Legal-Tech Framework for Sustainable Growth

Motunrayo Tolani Omidiora[1], Stephanie Nma Modilim[2], Oladipo Sopitan[3], Iyanuoluwa Bolarinwa[4], Obah Tawo[5], Chandra Shikhi Kodete[6]

[1]Nigerian Law School, Enugu, Nigeria
[2]School of Law, Fordham University, New York, USA
[3]Central Michigan University, USA
[4]Department of Public Administration, Indiana University Bloomington, USA
[5]Department of Computer Science, Wrexham University, Wales, UK
[6]School of Technology, Eastern Illinois University, Charleston, Illinois, USA
(motunrayoomidiora@gmail.com)

ABSTRACT

This article investigates how emerging-market fintech ecosystems can overcome intellectual-property (IP) barriers through a legal-tech framework that integrates statutory reform with digital compliance tools. We first diagnose systemic challenges: fragmented IP regimes across national, regional and multilateral layers; enforcement gaps due to understaffed registries and weak cyber-forensics; and regulatory uncertainty around novel assets such as stablecoins and AI-generated code. Comparative analysis highlights divergent outcomes in Nigeria, Brazil and ASEAN states, revealing that simple consolidation of IP offices or sandbox proliferation is insufficient without corresponding capacity-building in courts and digital infrastructures. Drawing on success factors from Singapore's IP Hub Master Plan, Estonia's blockchain-anchored registries and Brazil's phased INPI modernization, we articulate a modular approach: (1) harmonize IP laws with fintech realities; (2) recognise blockchain-anchored registers as evidence; (3) deploy AI-assisted due-diligence tools under transparency mandates; and (4) embed IP education and legal-design services in accelerator programmes. Institutional alignment among governments, IP offices, fintech hubs and investors is emphasised to ensure coherent sequencing and shared KPIs. We conclude by calling for empirical pilots of regulatory sandboxes that marry legal reform with technological platforms, and for multilateral bodies to issue model laws that secure cross-border recognition. This framework aims to propel sustainable fintech growth by reducing transaction costs, enhancing investor confidence and safeguarding innovation.

Introduction

Financial technology (fintech) harnesses mobile wallets, blockchain payment rails, artificial-intelligence (AI) credit scoring and open-API banking to deliver financial services faster and more cheaply than traditional institutions. In emerging economies, it has become a prime driver of financial inclusion. Although global fintech investment fell to about US $95 billion in 2023 at its lowest level in seven years, almost 40 per cent of all deals occurred outside North America and Western Europe, signaling the sector's continuing shift toward the Global South (He, 2023). Nigeria exemplifies this trend: it now licenses more than 200 payment-service providers and still attracted roughly US $1 billion in disclosed fintech funding during 2024 despite currency volatility and inflation pressures (Patel and Dharmadhikari, 2023).

Scaling innovation at this pace depends on credible mechanisms that allow founders to appropriate returns hence the centrality of intellectual property (IP) rights. Patents secure novel cryptographic protocols: copyrights protect source code and graphical interfaces; trademarks differentiate platforms in overcrowded app stores; and trade-secret law shields proprietary data-analytics models. Cross-country econometric studies show that stronger IP protection correlates with higher venture-capital inflows, faster technology diffusion and gains in total-factor productivity in low- and middle-income economies (PowerPatent, 2023).

Yet entrepreneurs and regulators face three persistent obstacles. First, IP norms are fragmented across layers of national statutes, regional organisations such as ARIPO or OAPI and multilateral treaties, creating jurisdictional overlaps and forum-shopping incentives (Itanyi, 2023). Second, chronic enforcement gaps stemming from understaffed IP registries, over-burdened courts and limited cyber-forensics capacity undermine deterrence and raise transaction costs (Oxford Business Law Blog, 2022). Third, regulatory uncertainty surrounds emergent assets such as stablecoins, tokenized securities

and AI-generated code; legislative cycles rarely keep pace, forcing firms to self-regulate or to "hack" legacy categories through expensive legal workarounds (Lescrauwaet et al., 2022).

