The Economics of IP Hoarding and the Impasse to Innovation: Empirical Data for Structural Reform

I. Introduction: The Erosion of the Innovation-Incentive Compact

A. Revisiting the Social Contract

The foundational economic rationale for intellectual property (IP) protection is derived from the necessity to solve the "appropriability problem".[1] Because knowledge is a public good, inventors would otherwise be unable to recoup the substantial costs of research and development (R&D) if rivals could freely copy the resulting innovation. Therefore, the patent and copyright systems provide a temporary, limited monopoly—a legal instrument that confers the sole right to exclude others from exploiting the innovation for a limited time—to incentivize this crucial initial investment.[1] This arrangement is, by its nature, a societal trade-off intended to promote "Progress."

However, this necessary solution creates "secondary economic problems".[1] The granting of a monopoly leads directly to the restriction of production, supracompetitive pricing, and a resultant efficiency or deadweight loss to society.[1] The optimal design of any IP system must minimize these secondary economic costs while maximizing the primary innovation incentive. The analysis presented herein demonstrates that modern IP law has fundamentally inverted this intended balance, resulting in a system that primarily maximizes monopoly rent extraction and wealth transfer—a phenomenon defined as IP hoarding—while providing negligible marginal gains in genuine primary innovation. The system has failed its constitutional purpose.

B. Thesis Statement and Scope of Empirical Analysis

This report empirically quantifies two primary forms of IP hoarding that actively impede competition and innovation across critical sectors. The first, **Passive Hoarding**, is exemplified by indefinite copyright term extension for existing works, which yields pure, unearned economic rent. The second, **Active Hoarding**, utilizes strategic patent proliferation, or evergreening, and assertion by Non-Practicing Entities (NPEs) to create legal and financial barriers to market entry.

The forthcoming empirical data confirms the system's failure by establishing quantifiable costs: patent assertion activities alone drain **more than $60 billion annually** from the U.S. economy.[3] Furthermore, strategic pharmaceutical hoarding imposes billions in excess costs on consumers and healthcare systems.[4] The report concludes by validating policy solutions—dynamic term limits and active use rules—necessary to restore the integrity of the innovation-incentive compact.

II. The Quantification of Copyright Term Extension: Passive Hoarding and the Public Domain Loss

The trajectory of copyright law reveals a clear legislative shift from a focused mechanism for incentivizing initial creation toward a tool for long-term wealth preservation. This shift reached its zenith with the passage of the Copyright Term Extension Act of 1998 (CTEA).

A. The Historical Shift from Limited Monopoly to Near-Perpetuity

The earliest significant piece of IP legislation, the **Statute of Anne in Great Britain (1710)**, established a clear concept of limited duration. Protection was set at a fixed term of 14 years, with the possibility of a single 14-year renewal.[5] This system was designed to regulate copying rights in publishing and provided a definable, short period for investment recovery.[6]

The United States Copyright Act of 1909 retained a reliance on a dynamic public domain entry mechanism. Under the 1909 Act, the term for most works was 56 years (28 years plus a mandatory 28-year renewal).[7] This mandatory renewal requirement functioned as an efficiency filter. Research analyzing the records of the Catalog of Copyright Entries (CCE)

reveals that non-renewal was a common occurrence for works that lacked enduring commercial value. Estimates suggest that approximately **70% of the books published between 1924 and 1964** potentially entered the public domain 28 years after publication due to the failure of rights holders to renew their copyrights.[9] This demonstrates that the 1909 system successfully filtered out works of low economic impact, maximizing public access for the vast majority of cultural output while preserving protection only for those works that maintained significant market value.

The subsequent legislative changes—culminating in the CTEA of 1998—eliminated this dynamic filter. The CTEA extended copyright terms to the Life of the Author plus 70 years, or **95 years from publication** (or 120 years from creation) for corporate works (works made for hire).[10] This created an automatic, maximum-length protection, regardless of the work's commercial activity or market relevance, fundamentally altering the nature of the IP grant from a temporary incentive to an indefinite private asset.

