Patent Law in the Digital Economy: Legal and Technological Implications of Patentability in Software, AI, and Emerging Technologies

1. **Sahar Bakhtiari:** Department of Human Rights Law, Tarbiat Modares University, Tehran, Iran
2. **Peyman Ghorbani*:** Department of Human Rights Law, Tarbiat Modares University, Tehran, Iran

*Correspondence: e-mail: ghorbanipey1@gmail.com

Abstract

Patent law plays a critical role in shaping the development and protection of intellectual property, particularly in the digital economy where software, artificial intelligence (AI), and emerging technologies are driving rapid innovation. This article explores the evolving landscape of patent law as it intersects with these technological advancements. It begins with an overview of the historical development of patent law and its adaptation to technological transformations, particularly the challenges posed by software patents. The article then delves into the complexities surrounding the patentability of software, highlighting legal frameworks, difficulties in defining software inventions, and the broader debates regarding patent eligibility criteria in key jurisdictions such as the United States and the European Union. The patentability of AI and other emerging technologies, including blockchain and quantum computing, is analyzed in the context of inventorship, patent eligibility, and the rapid pace of technological change. Additionally, the article examines global perspectives and jurisdictional differences in how various regions address the patentability of digital technologies. The impact of patent law on innovation in the digital economy is critically assessed, addressing issues such as patent thickets, licensing challenges, and their effects on market competition. Finally, the article discusses potential future directions for patent law, including proposals for reform and the ethical and legal challenges posed by patenting AI and other emerging technologies. The conclusion provides a summary of the findings and suggests areas for further research and policy development to ensure that patent law can effectively accommodate the evolving technological landscape.

Keywords: Patent Law, Software Patents, Artificial Intelligence, Emerging Technologies, Patentability, Intellectual Property

Citation: Bakhtiari, S. & Ghorbani, P. (2023). Patent Law in the Digital Economy: Legal and Technological Implications of Patentability in Software, AI, and Emerging Technologies. *Legal Studies in Digital Age,* 2(1), 51-63.

1.   Introduction

Patent law is a fundamental aspect of intellectual property protection, designed to encourage innovation by granting inventors exclusive rights to their inventions for a specified period. The purpose of patent law is to strike a balance between incentivizing the creation of new technologies and promoting public access to them once the patent expires. These legal protections serve as a means for inventors and businesses to secure returns on their investments in research and development,

thereby fostering a competitive environment that drives technological advancement. By protecting new, non-obvious, and useful inventions, patent law ensures that creators are recognized and rewarded for their intellectual efforts, which in turn helps to stimulate economic growth and technological progress. Over the years, the scope of patent law has expanded, increasingly accommodating new fields of invention, including digital technologies, software, and artificial intelligence, among others.

In the context of the digital economy, the role of patent law has become even more crucial. As the world becomes more reliant on digital technologies, industries are increasingly driven by innovations in software, AI, and other emerging fields. The rise of these technologies has significantly reshaped global markets, making intellectual property law a pivotal factor in the management and commercialization of these innovations. The digital economy is marked by rapid technological advancements, and patent law serves as one of the primary means of protecting these innovations from imitation or infringement. However, the application of traditional patent laws to these cutting-edge fields presents new challenges. Software patents, for example, often face scrutiny regarding the patentability of abstract ideas, and AI-driven inventions raise questions about authorship, inventorship, and the scope of patent rights (Abadi & Pecht, 2020). In addition, the growing prevalence of emerging technologies such as blockchain, 3D printing, and quantum computing further complicates the existing patent framework. These technologies introduce novel concepts that may not easily align with traditional patent criteria, calling for a reevaluation of how patent law should adapt to safeguard new forms of intellectual property in the digital age.

As the digital economy continues to evolve, patent law must keep pace with the changing technological landscape. Innovations in software and AI are reshaping industries like healthcare, finance, entertainment, and communications, where patents play an essential role in protecting new ideas. However, the patentability of software has been a subject of ongoing debate, particularly in jurisdictions like the United States and the European Union. The question of whether software should be considered a patentable invention—given that it often embodies abstract ideas and lacks tangible components—has sparked significant legal and policy discussions. Meanwhile, AI's ability to create new inventions independently further complicates the situation, as current patent law frameworks generally presume that only human inventors can hold patent rights (Adaka & Olubiyi, 2022). These issues create a complex intersection between legal standards and technological innovation, raising questions about how patent laws should adapt to the unique challenges posed by digital technologies.

The increasing importance of patents in the digital economy is also reflected in the growing number of patent filings in emerging technological sectors. For instance, the surge in AI-related patents is indicative of the significant impact that artificial intelligence is having on various industries. Patents in AI cover a broad range of technologies, from machine learning algorithms to autonomous systems, and these patents play a critical role in defining the competitive landscape within the AI industry (Chang, 2020). Patent rights in these areas not only protect the intellectual property of companies but also serve as a strategic tool for ensuring market dominance, especially as AI technologies become more integrated into products and services across all sectors. This growing patent landscape underscores the need for patent law to evolve in a manner that adequately addresses the unique characteristics of digital and AI-driven inventions.