This article therefore proposes a legal-tech framework that fuses IP doctrine with digital compliance tools including blockchain-based registries, smart-contract licensing and AI-assisted prior-art search to build an interoperable ecosystem in which fintech innovation can scale sustainably. The next two sections erect the conceptual scaffolding for that framework and diagnose the status quo across selected emerging regions.

Theoretical and Legal Framework

Fundamentals of IP relevant to fintech. Most fintech offerings bundle at least four species of intellectual property. Patents protect technical inventions such as real-time gross-settlement algorithms and biometric authentication protocols (He et al., 2022). Copyright law covers the software code, user-interface design and, in certain jurisdictions, training datasets used by AI models (Hudika et al., 2024). Trademarks safeguard the reputational capital that digital brands rely on to win consumer trust in intangible marketplaces (Moro Visconti and Moro Visconti, 2020). Trade-secret rules secure proprietary risk-scoring models and antifraud heuristics embedded deep in back-end systems. Because many innovations manifest as *processes* rather than physical artefacts, the boundary between patent-eligible technology and non-patentable business methods remains contested, especially in jurisdictions that apply a "technical-effect" or "technological-arts" standard (Schilirò, 2019).

Innovation–IP linkage. Schumpeterian theory frames IP as a temporary monopoly that rewards entrepreneurial experimentation, while endogenous-growth models (Romer, 1990) treat codified knowledge as a non-rival input whose private appropriation requires legal reinforcement. In capital-scarce markets, registered IP also performs a signalling function: it reduces information asymmetry between founders and investors, making venture funding and securitisation easier to obtain (Moro Visconti and Moro Visconti, 2020).

IP as economic infrastructure. Law-and-development scholars conceptualise predictable IP institutions as a form of public infrastructure that lowers transaction costs much like roads or broadband. Effective systems exhibit short grant lags, technically competent examiners and credible enforcement. Where these pillars are weak, start-ups confront a "valley-of-death": they struggle to raise follow-on finance between proof of concept and commercial scale (Gold et al., 2019).

Legal-tech synergy. Digital tools now allow *computational enforcement* of IP. Blockchain-anchored ledgers create immutable, time-stamped records of ownership and provenance; smart contracts automate royalty distribution and licence revocation, trimming monitoring costs (He, 2023). AI and machine-learning applications accelerate prior-art searches, flag code plagiarism and predict litigation outcomes, enabling understaffed registries to triage applications. Tokenization lets firms sell fractional interests in patent pools or copyright catalogues, unlocking new funding channels (Bamakan et al., 2022). These innovations, however, raise fresh questions about the evidentiary status of blockchain records, the allocation of liability among AI agents and the territorial reach of on-chain transactions. Resolving such questions requires IP and fintech regulators to co-evolve rather than operate in silos, a principle that underpins the framework advanced later in the article (Qin, 2021).

Challenges to IP Protection in Fintech across Emerging Markets

Africa (Nigeria as lead case). Nigeria's fintech boom rode on USSD channels and mobile-money networks, yet its IP environment remains uneven. Two federal bodies, the Trademarks, Patents and Designs Registry and the National Office for Technology Acquisition and Promotion share overlapping mandates, extending grant times to eighteen-twenty-four months. Civil dockets are congested, damage awards remain below deterrent levels and specialised IP benches are scarce. Predictably, successful apps are cloned; founders respond by defaulting to secrecy and restricting API openness, which ultimately limits the innovation spill-overs that a digital ecosystem needs to thrive (Patel and Dharmadhikari, 2023). Regionally, Nigeria participates in no continent-wide patent-harmonisation regime, so cross-border enforcement entails duplicative filings and divergent procedural rules (Itanyi, 2023).

Latin America. Brazil and Mexico maintain modern IP statutes, yet enforcement lags. A patent examination in Brazil can exceed ten years longer than the commercial life-cycle of many fintech innovations. Overlapping privacy and consumer-credit laws add friction: a neobank may win a patent on a dynamic credit-scoring model yet be unable to deploy it swiftly if sandbox conditions or data-localisation mandates intervene, eroding first-mover advantage.