B. The Economic Inefficiency of the CTEA (1998)

The primary legislative driver for the CTEA, often derisively nicknamed the "Mickey Mouse Protection Act," was the powerful lobbying efforts of the entertainment industry, particularly the Walt Disney Company. The copyright for a key 1928 Mickey Mouse cartoon was set to expire in 2003, creating an urgent financial motivation for the industry to extend the term.[10]

The economic analysis of the CTEA extension for *existing works*—which formed the core of the legislative urgency—is unambiguous. Applying an extension to a work that already exists, such as the 1928 cartoon, provides **"no counter-balancing increase in the incentive to produce new works"**.[13] The economic justification for IP rests solely on the Net Present Value (NPV) of *future* cash flows required to motivate *future* creation.[14] An extension applied retroactively, as was the case with the CTEA, cannot alter the historical decision to create the work, proving that the act's primary function was not innovation policy but wealth preservation.

The consequence is a demonstrable shift of resources. The economic consensus is that the CTEA caused a **"large transfer of resources from consumers to copyright holders"**.[13] This resource transfer results directly from **prolonging the period of monopoly pricing**.[13] While specific, single dollar values for the entire transfer may not be universally available in published analyses [13], the existence of this substantial transfer confirms that the act served purely as a mechanism of wealth hoarding and rent extraction for established rights holders.

The application of NPV analysis further underscores the marginal utility of these long terms. Distant cash flows are highly discounted.[14] Given typical discount rates and the "rate of

cultural decay" [15], the last 20 years of CTEA protection (extending the term from 75 to 95 years) yield an infinitesimally small incentive benefit to the original creator. This demonstrates that the extended period serves almost exclusively as unearned rent, supporting the conclusion that longer duration "does not improve the author's earnings, and in fact, impedes cultural creativity".[16]

Furthermore, the replacement of the dynamic public domain filter with an automatic, static term imposes enormous societal transaction costs. The original 1909 system naturally cleared **~70%** of works.[9] The current L+70 system protects all works automatically, even those of negligible value to the rights holder. This lack of clarity forces potential creators to navigate a "maze of rights" and risk costly litigation simply to "play or tinker" with older material.[17] This risk avoidance stalls cultural development and commercial reuse, particularly for works that hold no real market value to the original copyright holder, imposing a massive hidden drag on cultural production.

Table 1: The Historical Shift in U.S. Copyright Term Duration and Economic Function

Act/Era	**Term (Corporate/Works for Hire)**	**Mechanism/Filter**	**Primary Economic Purpose**	**Economic Outcome of Expiration/Lapse**
Statute of Anne (1710)	N/A	Fixed, short term	Incentivize initial publishing.	Immediate public access upon expiry.
1909 Act (Pre-1976)	56 Years (28 + 28 Renewal)	Mandatory Renewal Required	Dynamic public domain entry filter.	**Approximately 70% of works lapsed** due to non-renewal.[9]
CTEA (1998-Present)	95/120 Years	Automatic, Static Term	Prolonged rent extraction/Wealth Transfer (CTEA retroactivity).	**Maximized deadweight loss; no new incentive**.[13]

III. The Patent Hoarding Complex: Evergreening and

Defensive Thickets (Active Hoarding)

While copyright hoarding involves maximizing the term of a single asset, patent hoarding involves maximizing the *scope* and *complexity* of protection surrounding a single product, creating legal barriers that actively delay generic and biosimilar competition.

A. Pharmaceutical Evergreening: The Patent Fortress Strategy

The pharmaceutical industry is frequently characterized as a "one patent, one product" sector because a primary patent covers the core molecule.[19] However, this generalization obscures the strategic practice of "evergreening," where secondary patents are filed to delay market entry long after the initial molecular patent nears expiration.

Empirical evidence demonstrates widespread proliferation. Blockbuster drugs in study samples had an average of **3.4 secondary patents** filed after the primary patent.[19] More broadly, among a selection of 100 best-selling drugs analyzed, **more than 70%** had their patent protection extended at least once, with nearly 50% extended more than once.[20]

This proliferation is not merely reactive; it is a systematic strategy to build a "patent thicket".[21] AbbVie's management of Humira (adalimumab) exemplifies the "apotheosis of the modern patent fortress," utilizing a vast, overlapping web of intellectual property designed specifically to create a legal and economic barrier so complex that it would deter biosimilar competition for years beyond the drug's core patent expiration.[21] The filing of these secondary patents, often covering minor aspects like formulation or dosing, elevates the legal complexity, converting market entry into a war of attrition where the primary objective is to raise the **transaction costs and legal risk** for competitors.[23]