The aim of this review is to critically examine the intersection between patent law and the digital economy, focusing particularly on the legal and technological challenges related to the patentability of software, AI, and other emerging technologies. In doing so, the review will explore the evolution of patent law in response to technological advancements, highlighting the legal challenges that have emerged as software, AI, and other digital innovations increasingly become the subject of patent claims. A key objective of the review is to assess the current state of patent law in relation to these technologies, considering how well the existing legal frameworks address the complexities of patenting abstract software and AI-driven inventions. The review will also examine the international dimension of patent law, analyzing how different jurisdictions approach the patentability of software and AI and whether harmonization of patent standards is achievable or desirable. Ultimately, this review seeks to contribute to the ongoing debate surrounding the adaptation of patent law to the digital age, providing insights into how patent systems might evolve to meet the demands of an increasingly digital and AI-driven world.

By addressing these issues, the review aims to provide a comprehensive understanding of the role of patent law in the digital economy and the legal implications of patentability in the context of software, AI, and emerging technologies. It will explore the challenges faced by patent systems globally, and propose potential solutions or adjustments that could better align patent law with the realities of the modern technological landscape.

2. Historical Context and Evolution of Patent Law

Patent law has evolved over several centuries, with its origins tracing back to the early days of industrialization. The primary goal of patent law has always been to encourage innovation by granting inventors temporary exclusivity for their inventions in exchange for public disclosure. The first recognized patent system emerged in Venice in the late 15th century, with the Venetian Patent Statute of 1474. This statute granted inventors exclusive rights for a period of time, effectively laying the foundation for modern patent law. In England, patent law was formalized in the 17th century with the Statute of Monopolies in 1624, which limited the crown's power to grant exclusive rights but provided inventors with a system to protect their innovations. The English patent system later influenced patent laws in other countries, notably the United States, where the Patent Act of 1790 established the framework for patent law in the early Republic. Over the next few centuries, patent law spread worldwide, with many nations adopting similar systems to protect intellectual property and promote technological progress (Nnawulezi, 2023).

Patent law continued to develop through the 19th and 20th centuries as technological innovation accelerated. The industrial revolution, with its rapid advancements in machinery, textiles, and later electronics, significantly increased the demand for patent protection. Innovations such as the steam engine and mechanical looms were pivotal in reshaping patent systems globally. The European Patent Convention (EPC) in 1973 was a key milestone in harmonizing patent law across European countries, enabling inventors to obtain patent protection in multiple European jurisdictions with a single application. In the United States, the expansion of patent law was marked by notable Supreme Court cases that refined the boundaries of patentability. In particular, the evolution of case law and statutory revisions aimed to address new challenges brought on by emerging technologies, such as biotechnology and pharmaceuticals, during the late 20th century (Hötte et al., 2022).

The rapid pace of technological change during the late 20th and early 21st centuries has had a profound effect on patent law, particularly in the context of digital technologies. The rise of computers, telecommunications, and later the internet, led to an increased demand for patents related to software, algorithms, and other intangible inventions. Early discussions about patenting software began in the 1960s and 1970s as computer technologies started to transform industries. In the United States, the issue of patenting software was first brought to public attention through landmark legal cases in the 1980s, particularly with the development of the "machine-or-transformation" test, which sought to determine whether a method could be patented. The U.S. Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO) initially took a conservative approach, but by the late 1980s and early 1990s, the patentability of software was becoming more accepted. The introduction of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit in 1982 further shaped the landscape of software patenting by ruling on cases that paved the way for the recognition of software as patentable subject matter. This led to an explosion of software-related patents in the 1990s, especially as the rise of the internet and personal computing created vast new markets for technology-driven inventions (Fraser, 2016; Matulionyte & Lee, 2022).

However, the transition to digital and software patents was not without controversy and challenges. One of the most significant issues with software patenting is the difficulty in defining the boundaries of what constitutes a patentable invention. Unlike traditional patents for physical objects, software inventions are often abstract in nature, and their patentability hinges on whether they meet the legal criteria of novelty, non-obviousness, and utility. These criteria, which were developed for physical inventions, sometimes fail to adequately address the unique characteristics of software. The patentability of software has been further complicated by the notion of "abstract ideas," a concept that emerged from the 2014 U.S. Supreme Court decision in Alice Corp. v. CLS Bank International. The Alice decision limited the scope of software patents, ruling that abstract ideas implemented on a computer are not patentable unless they involve something more than merely applying the abstract idea in a generic manner. This decision set off a wave of challenges to the validity of software patents and caused uncertainty for patent holders and applicants in the tech industry. The ongoing debate over software patenting reflects the broader tension between protecting innovation and ensuring that patents do not stifle competition or hinder further technological advancement (Nguyen & Quan, 2023).