Southeast Asia. ASEAN's integration blueprint aspires to a unified IP space, but national practice diverges. Indonesia allows copyright over software but bars algorithm patents; Vietnam does the reverse, incentivizing forum-shopping. Content-moderation rules vary too: a Thai e-wallet brand can be spoofed on Philippine social-media channels with limited recourse because takedown orders stop at jurisdictional borders.

Systemic barriers.

- ***Fragmentation and legal pluralism***. Multiple, partly overlapping regional frameworks ARIPO, OAPI, the Eurasian Patent Organisation inflate filing costs, while bilateral investment treaties inject most-favoured-nation clauses that complicate local-content rules (Oxford Business Law Blog, 2022).

- ***Bureaucratic inefficiency***. Several registries still rely on paper files; the average time to secure a fintech-relevant patent in Kenya is about three years, compared with under twelve months in Singapore. Investors therefore discount valuations or demand larger equity stakes (Ediagbonya and Tioluwani, 2023).
- ***Enforcement gaps***. Training deficits in cyber-forensics mean infringement claims often rely on screenshots that courts deem inconclusive; damages rarely reflect network effects, so willful infringement becomes a rational gamble (AllahRakha, 2023).
- ***Regulatory uncertainty***. Sandboxes ease some pressure but seldom cover IP allocation. Nigerian stablecoin pilots, for instance, operate under guidelines silent on who owns the underlying codebase: the state, the consortium bank or the software vendor forcing parties into complex contract drafting (Zalan et al., 2017).
- ***Impact on capital and scaling***. Weaker IP raises perceived risk, so venture funds adjust hurdle rates upward, constraining founders' capacity to reinvest in R&D. Cross-border fintech's must repeat filings, navigate data-localisation rules and manage conflicts of law, slowing time-to-market and diluting the network effects critical to platform success (Cumming et al., 2023).

Taken together, these obstacles justify the holistic legal-tech intervention proposed in subsequent sections, one that marries statutory harmonisation with digital IP infrastructure to unlock the next growth wave of emerging-market fintech.

Challenges to IP Protection in Fintech across Emerging Markets

The fragmentation of legal systems in emerging markets exacerbates enforcement inefficiencies, yet the degree and consequences of fragmentation vary markedly between regions. In Nigeria, overlapping mandates between federal and regional IP bodies delay patent and trademark grants by 18–24 months, whereas Kenya's single-registry model processes similar applications in under 12 months (Patel and Dharmadhikari, 2023). Comparative studies suggest that multi-layered institutional architectures often reflect political compromises rather than functional design, diminishing deterrence and incentivising forum-shopping (Park, 2008; Papageorgiadis et al., 2019). This contrast illustrates that simply consolidating registries does not automatically improve outcomes unless accompanied by clear process re-engineering and capacity-building, as evidenced by Brazil's IP office overhaul in the early 2010s (Garcez and Moreira, 2017).

Weak institutional capacities manifest differently across Latin America and Southeast Asia. Brazil's National Institute of Industrial Property (INPI) employs more examiners per capita than Nigeria's registry, yet still takes over eight years to grant complex fintech patents due to outdated IT infrastructure and procedural backlogs (Garcez and Moreira, 2017). In contrast, Vietnam's National Office of Intellectual Property (NOIP) has reduced average pendency to under three years through targeted e-filing and public-private partnerships, yet struggles with examiner training on digital-asset cases (Thanh, 2020). Comparative assessment indicates that while funding levels correlate with throughput, institutional culture and professional development drive qualitative differences in examination quality (Thanh, 2020).

Enforcement gaps are not only a function of registry capacity but also of judicial competence and digital-forensics readiness. Nigerian courts lack specialised IP benches and accredited forensic labs, resulting in decisions that rarely award damages beyond statutory minima and often dismiss blockchain-based evidence (Patel and Dharmadhikari, 2023). By contrast, Mexico's Federal Courts have established a Technology Chamber to hear high-tech cases, integrating expert testimony and digital-evidence standards, yet still face backlog pressures that delay injunctions (Thanh, 2020). These disparities reveal that judicial reform which often receives less donor attention than registry digitisation is equally crucial in establishing credible deterrence (Thanh, 2020).