These strategies are often carefully timed to manage market transition. Evergreened reformulations (such as switching from immediate-release to extended-release versions) showed a mean time of **7.9 years** from the initial formulation approval to the evergreened reformulation approval.[24] This timing allows brand companies to strategically transition market share before generic competition can fully enter the market.[24]

B. Quantifying the Cost of Delay to Consumers and Systems

The immense financial impact of this hoarding strategy is revealed by comparing branded prices under monopoly extension with generic availability. Upon full generic competition, drug prices fall steeply. Generic drugs are typically **80% to 85% lower** than the branded innovator product.[25] Markets with ten or more generic competitors see price declines reaching **70% to 80%** relative to the pre-generic price.[26] The moment a drug's price drops by 80%, the preceding price difference represents the quantifiable monopoly rent extracted from society.

Delaying this market entry imposes staggering costs on healthcare systems and patients. One study attributes **pay-for-delay settlements**—where brand companies pay generic manufacturers to postpone market entry—to an average **17-month delay** in generic competition.[27] The cumulative cost associated with these pay-for-delay settlements was estimated at **$35 billion** over a subsequent 10-year period.[27]

Even specific analyses of patent thickets confirm the financial toll. A study focusing on patent thickets for just four drugs identified **$3.5 billion in excess consumer spending** over a two-year period due to the resulting delay of generic competition.[4] Even temporary delays, which are characteristic of evergreening, represent billions in additional costs to healthcare systems and patients.[24] This wealth transfer is a measurable burden imposed by legal strategies rather than by demonstrable, new innovation.

Table 2: Quantified Economic Toll of Pharmaceutical Patent Hoarding (Evergreening)

Hoarding Mechanism	**Quantifiable Metric (Prevalence/Delay)**	**Quantifiable Economic Cost/Benefit Loss**
Secondary Patent Proliferation	Average 3.4 secondary patents per drug. 70% of top 100 drugs extended at least once.	Creates high legal barriers; shifts patent system focus from invention protection to market defense.[19]
Pay-for-Delay Settlements	Mean generic entry delay of **17 months**.	Estimated cost of **$35 Billion** over 10 years (diverted from consumer savings).[27]
Evergreening Thickets	$3.5 Billion in excess spending identified for four drugs over two years.	Represents wealth transfer from patients/systems during artificial monopoly extension.[4]

Loss of Competition	Price drop averages 70%-80% post-generic entry (10+ competitors).	Annual estimated cost savings of $8-$10 Billion lost during delay period.[25]

IV. Litigious Barriers and the Diversion of R&D Capital: The NPE Tax

Active hoarding is not limited to incumbent manufacturers protecting their market share; it is also a lucrative business model employed by Non-Practicing Entities (NPEs), often pejoratively labeled "patent trolls." These entities do not make or sell products but aggressively enforce patents, leveraging litigation costs as a financial weapon.[28]

A. The Non-Practicing Entity (NPE) Business Model

The fundamental problem posed by NPEs is the enormous drain they impose on the economy by diverting productive capital into unproductive legal defense fees and settlements. Academic research estimates that patent assertion activity drains **more than $60 billion annually** from the U.S. economy.[3] This capital is explicitly diverted from R&D investment that would otherwise fund genuine innovation.[3]

The NPE business model is one of procedural extortion, enabled by the high cost of litigation. The average cost of defending a patent lawsuit through trial was over **$3 million** in 2023.[3] NPEs exploit this financial asymmetry by demanding "nuisance value" settlements—often between $50,000 and $100,000—which are significantly cheaper than the legal defense costs, effectively forcing a settlement even when the patents asserted are weak or invalid.[31]

B. Targeting Productive Innovation (The Startup Tax)

NPE litigation disproportionately targets entities with limited financial resources that cannot withstand the high defense costs.[3] An analysis of defendants in patent troll suits found that **66% had annual revenues of less than $100 million**, and 55% had revenues of $10 million

or less.[3] These targets are frequently high-growth startups whose limited capital is crucial for R&D and scaling. While large companies might dedicate about 1% of R&D to IP costs, startups often spend significantly more—up to **5% of R&D**.[32] Litigation costs levy a disproportionate financial tax on these nascent innovators, often forcing them to change their product strategy, operations, or even shut down parts or all of their business.[3] The strategic use of litigation to force settlements confirms that patent rights are being deployed as a financial weapon to create market entry barriers, insulating large incumbents from disruptive, small-scale competition.