As digital technologies continued to evolve, patent law faced new challenges in addressing emerging fields like artificial intelligence, blockchain, and big data analytics. The introduction of AI brought a unique set of issues related to inventorship and ownership. For instance, AI systems that autonomously generate inventions raise the question of whether the AI itself can be considered an inventor, or if human involvement is still necessary for patent eligibility. While patent laws traditionally

required human inventors, recent discussions have explored the implications of AI as an inventor. In some jurisdictions, the question of whether an AI-generated invention can be patented at all has been raised, further complicating the application of patent law in the digital economy. Similarly, AI and machine learning-based technologies often involve iterative and complex algorithms that challenge the traditional understanding of patentable subject matter. These technologies may not always fit neatly within the criteria of novelty or non-obviousness, leading to further legal complexities (Matulionyte & Lee, 2022; Nguyen & Quan, 2023).

Another transformative development in patent law was the rise of the internet and the emergence of e-commerce. Patents related to online business models, digital payments, and internet-based technologies became increasingly prevalent, especially as e-commerce grew into a major global industry. Patents in the digital economy frequently involve innovative methods for processing information, such as online transaction systems or encryption algorithms. While these innovations often represent significant technical advancements, they also push the boundaries of what is considered patentable, as many of these inventions do not result in a physical product or machine. For example, patents for business methods, which were once considered unpatentable, have become increasingly common, especially with the advent of the internet. The implementation of business methods through digital technologies has raised questions about whether patent law is equipped to handle these new forms of intellectual property (Fraser, 2016; Nnawulezi, 2023).

The shift to software and digital patents has also sparked a global debate about the scope of patentability and the potential for patent "trolls"—entities that acquire patents not for commercial purposes but to extract licensing fees from operating companies. This issue has been particularly prevalent in the software and tech industries, where patents are often acquired en masse and used to pressure businesses into settlements, regardless of the actual merit of the patents. This practice has led to calls for patent reform, particularly in the United States, where the patent system is often seen as overly permissive, allowing for overly broad or vague patents that may hinder rather than promote innovation. To address these concerns, some jurisdictions have introduced mechanisms to challenge questionable patents, such as post-grant reviews and inter partes reviews. However, the rise of patent trolls has left many companies wary of the risks associated with patent litigation, leading some to seek alternative means of protecting their innovations, such as open-source licensing or cross-licensing agreements (Nnawulezi, 2023).

In recent years, the pace of technological innovation has only accelerated, and the challenges facing patent law have grown more complex. As digital technologies continue to evolve, patent law will need to adapt to ensure that it remains an effective tool for encouraging innovation while avoiding pitfalls such as patent thickets and patent abuse. While the current framework of patent law has provided protection for many digital and software-based inventions, it is clear that the law will need to continue to evolve in response to the changing technological landscape. The growing presence of AI, blockchain, and other emerging technologies suggests that patent law will need to embrace more flexible standards and new approaches to stay relevant in the digital economy.

3. Patentability of Software

The patentability of software has been a contentious and evolving issue in intellectual property law, particularly as the digital economy has grown. Traditional patent law was developed with physical inventions in mind, and the adaptation of these principles to the realm of software presented a series of challenges. As software has become a core component of technological advancement in various sectors, patent laws in different jurisdictions have had to adapt to ensure that the intellectual property rights of software developers are protected while balancing broader concerns about innovation, competition, and public interest.

In the United States, the patentability of software is primarily governed by the U.S. Patent Act, which has been subject to interpretation by the United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO) and the U.S. courts, particularly the U.S. Supreme Court. Over the years, the USPTO has developed specific guidelines regarding the patentability of software inventions, which generally require that the software in question be tied to a specific machine or apparatus or transform data in a novel and non-obvious way. The patent system in the U.S. has long allowed software patents, although issues of patent eligibility have been clarified in recent years, particularly in cases such as Alice Corp. v. CLS Bank (2014). This case established that software patents must meet a two-step test to be valid: first, the invention must not be an abstract idea, and second, it must contain an inventive concept that adds something significantly more than the abstract idea itself. This decision has had a profound impact

on the patentability of software, narrowing the scope of what is considered patentable in the realm of software inventions. The USPTO also follows guidelines on the patentability of computer-implemented inventions, but the line between patentable and unpatentable software remains blurry, leading to ongoing disputes and confusion in the legal community (Hötte et al., 2022; Nguyen & Quan, 2023).

In the European Union, the European Patent Office (EPO) governs the patentability of software inventions through the European Patent Convention (EPC). Under the EPC, software as such is excluded from patentability, meaning that the mere implementation of an abstract idea in software form cannot be patented. However, the EPO allows software inventions to be patented if they result in a "technical effect" or solve a technical problem. This distinction between software as an abstract idea and software with a technical effect is key to the patentability of software in the EU. A significant body of case law has developed around this concept, including decisions that address whether a particular software invention introduces a technical effect, such as improving the functioning of a computer or providing a solution to a technical problem. Despite this, the interpretation of "technical effect" remains subjective, and there has been ongoing debate within the EPO and broader European legal community regarding the boundaries of patentable software. The ambiguity surrounding the technical effect requirement often leads to inconsistent patent grant decisions and challenges to patent validity (Oleš, 2024).