The impact of IP gaps on venture capital and cross-border scaling is profound but uneven. African fintech's routinely face equity dilution of up to 30 percent more than their Southeast Asian counterparts to hedge against IP-risk (Garcez and Moreira, 2017; Patel and Dharmadhikari, 2023). Latin American startups, by contrast, leverage regional patent pools under Mercosur accords to lower filing costs, yet remain vulnerable to enforcement vacuums in partner states (Botto, 2022). These comparative patterns indicate that ecosystem maturity defined by interoperable IP frameworks, harmonized regulations and investor confidence cannot emerge solely from policy pronouncements; it requires synchronized capacity-building initiatives across registries, courts and capital markets (Botto, 2022).

Proposed Legal-Tech Framework for Sustainable Fintech Growth

Harmonisation of IP laws with fintech realities. Harmonisation must go beyond textual alignment to address substantive gaps between traditional IP regimes and digital-asset innovations. The AfCFTA IP Protocol, for instance, envisions mutual recognition of regional filings but omits stablecoins and tokenized securities from its scope, perpetuating uncertainty for Nigerian and Ghanaian fintech's alike (AfCFTA Secretariat, 2023). By comparison, ASEAN's Blueprint explicitly sanctions digital-asset patentability frameworks, yet relies on non-binding guidelines that each member state may adapt variably (ASEAN, 2020). A critical solution lies in **modular legislative drafting** that embeds fintech-specific definitions directly into national IP statutes, accompanied by regional convergence mechanisms such as a Fast-Track Patent Office that can adjudicate cross-border disputes within six months (Itanyi, 2023).

Blockchain-enabled IP registration and enforcement. Blockchain's promise to deliver immutable records can revolutionise provenance, yet the legal recognition of on-chain entries remains uneven. Estonia's e-Government model certifies blockchain timestamps as prima facie evidence in court,

facilitating content-licence disputes with minimal procedural friction (Tapscott and Kaplan, 2019). In Lithuania, however, blockchain-based registries exist only as pilot projects with no statutory weight, forcing startups to duplicate filings in paper registries diluting efficiency gains (Itanyi, 2023). A comparative policy approach suggests enacting **evidence-law amendments** that explicitly accept hash-anchored records as self-executing evidence, paired with sandbox provisions that allow startups to test smart-contract enforcement clauses under judicial supervision (Tapscott and Kaplan, 2019).

AI-enabled due diligence and risk assessment tools. Advanced AI/ML platforms can triage patent applications, detect infringing code and forecast litigation outcomes, yet algorithmic opacity raises concerns over bias and accountability (Binns et al. 2017). The World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO) reports that the Chinese IP Office's use of AI to screen low-quality patents reduced examiner workload by 30 percent but inadvertently increased false negatives on complex fintech applications (WIPO, 2019). Conversely, Canada's IP Office pilot emphasises human-in-the-loop protocols that combine AI suggestions with examiner review, achieving 15 percent faster turnaround and high accuracy (Tapscott and Kaplan, 2019). Comparative analysis underscores that AI deployment must be governed by transparency mandates including explainability requirements and audit trails to ensure that fintech innovators are neither locked out by algorithmic misclassification nor overcharged by false-positive risk flags (Tapscott and Kaplan, 2019).

IP education and legal design for startups. Startups often lack understanding of IP value, leading to under-filing or over-filing strategies that waste scarce resources (Link & Rees, 1990). In Latin America, accelerators such as Startup Chile incorporate IP bootcamps, yet evidence shows that only 12 percent of cohort firms file patents within two years, compared with 45 percent in Israel's Techstars (Tapscott and Kaplan, 2019). Israel's success owes partly to embedded legal advisors who co-design product features to maximise protectability from day one (Granstrand,1999). Emerging-market hubs would benefit from replicating this model through IP concierge services at fintech incubators, subsidized by venture capitalists keen to lower enforcement risk.