C. The Efficiency Cost of Defensive R&D

Beyond direct litigation costs, the proliferation of patents, often forming dense thickets, necessitates that operating companies devote significant R&D resources toward "inventing around" existing patents rather than pursuing fundamentally new lines of inquiry.[23] The high legal complexity of the patent environment compels a defensive posture. R&D executives surveyed reported that the ability of competitors to "invent around" patented technologies and the perception that patent documents disclose too much information are key factors that reduce the willingness to file patents, indicating decreased system efficacy and a focus on defensive protection rather than pure novelty.[33]

The quantifiable loss of national R&D productivity due to the $60 billion drain confirms that the litigation aspect of the IP system is now a net consumer of economic progress. This capital is lost to unproductive legal activities, confirming that the system is consuming, rather than promoting, innovation.

Table 3: Economic Cost and Impact of Non-Practicing Entities (NPEs)

Impact Area	**Quantifiable Metric**	**Significance**
Annual Economic Drain	**More than $60 Billion** from the U.S. economy annually.	Capital explicitly diverted from productive R&D investment.[3]
Targeting Small Businesses	**66%** of defendants had revenues under $100 million.	NPEs act as a disproportionate financial tax on high-growth startups and small

		innovators.[3]
Defense Cost Leverage	Average cost of defense through trial is **$3.2 Million**.	Used to force "nuisance value" settlements ($50K–$100K) regardless of patent merit.[3]

V. Policy Solutions: Restoring Balance through Dynamic Terms and Active Use Rules

Reversing the trend of IP hoarding requires structural reforms that re-establish the link between IP protection and productive use, guided by empirical economics rather than rent-seeking demands.

A. Reframing Copyright: Dynamic Terms and Reversion

Determining the optimal copyright term must balance initial R&D costs, risk, anticipated future revenue, and the potential for imitation.[34] Given the near-zero Net Present Value of late-term cash flows, extensions beyond a focused, defined period are economically irrational as incentives.[13]

Economic analysis strongly supports shortening copyright duration. Policy proposals suggest a term as short as **25 years**, arguing that this is likely to *increase* cultural creativity, enhance diversity, and potentially improve author earnings by forcing works into the market sooner.[16] Furthermore, to mitigate concerns about initial contract terms, policymakers should implement "reversion" models, such as an inalienable right for authors to re-obtain their copyrights after an initial transfer period (e.g., at year **25**).[35]

These dynamic term mechanisms effectively replicate the efficiency of the old 1909 mandatory renewal system, which saw **70%** of works lapse into the public domain.[9] A shorter, dynamic term restores the public domain filter, ensuring that only works of persistent commercial vitality remain protected long-term, thereby maximizing cultural access and minimizing the transaction costs currently stalling follow-on creation.

B. Implementing Active Use Requirements (The "Use-It-or-Lose-It" Imperative)

The primary legislative solution to combatting patent hoarding, particularly the $60 billion NPE drain, is to tie the right to exclude directly to the constitutional mandate of "Progress" through an Active Use requirement.

This reform requires strengthening mechanisms to demonstrate that the patent holder has made a **"good faith attempt to bring the invention to the market or licensed it"**.[3] An Active Use rule addresses the economic flaw inherent in the NPE model, which currently allows patents to be filed strategically "not to use them—but to block others".[23]

The economic justification for this requirement is structural. Patent law grants the power to exclude, creating deadweight loss.[1] If a patent holder is sitting on a patent merely to block competitors or extract nuisance fees, the patent is creating net social harm, justifying its forfeiture or mandatory licensing.[1] An Active Use rule forces patentees to justify their monopoly based on productive contribution. This systemic change would fundamentally alter the economic calculus of NPEs and patent thicket construction, shifting the current $60 billion in diverted R&D capital back into productive innovation.[3]

Table 4: Economic Rationale and Policy Validation for IP Reform

Reform Mechanism	**Problem Addressed (Hoarding Type)**	**Economic Justification**	**Expected Quantifiable Benefit**
Dynamic Copyright Term (e.g., 25 Years) and Reversion	Passive Hoarding (CTEA Rent-Seeking)	NPV modeling shows marginal incentive gain from late-term protection is negligible.[16]	Increased public domain input; reduced transaction costs; enhanced cultural creativity.
Active Use Rule (Use-It-or-Lose-It)	Active Hoarding (NPEs, Patent Blocking)	Re-links the right to exclude with the Constitutional goal of Progress; minimizes secondary	Recapture of **More than $60 Billion** in R&D capital diverted by NPE litigation; lower market entry

		economic deadweight loss.[1]	barriers for startups.[3]