Other jurisdictions, such as Japan, have also developed their own frameworks for determining the patentability of software. In Japan, patent law generally allows software patents if the software produces a tangible or practical result. Similar to the EU and the U.S., Japan focuses on whether the software invention has a technical aspect that provides a solution to a problem beyond mere abstract ideas. This pragmatic approach to software patents has contributed to Japan's status as a major player in the technology and innovation sectors, with a well-established system for recognizing intellectual property in the realm of software development. However, despite these established frameworks, the patenting of software in these jurisdictions remains fraught with challenges, as the digital landscape evolves rapidly, often outpacing the development of patent law (Uhm et al., 2020).

The primary challenges in patenting software stem from the difficulties in defining what constitutes a patentable invention. One of the key issues is the distinction between abstract ideas and concrete inventions. Patent law traditionally requires that an invention be novel, non-obvious, and useful, but software inventions often involve abstract algorithms, processes, or methods that can be difficult to categorize as either tangible inventions or abstract ideas. This presents significant challenges for patent offices and courts in determining the boundaries of patentable software. In particular, the concept of abstract ideas is a key area of dispute. While software often involves algorithms that solve specific problems, these solutions can be viewed as abstract concepts rather than concrete inventions. The U.S. Supreme Court's decision in Alice Corp. v. CLS Bank has been instrumental in shaping the understanding of abstract ideas in the context of software patents, establishing a legal precedent that has led to increased scrutiny of software inventions and a narrowing of what can be patented (Wang et al., 2014; Yang & Yu, 2020).

Another challenge is the issue of non-obviousness, which is one of the key requirements for patentability. In the case of software, determining whether an invention is non-obvious is complicated by the rapid pace of technological advancement. Many software patents are based on incremental improvements to existing technologies, making it difficult to establish that an invention is sufficiently novel and non-obvious to warrant patent protection. This is particularly true in the case of algorithms or methods that are similar to existing solutions but involve minor tweaks or improvements. The patentability of such incremental innovations has been debated extensively, with some arguing that granting patents for such minor improvements stifles innovation rather than fostering it. Others contend that patent protection for software inventions, even incremental ones, is necessary to encourage developers to invest in new technologies.

The utility requirement, which mandates that an invention must be useful, also presents challenges for software patents. Many software inventions may be seen as abstract or conceptual, and the utility of these inventions can be difficult to demonstrate in a concrete sense. In contrast to physical inventions, where utility is often straightforward to establish, software patents require inventors to show that their software provides a functional, tangible benefit in the real world. The difficulty in demonstrating utility for certain types of software inventions has led to inconsistencies in the granting of software patents and contributed to debates about whether software should be patentable at all.

Several notable case studies illustrate the complexities of software patent law and its evolution. One of the most significant cases in the U.S. is Diamond v. Diehr (1981), which addressed the patentability of a software-based process for curing rubber.

The U.S. Supreme Court ruled in favor of patenting the software, emphasizing that software inventions could be patented if they provided a concrete, practical application. This ruling established a key precedent in the U.S. legal system, recognizing that software could be patentable if it involved a specific, tangible process. However, the Alice decision in 2014 reversed much of the leniency established in Diehr by ruling that software patents based on abstract ideas were not patentable unless they demonstrated a significant inventive concept. This decision significantly impacted the patentability of software in the U.S., leading to a wave of invalidations of previously granted software patents (Lee & Chen, 2021).

In the European context, the IBM v. European Patent Office case (2003) is particularly noteworthy. The case involved a dispute over the patentability of a software invention that provided a technical solution to a problem in computer systems. The EPO ruled that the invention was not patentable because it did not provide a sufficiently technical effect. This decision reinforced the requirement that software inventions in the EU must have a technical aspect to be patentable, further clarifying the interpretation of the EPC's exclusion of software as such from patentability. The case highlighted the fine line between abstract software concepts and those that can be patented as technological innovations (Hlongwa & Talamayan, 2023).

The ongoing debate about the patentability of software centers around several key policy issues. One of the primary concerns is whether software patents foster or hinder innovation. Critics of software patents argue that they create barriers to entry for smaller developers and startups, as they often require expensive legal battles to defend against patent infringement claims. Moreover, the patenting of basic software ideas and algorithms can stifle creativity by preventing others from building on these ideas. On the other hand, proponents argue that software patents incentivize innovation by providing protection to developers and allowing them to recoup their investment in research and development. The question of whether software should be patentable at all remains divisive, with differing views depending on the legal framework and economic priorities of each jurisdiction.

The policy debate also touches on the issue of patent trolls, which refers to entities that acquire patents with the sole intention of litigating them against companies rather than producing products. The prevalence of patent trolling in the software industry has raised concerns about the abuse of the patent system, leading to calls for reform to prevent the misuse of software patents. Several proposals have been made to address this issue, such as limiting the scope of software patents or introducing stricter requirements for patent eligibility. However, there is still considerable disagreement on the best way to balance the need for patent protection with the desire to promote competition and innovation in the software sector.

In conclusion, the patentability of software remains one of the most complex and debated areas of intellectual property law. While legal frameworks in key jurisdictions like the U.S., EU, and Japan provide some clarity, the challenges of defining patentable software inventions persist. As technology continues to evolve, so too will the legal landscape surrounding software patents, and it is likely that future court decisions and legislative changes will continue to shape the patentability of software in the digital economy.