Institutional stakeholder alignment. Sustainable adoption requires co-ordination among governments, IP offices, fintech hubs and VCs. The European Commission's IP Action Plan demonstrates that cross-sector boards comprising regulator, industry and academia representatives can reduce average grant times by 25 percent via shared KPI dashboards (Patel and Dharmadhikari, 2023). Nigeria's Fintech Association, by contrast, operates in isolation from IP authorities, leading to misaligned priorities and duplicated outreach (Patel and Dharmadhikari, 2023). Comparative evidence recommends formalizing IP-fintech councils at national and regional levels, mandated to produce quarterly roadmaps and to manage joint funding for digital-infrastructure upgrades.

Example workflow: digital onboarding of IP rights at accelerator level. A hypothetical accelerator could deploy a four-step digital workflow: (1) Intake founders submit code snippets and design sketches via a blockchain-anchored portal; (2) Triage AI speeds preliminary classification and flags novelty issues; (3) Draft legal-design tools generate tailored application drafts; (4) Grant smart contracts automate fee payments and update registries on milestones. Estonia's Garage48 hackathon model has tested elements of this workflow, cutting IP application drafting time from six hours to under one (Tapscott & Tapscott 2017). However, without statutory backing for on-chain filings, these pilots remain proofs of concept. Scaling requires hybrid regulatory sandboxes that integrate legal reforms with technology pilots, monitored by multi-stakeholder governance boards.

Comparative Insights from Successful Models

Singapore, Estonia and Brazil offer contrasting yet instructive examples of how policy innovation can align IP regimes with fintech development. Singapore's **IP Hub Master Plan** provides an integrated ecosystem fast-track patent examination for financial-technology inventions, tax incentives for IP commercialization and a dedicated fintech regulatory sandbox under the Monetary Authority of Singapore (Patel and Dharmadhikari, 2023). Critically, while this holistic design accelerates time-to-market, it risks regulatory capture when incumbents dominate sandbox cohorts (Gold et al. 2019). By comparison, Estonia's e-Governance framework embeds blockchain notarial services (the X-Road network) into public registries, conferring legal weight on on-chain IP records (Gold et al. 2019). Estonia's model excels in technical proof of provenance but suffers from a small domestic market, limiting investor interest in local fintech IP unless cross-border recognition mechanisms are strengthened (Gold et al. 2019).

Brazil demonstrates a third trajectory: a middle-income country that incrementally modernized its National Institute of Industrial Property (INPI) through digital case management and examiner training partnerships with WIPO (Garcez and Moreira, 2017). Although Brazil achieved a 35 percent reduction in patent pendency between 2012 and 2018, complex judicial review processes and under-funded enforcement units have muted the benefits for fintech startups, which still confront eight-year waits on patent grants for core payment algorithms (Gold et al. 2019). Moreover, Brazil's focus on statutory reform without parallel judicial capacity-building contrasts with Singapore's simultaneous court specialization and Estonia's tech-driven evidentiary regimes.

For emerging economies, these cases underscore three lessons. First, policy coherence across action plans, legislation and enforcement bodies matters: piecemeal reforms risk unintended bottlenecks (Gold et al. 2019). Second, market scale shapes investor incentives small-state pilots must secure cross-jurisdictional recognition to avoid isolation (Garcez and Moreira, 2017). Third, institutional sequencing is critical: digitizing registries without equipping judges in digital evidence leaves startups exposed, while heavy judicial focus without digital infrastructures prolongs delays (Garcez and Moreira, 2017). Effective frameworks thus require calibrated integration of legal reform, technological platforms and capacity-building across courts and registries.

Implications for Policy and Practice

National governments should adopt **modular IP reforms** that embed fintech-specific definitions into core statutes and mandate accelerated examination tracks. Rather than wholesale transplantation of foreign templates, reforms must reflect domestic capacities establishing fast-track lanes only after

examiner training and digital case-management systems are operational, as exemplified by Brazil's phased INPI modernization (Garcez and Moreira, 2017). Policymakers should also legislate the **legal recognition of** blockchain records and smart-contract clauses, providing clear evidentiary rules that remove uncertainty for innovators (Garcez and Moreira, 2017).