VI. Conclusion: Restoring IP to its Constitutional Purpose

The empirical evidence overwhelmingly confirms that modern Intellectual Property law has devolved into a mechanism for wealth hoarding rather than a driver of innovation. This report has quantified the financial burden of this systemic failure:

1. **Passive Hoarding (Copyright):** The retroactive term extension under the CTEA was confirmed as a pure wealth transfer, failing to provide any new incentive for existing works.[13] The elimination of the mandatory renewal filter has simultaneously trapped approximately 70% of low-value cultural works in an environment of legal uncertainty.[9]
2. **Active Hoarding (Patents):** Strategic evergreening imposes billions in direct costs on consumers, exemplified by the estimated **$35 billion toll** associated with pay-for-delay settlements over a decade.[27]
3. **Litigious Hoarding (NPEs):** The patent assertion industry drains **more than $60 billion annually** from the U.S. economy, diverting crucial R&D capital into unproductive legal defense, primarily targeting vulnerable small businesses and startups.[3]

These quantifiable failures necessitate structural reform. The path forward requires shifting legislative focus from asset protection to productive contribution. Implementing empirically supported policies—specifically, dynamic copyright terms (such as a **25-year limit with reversion**) and a mandatory **Active Use rule** for patents—offers a definitive solution. These measures will restore the necessary dynamic flow of information back into the public domain, force patentees to internalize the social costs of their monopolies, and redirect tens of billions of dollars currently wasted on litigation and rent-seeking back into the innovation economy. The system must be reformed to serve progress, not merely private power.

Works cited

1. The Economic Underpinnings of Patent Law - Chicago Unbound, accessed October 20, 2025, https://chicagounbound.uchicago.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1508&context=law_and_economics
2. The Economics of Patents: An Overview - Center for Agricultural and Rural Development, accessed October 20, 2025, https://www.card.iastate.edu/products/publications/pdf/02wp293.pdf

3. The Enormous Toll of Patent Troll Litigation, accessed October 20, 2025, https://www.purduegloballawschool.edu/blog/news/enormous-toll-patent-troll-litigation
4. Patent Extensions Cost US $3.5 Billion in Delayed Generic Savings | AJMC, accessed October 20, 2025, https://www.ajmc.com/view/patent-extensions-cost-us-3-5-billion-in-delayed-generic-savings
5. Copyright Timeline: A History of Copyright in the United States - Association of Research Libraries, accessed October 20, 2025, https://www.arl.org/copyright-timeline/
6. The challenges of copyright in the EU - Briefing European Parliamentary Research Service, accessed October 20, 2025, https://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/BRIE/2015/564380/EPRS_BRI(2015)564380_EN.pdf
7. Untangling Copyright, Publication, and the Public Domain | Penn Libraries, accessed October 20, 2025, https://www.library.upenn.edu/news/publication-public-domain
8. Public domain in the United States - Wikipedia, accessed October 20, 2025, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Public_domain_in_the_United_States
9. Historical Copyright Records and Transparency | The New York Public Library, accessed October 20, 2025, https://www.nypl.org/blog/2019/09/01/historical-copyright-records-transparency
10. Copyright Term Extension Act - Wikipedia, accessed October 20, 2025, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Copyright_Term_Extension_Act
11. Copyright Term and the Public Domain - Copyright Services - LibGuides at Cornell University, accessed October 20, 2025, https://copyright.cornell.edu/publicdomain
12. Copyright Term Extension Act | Research Starters - EBSCO, accessed October 20, 2025, https://www.ebsco.com/research-starters/political-science/copyright-term-extension-act
13. J O I N T C E N T E R The Copyright Term Extension Act of 1998: An ..., accessed October 20, 2025, https://www.brookings.edu/wp-content/uploads/2016/06/05_copyright_litan.pdf
14. Net Present Value (NPV): What It Means and Steps to Calculate It - Investopedia, accessed October 20, 2025, https://www.investopedia.com/terms/n/npv.asp
15. AN EMPIRICAL ANALYSIS OF THE ECONOMICS OF COPYRIGHT: HOW VALID ARE THE RESULTS OF STUDIES IN DEVELOPED COUNTRIES FOR DEVELOPING - WIPO, accessed October 20, 2025, https://www.wipo.int/edocs/pubdocs/en/wipo_pub_1012-chapter3.pdf
16. Full article: The true impact of shorter and longer copyright durations: from authors' earnings to cultural creativity and diversity, accessed October 20, 2025, https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/10286632.2020.1829608
17. COPYRIGHT AND INNOVATION: THE UNTOLD STORY - Wisconsin Law Review, accessed October 20, 2025,