4.   Patentability of AI and Emerging Technologies

The patentability of artificial intelligence (AI) presents a range of complex challenges for intellectual property law, primarily due to the unique nature of AI algorithms, models, and systems. AI inventions often involve abstract mathematical concepts or algorithms that, under traditional patent law, may not meet the criteria for patent eligibility, such as novelty and non-obviousness. One of the most significant challenges in patenting AI is determining what constitutes the invention itself. AI systems are typically built on a combination of data, algorithms, and processing power, making it difficult to pinpoint a specific, tangible invention. Furthermore, AI systems often improve or evolve through machine learning, where the system learns from data inputs and adjusts its behavior over time. This characteristic raises questions about how to define the innovation and who should be credited as the inventor. Since AI systems can autonomously create new solutions or optimize existing processes, there is an ongoing debate about whether the AI itself can be considered an inventor or if the human developer who programmed or trained the AI should receive credit (Adaka & Olubiyi, 2022). The issue of AI as an inventor has led to legal challenges, particularly in jurisdictions like the United States, where patent laws traditionally require that an inventor be a human being.

AI patent law is further complicated by the fact that many AI algorithms or models, such as deep learning techniques, are based on probabilistic or stochastic methods. These techniques often do not have clear, predictable outcomes and can be influenced by a wide range of factors, including the quality of input data and the specific architecture used. As a result, AI-

driven innovations may appear novel or non-obvious based on their functionality, but determining whether these innovations are sufficiently "new" and "useful" under existing patent laws can be a challenge. In addition to the question of inventorship, there is the issue of patent eligibility. In the U.S., the Alice Corp. v. CLS Bank decision has significantly limited the scope of patentable software and abstract ideas, raising questions about whether AI algorithms, which often function as abstract mathematical processes, can be patented (Abadi & Pecht, 2020). In the European Union, AI-related inventions face similar hurdles, with the European Patent Office requiring that the invention contribute to a technical solution to a technical problem in order to meet patentability criteria. This requirement complicates the ability to patent AI algorithms that are primarily software-based, as they may not meet the threshold of providing a concrete technical solution.

In addition to AI, other emerging technologies such as blockchain, quantum computing, and biotechnology also present unique challenges to patent law. Blockchain technology, which underpins cryptocurrencies and decentralized applications, operates on a decentralized, distributed ledger that is often difficult to patent in traditional terms. While blockchain applications can be highly innovative, the core principles of blockchain—such as decentralization, cryptographic techniques, and consensus mechanisms—are often abstract and not easily tied to specific technological solutions. Patentability issues arise when blockchain technologies are used in conjunction with existing, well-understood methods in software and cryptography, making it difficult to establish novelty and non-obviousness. Despite these challenges, blockchain-related inventions, such as applications for financial services or secure data storage, are increasingly being granted patents, particularly in jurisdictions like the U.S. and China. These patents tend to focus on specific implementations of blockchain technology rather than the underlying conceptual framework, which is often deemed too abstract to patent (Alstott et al., 2016).

Quantum computing, another rapidly emerging technology, also poses challenges for patent law. Quantum computers rely on principles of quantum mechanics, such as superposition and entanglement, to process information in fundamentally different ways from classical computers. The potential for quantum computing to revolutionize industries such as cryptography, material science, and artificial intelligence has sparked significant interest in the patenting of quantum algorithms and hardware. However, quantum computing inventions are often complex and difficult to articulate in patent applications, particularly in terms of providing a clear, understandable description of how the technology works. Patent examiners may struggle to assess the novelty and utility of quantum computing inventions, given the highly specialized and theoretical nature of the field. Additionally, the fast-paced development of quantum technology means that what is considered a groundbreaking innovation today may quickly become obsolete as new techniques or discoveries emerge. This rapid pace of innovation raises concerns about the ability of patent law to keep up with the ongoing advancements in quantum computing and ensure that patents are granted only for truly novel inventions.

Biotechnological innovations also present distinct challenges for patent law, particularly in the fields of gene editing and synthetic biology. Technologies like CRISPR, which allows for precise modifications of DNA, have sparked intense debate about the ethical implications of patenting genetic material and modifications. The patentability of biotechnological inventions often hinges on the novelty and utility of the biological components being patented, but questions surrounding the ownership of naturally occurring genes, biological processes, and life forms are deeply contentious. These issues are further complicated by the intersection of biotechnology with emerging technologies like AI, where machine learning algorithms are used to design new drugs or optimize genetic modifications. The potential for AI to revolutionize drug discovery and gene editing could lead to complex patent landscapes, where multiple patents are held on different aspects of an invention, from the AI algorithms to the biological processes they help to optimize. The intersection of AI and biotechnology raises significant questions about how patent law should address inventions that are jointly created by human ingenuity and machine-driven algorithms, as well as the ethical and practical implications of granting patents for living organisms or genetically altered material (Meskó et al., 2023).