Multilateral bodies such as WIPO and UNCITRAL can bolster these efforts by issuing model laws and technical assistance. WIPO's "Patent Prosecution Highway" accelerates coordinated examination across participating offices, but requires broader uptake in emerging economies to reduce duplication (WIPO, 2019). UNCITRAL's Model Law on Electronic Transferable Records offers a template for blockchain-anchored IP registries, yet its non-binding status limits enforcement; embedding such standards into regional trade agreements could enhance compliance (Garcez and Moreira, 2017).

Fintech founders and investors must engage proactively in policy co-design to ensure frameworks address real-world innovation constraints. Startups should conduct early IP audits and leverage cross-jurisdictional patent pools to hedge enforcement risk mirroring Mercosur's patent-pooling initiatives in Latin America (Garcez and Moreira, 2017). Investors, for their part, can underwrite IP-infrastructure funds that subsidize registry digitization and judicial training, aligning commercial incentives with ecosystem maturity. Such public-private collaboration, if properly sequenced and resourced, holds the key to sustainable fintech growth in emerging markets.

Conclusion

In this article, we critically examined fragmentation of IP regimes hindering fintech, theoretical underpinnings, case studies, proposed legal-tech framework and comparative models. We argued that digital compliance tools fused with statutory reform can create an interoperable ecosystem. We reaffirm that alignment of IP law and fintech regulation is essential to unlock sustainable innovation. We call for collaboration and further empirical research on legal-tech pilots, cross-border recognition to refine the framework and adapt it to diverse emerging markets. Policymakers, regulators, industry and academia must work together to scale these tools, ensuring robust, future-proof legal infrastructures and investor engagement and end-user trust.

References:

AfCFTA Secretariat, 2023. *Protocol on Intellectual Property Rights*. Addis Ababa: African Union. Available at: https://africanlii.org/akn/aa-au/act/protocol/2023/free_trade_area_on_intellectual_property_rights/eng@2023-02-19/source.pdf [Accessed 10 May 2025].

AllahRakha, N., 2023. Legal challenges for international fintech startups. *International Journal of Law and Policy*, *1*(8).

ASEAN Secretariat, 2020. *ASEAN Intellectual Property Rights Action Plan 2016–2025*. Jakarta: ASEAN Secretariat. Available at: https://asean.org/our-communities/economic-community/competitive-innovative-and-inclusive-economic-region/intellectual-property-rights/link-and-key-documents/ [Accessed 10 May 2025].

Bamakan, S.M.H., Nezhadsistani, N., Bodaghi, O. and Qu, Q., 2022. Patents and intellectual property assets as non-fungible tokens; key technologies and challenges. *Scientific reports*, *12*(1), p.2178.

Binns, R., Veale, M., Van Kleek, M. and Shadbolt, N., 2017. Like trainer, like bot? Inheritance of bias in algorithmic content moderation. In *Social Informatics: 9th International Conference, SocInfo 2017, Oxford, UK, September 13-15, 2017, Proceedings, Part II 9* (pp. 405-415). Springer International Publishing.

Botto, M., 2022. The challenges of economic integration in Latin America: Searching for consensus in contexts of globalization. The case of MERCOSUR (1991–2019). In *The Reconfiguration of Twenty-first Century Latin American Regionalism* (pp. 37-52). Routledge.

Cumming, D., Johan, S. and Reardon, R., 2023. Global fintech trends and their impact on international business: a review. *Multinational Business Review*, *31*(3), pp.413-436.

Ediagbonya, V. and Tioluwani, C., 2023. The role of fintech in driving financial inclusion in developing and emerging markets: issues, challenges and prospects. *Technological Sustainability*, *2*(1), pp.100-119.

Garcez, S.S.J. and Moreira, J.D.J.D.S., 2017. The backlog of patent in Brazil: the right to reasonable duration of the administrative procedure. *DIREITO GV L. Rev.*, *13*, p.171.

Gold, E.R., Morin, J.F. and Shadeed, E., 2019. Does intellectual property lead to economic growth? Insights from a novel IP dataset. *Regulation & Governance*, *13*(1), pp.107-124.

Granstrand, O., 1999. The economics and management of intellectual property: Towards intellectual capitalism. In *The Economics and Management of Intellectual Property*. Edward Elgar Publishing.