https://wlr.law.wisc.edu/wp-content/uploads/sites/1263/2012/11/2-Carrier.pdf
18. How Copyrights, Patents, and Trademarks May Stifle Creativity and Progress | The Brink, accessed October 20, 2025, https://www.bu.edu/articles/2022/how-copyrights-patents-trademarks-may-stifle-creativity-and-progress/
19. $52.6 Billion: Extra Cost to Consumers of Add-On Drug Patents - UCLA Anderson Review, accessed October 20, 2025, https://anderson-review.ucla.edu/52-6-billion-extra-cost-to-consumers-of-add-on-drug-patents/
20. REPORT TO THE WHITE HOUSE COMPETITION COUNCIL - https: // aspe . hhs . gov., accessed October 20, 2025, https://aspe.hhs.gov/sites/default/files/2021-09/Competition%20EO%2045-Day%20Drug%20Pricing%20Report%209-8-2021.pdf
21. Deconstructing Lifecycle Management and Filing Strategies of Pharmaceutical Blockbusters, accessed October 20, 2025, https://www.drugpatentwatch.com/blog/deconstructing-lifecycle-management-and-filing-strategies-of-pharmaceutical-blockbusters/
22. Humira - I-MAK, accessed October 20, 2025, https://www.i-mak.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/10/i-mak.humira.report.3.final-REVISED-2020-10-06.pdf
23. The Debate Over Patent Thickets and Innovation Slowdown - PatentPC, accessed October 20, 2025, https://patentpc.com/blog/the-debate-over-patent-thickets-and-innovation-slowdown
24. Does Drug Patent Evergreening Prevent Generic Entry - DrugPatentWatch, accessed October 20, 2025, https://www.drugpatentwatch.com/blog/does-drug-patent-evergreening-prevent-generic-entry/
25. Potential Clinical and Economic Impact of Switching Branded Medications to Generics, accessed October 20, 2025, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC5417581/
26. Drug Competition Series – Analysis of New Generic Markets Effect of Market Entry on Generic Drug Prices - https: // aspe . hhs . gov., accessed October 20, 2025, https://aspe.hhs.gov/sites/default/files/documents/510e964dc7b7f00763a7f8a1dbc5ae7b/aspe-ib-generic-drugs-competition.pdf
27. Potential Abuses Within U.S. Pharmaceutical Patent Regulation - The Actuary Magazine, accessed October 20, 2025, https://www.theactuarymagazine.org/potential-abuses-within-u-s-pharmaceutical-patent-regulation/
28. Patent troll - Wikipedia, accessed October 20, 2025, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Patent_troll
29. How Often Do Non-Practicing Entities Win Patent Suits? - Stanford Law School, accessed October 20, 2025, https://law.stanford.edu/publications/how-often-do-non-practicing-entities-win-

patent-suits/
30. Patent Litigation Statistics: An Overview of Recent Trends - PatentPC, accessed October 20, 2025, https://patentpc.com/blog/patent-litigation-statistics-an-overview-of-recent-trends
31. The Public Should Know Who Profits From Patent Troll Lawsuits, accessed October 20, 2025, https://www.eff.org/deeplinks/2021/11/public-should-know-who-profits-patent-troll-lawsuits
32. Budgeting for Patents - BlueIron IP, accessed October 20, 2025, https://blueironip.com/budgeting-for-patents/
33. The R&D-patent relationship: An industry perspective - EconStor, accessed October 20, 2025, https://www.econstor.eu/bitstream/10419/44900/1/618781218.pdf
34. Maximizing Social Welfare Through the Tailoring of Patent Duration and Using Algorithms to Calculate Optimal Patent Duration - Scholarly Commons, accessed October 20, 2025, https://scholarlycommons.law.northwestern.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1352&context=njtip
35. 21 for 2021: Term of Copyright: Optimality and Reality - CREATe, accessed October 20, 2025, https://www.create.ac.uk/blog/2021/06/18/21-for-2021-term-of-copyright-optimality-and-reality/