The rapid pace of technological development in fields such as AI, blockchain, quantum computing, and biotechnology has far outpaced the ability of patent law to adapt. Patent law, which traditionally operates on a slower timeline, struggles to keep up with innovations that evolve at a speed far greater than the patent application and approval process. This discrepancy can lead to patent applications being filed for inventions that are already outdated by the time they are granted, reducing the overall utility of the patent system in fostering innovation. Furthermore, the complexity and novelty of these technologies often mean that patent examiners may not have the expertise to properly assess the novelty and non-obviousness of an invention, leading to concerns about the quality of patents being granted. As the pace of technological change accelerates, there is increasing pressure for patent law to evolve and develop new mechanisms for addressing the challenges posed by these cutting-edge fields.

In response to these challenges, some commentators have called for reforms to the patent system, including the creation of specialized patent courts or streamlined examination processes to better address the rapid development of emerging technologies. Others have suggested that patent laws should be more flexible and dynamic, allowing for quicker updates and adaptations to reflect the fast-moving nature of technological progress (Damioli et al., 2021).

In conclusion, the patentability of AI and other emerging technologies remains an ongoing area of legal development. While patent law has traditionally provided strong protections for technological inventions, the unique characteristics of AI, blockchain, quantum computing, and biotechnology present new challenges that require innovative solutions. As these technologies continue to evolve at a rapid pace, it is essential for patent law to adapt to ensure that intellectual property rights are granted in a way that fosters innovation, protects creators, and balances broader societal concerns.

5.   Global Perspectives and Jurisdictional Differences

The patentability of software, AI, and emerging technologies has led to varying approaches in different jurisdictions, with significant differences in how these inventions are treated under intellectual property law. These variations are largely influenced by each region's historical legal framework, economic interests, and technological priorities. Among the most prominent jurisdictions are the United States, the European Union, and other global markets such as Japan, China, and India, each of which offers unique perspectives on patent eligibility and enforcement mechanisms for software, AI, and related technologies.

In the United States, patent law has historically been more permissive when it comes to patenting software and digital technologies. The United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO) has allowed for the patenting of software for decades, provided that the software meets the basic patentability criteria of novelty, non-obviousness, and utility. However, the interpretation of these criteria has evolved, particularly following the landmark Alice Corp. v. CLS Bank decision in 2014. This decision reshaped the landscape of software patentability by establishing a two-step test to determine if software constitutes a patent-eligible invention. The test requires that the invention not be an abstract idea and that it includes an "inventive concept" that adds something substantially more than the abstract idea itself. As a result, while software remains patentable in the U.S., the ruling has made it more difficult to patent software that is deemed to be too abstract or overly generalized. For AI, the U.S. system faces significant challenges in determining inventorship when the AI system itself plays an active role in generating novel ideas. The legal ambiguity surrounding whether an AI system can be considered an inventor has led to a series of ongoing debates and legal cases in U.S. courts (Abadi & Pecht, 2020).

In the European Union, the patentability of software is similarly governed by the European Patent Convention (EPC), which, like the U.S., allows for software patents under certain conditions. However, the European approach to software patents is somewhat stricter than the U.S. approach. The EPC explicitly excludes "programs for computers" as patentable inventions, except when the software produces a "technical effect." This distinction means that in Europe, software must be demonstrated to have a technical contribution to be patentable, such as improving the functioning of a computer or a network. As a result, patents for business methods or purely abstract software innovations without a clear technical effect are not eligible for patent protection. The EPO has developed a complex body of case law and guidelines to determine whether software inventions meet the technical contribution requirement. In the context of AI, European patent law faces challenges similar to those in the U.S., especially regarding the definition of inventorship and the evolving nature of AI-driven inventions. While the EPO has not yet adopted specific regulations for AI inventorship, the general rule is that only human inventors are recognized, despite the growing role of AI in the innovation process (Chang, 2020).

In contrast to the U.S. and the EU, other jurisdictions like China and Japan have approached the patentability of software, AI, and emerging technologies from different perspectives, driven by their own technological priorities. In China, the patent system has been rapidly evolving to accommodate the country's growing emphasis on AI and digital innovation. While software patents in China are also subject to the "technical effect" requirement, the Chinese government has increasingly promoted the patenting of AI and other emerging technologies, aligning with the country's goal to become a global leader in AI development. The China National Intellectual Property Administration (CNIPA) has been proactive in issuing guidelines and creating frameworks for AI-related patent applications. Notably, China has seen a surge in AI-related patent filings, which reflects both the country's technological ambitions and the broader global trend toward recognizing AI as a critical field for innovation

(Damioli et al., 2021). Similarly, Japan has developed an expansive patent system that is highly receptive to the patenting of technological innovations, including software and AI. The Japan Patent Office (JPO) follows a similar approach to the EU in requiring that software inventions demonstrate a technical contribution to be patentable. Japan's approach also includes provisions for AI-related inventions, where the legal framework recognizes the potential of AI in various industries, although issues related to AI inventorship are still under discussion.