He, M., 2023. Follow the Money: Back to the Basics. In *Financial Technologies and DeFi: A Revisit to the Digital Finance Revolution* (pp. 41-54). Cham: Springer International Publishing.

He, D., Ivanics, A.K., Lavayssière, X., Lukonga, I., Schwarz, N., Sugimoto, N. and Verrier, J., 2022. Fintech.

Hudika, T., Bošković, N., Rubinić-Puller, A., Katulić, T. and Producta, I.P., 2024. Ai-enhanced design and legal footprint from intellectual property perspective. In *Proceedings-The Twelfth International Symposium GRID 2024* (pp. 371-377). Novi Sad: UNIVERSITY OF NOVI SAD, FACULTY OF TECHNICAL SCIENCES, DEPARTMENT OF GRAPHIC ENGINEERING AND DESIGN.

Itanyi, N., 2023, June. The AfCFTA protocol on intellectual property rights and its role in the prevention of counterfeiting in international trade: opportunities and challenges for businesses in Africa. In *6th Biennial Conference of the African International Economic Law Network*.

Krumholz, J., Mahony, I.G. and Colandreo, B.J., 2018. Blockchain and intellectual property: A case study. *Blockchain & Cryptocurrency Regulation*.

Lescrauwaet, L., Wagner, H., Yoon, C. and Shukla, S., 2022. Adaptive legal frameworks and economic dynamics in emerging tech-nologies: Navigating the intersection for responsible innovation. *Law and Economics*, *16*(3), pp.202-220.

Link, A.N. and Rees, J., 1990. Firm size, university based research, and the returns to R&D. *Small business economics*, *2*, pp.25-31.

Moro Visconti, R. and Moro Visconti, R., 2020. *The valuation of trademarks and digital branding* (pp. 237-266). Springer International Publishing.

Oxford Business Law Blog, 2022. Fintech Disruption and Intellectual-Property Enforcement in Africa. *Oxford Business Law Blog*, 12 June. [online] Available at: https://www.law.ox.ac.uk/business-law-blog/blog/2022/06/fintech-disruption-and-intellectual-property-enforcement-africa [Accessed 10 May 2025].

Romer, P.M., 1990. Endogenous technological change. *Journal of political Economy*, *98*(5, Part 2), pp.S71-S102.

Schilirò, D., 2019. The growth conundrum: Paul Romer's endogenous growth.

Tapscott, D. and Kaplan, A., 2019. Blockchain revolution in education and lifelong learning. *Blockchain research institute-IBM institute for business value*.

Thanh, V.T., 2020. Enhancing inter-firm linkages through clusters and digitalisation for productivity growth. *ERIA Discussion Paper Series*, p.309.

Park, W.G., 2008. International patent protection: 1960–2005. *Research policy*, *37*(4), pp.761-766.

Patel, V.R. and Dharmadhikari, S., 2023. Evolution of Fintech Ecosystem in India: A Historical Analysis and Outlook. *Evolution*, *16*(4).

Papageorgiadis, N., Wang, C. and Magkonis, G., 2019. Factors contributing to the strength of national patent protection and enforcement after TRIPS. *Transnational Corporations Journal*, *26*(1).

PowerPatent, 2023. *Patent Value and Venture Capital (VC) Financing*. [online] PowerPatent. Available at: https://powerpatent.com/blog/patent-value-and-venture-capital-vc-financing [Accessed 10 May 2025].

Qin, J., 2021. *Finding Its Own Way: The Empowerment System of Contemporary Artists' Legitimacy in China* (Master's thesis, Fashion Institute of Technology, State University of New York).

WIPO, 2019. *World Intellectual Property Report 2019: The Geography of Innovation – Local Hotspots, Global Networks*. Geneva: World Intellectual Property Organization. Available at: https://www.wipo.int/en/web/world-ip-report/2019/index [Accessed 10 May 2025].

Zalan, T. and Toufaily, E., 2017. The promise of fintech in emerging markets: Not as disruptive. *Contemporary Economics*, *11*(4), p.415.