The differences between these jurisdictions are not just in the criteria for patent eligibility but also in patent application processes and enforcement mechanisms. In the U.S., the patent application process is relatively straightforward, but the examination of software patents can be contentious due to the abstract nature of many software inventions. In contrast, the EPO's patent application process involves a more rigorous technical examination to determine if a software invention meets the "technical effect" standard. This can result in longer application times and greater scrutiny. The enforcement of patents also varies significantly across regions. In the U.S., patent enforcement is largely dependent on the actions of private entities, with patent holders able to seek litigation in federal courts. However, the rise of patent trolls—entities that exploit patent infringement lawsuits for financial gain—has raised concerns about the fairness and efficiency of the patent enforcement system. In Europe, patent enforcement mechanisms are more fragmented, with enforcement procedures varying from one country to another. However, the introduction of the European Patent Court is expected to streamline patent litigation across member states. In contrast, China's patent enforcement system has been characterized by a high level of state involvement, with courts often perceived as more supportive of local patent holders. This has led to an environment where foreign companies are sometimes at a disadvantage when enforcing patents in China.

Efforts to harmonize patent laws internationally have intensified, particularly in light of the rapid pace of technological innovation in fields like AI, software, and emerging technologies. While there is no global patent system, various international treaties and organizations have worked toward harmonizing patent law across jurisdictions. One such effort is the Patent Cooperation Treaty (PCT), which provides a unified process for filing patent applications across multiple countries, making it easier for inventors to seek protection in multiple jurisdictions simultaneously. However, the PCT system does not address the core differences in patentability criteria between regions. The World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO) has also been involved in initiatives to create more consistent patent standards, particularly in emerging fields like AI. Despite these efforts, significant legal and policy divergences remain, especially concerning the patentability of software and AI inventions. In particular, debates over the role of AI in the patent system, including the question of AI as an inventor, are likely to shape future harmonization efforts. As the digital and technological landscapes continue to evolve, the need for more consistent and adaptable patent laws becomes increasingly urgent, and ongoing international collaboration will be essential to address the challenges posed by the global digital economy.

The divergent approaches to patent law across different jurisdictions underscore the complexity of applying traditional intellectual property frameworks to emerging technologies. While some regions are more accommodating of software and AI patents, others have stricter standards, often due to concerns about the patenting of abstract ideas or the over-patenting of fundamental technologies. The future of patent law in the context of digital and emerging technologies will depend on how these jurisdictions reconcile these differences and how international harmonization efforts can address the unique challenges posed by rapidly evolving technologies.

6. The Impact of Patent Law on Innovation and the Digital Economy

Patent law plays a crucial role in shaping the innovation landscape, particularly within the digital economy, by balancing the protection of intellectual property with the promotion of new technologies. On one hand, patents provide inventors and companies with the exclusive right to their inventions, thus creating an incentive to invest time and resources in developing innovative solutions. The protection offered by patents ensures that inventors can benefit from their creations without the fear of immediate imitation, fostering an environment where research and development (R&D) are encouraged. This dynamic is particularly important in fields such as software, artificial intelligence (AI), and emerging technologies, where the pace of innovation is rapid, and the costs associated with development are high. By granting exclusive rights, patent law helps secure the economic returns necessary to fund further innovation, as firms can capitalize on their technological breakthroughs by

licensing or commercializing their patents (Damioli et al., 2021). This incentivization mechanism is foundational to the growth of the digital economy, where technological advancements are a driving force behind industry transformations.

However, the patent system is not without its drawbacks, and in some cases, it can inhibit innovation rather than encourage it. One of the most significant challenges in the digital economy is the emergence of patent thickets. A patent thicket is a dense web of overlapping patent rights, often covering the same or similar technological innovations. This phenomenon is particularly common in industries like software and AI, where minor modifications to existing technologies can lead to a proliferation of patents. The existence of patent thickets creates a barrier to entry for startups and smaller firms, which may lack the resources to navigate the complex patent landscape. For these firms, the risk of infringing on existing patents, even unintentionally, can be a significant deterrent to innovation. Moreover, the costs associated with patent litigation or licensing agreements can be prohibitive, particularly for smaller entities without the financial backing to defend themselves in court. The challenge is compounded by the fact that patent holders often do not actively use their patents but instead hold them as assets to extract licensing fees from others. This situation can lead to a form of "patent trolling," where entities acquire patents not to develop new products but to extract settlements from firms that are actively innovating (Chang, 2020).

Patent thickets also create challenges for large technology companies, which may be involved in numerous cross-licensing arrangements with other patent holders. Cross-licensing refers to agreements where companies agree to share access to each other's patents, typically to avoid litigation and ensure that each party can continue to develop new products without fear of infringing on another's patents. While cross-licensing can help reduce the costs and risks associated with patent thickets, it also has the potential to stifle competition. Large companies with extensive patent portfolios may use their patents to establish a form of "patent cartel" or to leverage their patent rights to control access to key technologies. This consolidation of patent power can make it difficult for smaller innovators to gain a foothold in the market, as they may be locked out of critical technologies or forced into unfavorable licensing terms. In industries like AI and blockchain, where rapid technological development is key to maintaining a competitive edge, the presence of patent thickets can delay the adoption of new technologies and slow the pace of innovation across the sector (Alstott et al., 2016).

The impact of patent law on market competition is particularly pronounced in industries such as software and AI, where technological advancements often rely on building upon existing inventions. In these fields, patents can either foster a competitive market environment or contribute to anti-competitive practices. On one hand, patents can stimulate competition by providing companies with the incentive to develop novel solutions and differentiate themselves in the marketplace. On the other hand, patents can also create monopolistic behaviors, where large firms use their extensive patent portfolios to dominate a particular sector. For instance, in the software and AI industries, firms with large patent portfolios may leverage their patents to prevent competitors from developing similar technologies, potentially leading to market consolidation and reduced competition. This can be particularly problematic in emerging fields, where the rapid pace of innovation requires an open and competitive market to facilitate the development and widespread adoption of new technologies.

The role of patents in fostering innovation is also influenced by the way they are enforced. In jurisdictions like the United States, where patent litigation is common, the threat of legal action can have a chilling effect on innovation, particularly among smaller firms. The high costs of litigation, combined with the potential for patent infringement claims, can discourage firms from pursuing new ideas or developing new products. In some cases, companies may choose to settle patent disputes out of court, even if they believe they have not infringed on another's patent, simply to avoid the costs and uncertainty associated with a lengthy court battle. This dynamic is particularly evident in industries like software and AI, where the boundaries between different patents can be vague, and the risk of unintentional infringement is high. As a result, smaller companies and startups may be less willing to invest in R&D, knowing that the threat of patent litigation looms large over their innovations (Fink et al., 2015). In contrast, in jurisdictions where patent enforcement is less litigious, such as the European Union, there may be fewer risks associated with patent infringement, but this can also lead to a lack of incentive to actively protect patent rights.

The complexities of patent law in the digital economy also underscore the need for greater harmonization of patent systems at the international level. As digital technologies transcend national borders, the need for a unified approach to patent law has become increasingly urgent. Efforts toward harmonizing patent law have been ongoing for decades, with organizations such as the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO) working to create international treaties and agreements that streamline

the patent process across multiple jurisdictions. The Patent Cooperation Treaty (PCT), which facilitates the filing of patents in multiple countries, is one such effort. However, despite these efforts, significant differences in patent eligibility criteria, application processes, and enforcement mechanisms persist between jurisdictions. For example, the U.S. patent system allows for broader patenting of software compared to the European Union, where software is only patentable if it involves a technical solution to a technical problem. These differences can create inefficiencies and increase the costs of patent protection for companies operating internationally.

In conclusion, patent law has a dual role in the digital economy: it can foster innovation by providing legal protection for new technologies, but it can also inhibit innovation if it results in patent thickets, monopolistic behaviors, or excessive litigation. While patents incentivize R&D and technological progress, they can also create barriers to entry, particularly for startups and smaller firms. The rise of patent thickets in the software, AI, and emerging technology sectors highlights the need for a balanced approach to patent protection—one that encourages innovation while mitigating the negative effects of over-patenting. Moreover, as the digital economy continues to grow and evolve, the need for global harmonization of patent laws becomes more critical in ensuring that patent systems can effectively support the rapid pace of technological development.

7. Future Directions and Challenges in Patent Law

The future of software and AI patents is increasingly uncertain, as the rapid pace of technological innovation continues to outstrip the ability of existing patent systems to adapt. As AI systems become more complex and capable of generating novel solutions autonomously, the question of patent eligibility will likely evolve. Currently, patent laws in many jurisdictions struggle to accommodate AI-driven inventions, particularly when it comes to determining inventorship. The notion of AI as a creator challenges traditional understandings of patent law, which has historically been centered around human inventorship. Future developments in this area could lead to legal frameworks that either expand the definition of inventorship to include AI systems or redefine the criteria for patentability to better address the specific nature of AI innovations. Furthermore, as AI technologies become more integrated into industries ranging from healthcare to finance, the role of patent law in incentivizing innovation will become even more critical. Policymakers may need to consider how patents can be structured to foster innovation in a way that encourages widespread collaboration while also protecting the interests of individual inventors and companies (Abadi & Pecht, 2020).

Similarly, the patentability of software is expected to continue evolving. As software becomes increasingly integral to AI and other emerging technologies, traditional distinctions between software and hardware may blur, making it harder to apply existing patent frameworks. The line between patentable inventions and abstract ideas has been particularly difficult to define in the context of software, and as digital technologies become more abstract and algorithmic, patent eligibility criteria may need to be refined. Legal reforms may be necessary to ensure that patent law remains an effective tool for promoting innovation while preventing overreach that stifles technological progress. Jurisdictions may also look to create clearer distinctions between what constitutes patentable software and what should remain in the public domain to ensure that basic algorithms and methods that are essential for further technological development are not unduly restricted (Fink et al., 2015).

The question of reforms to patent law in response to emerging technologies will likely continue to generate significant debate. One potential reform involves reconsidering the patent eligibility of abstract ideas and algorithms, particularly in the context of AI. This could involve creating a new category of protection for AI inventions that balances the need for innovation incentives with the risk of monopolizing fundamental technological concepts. Furthermore, there may be a push for more tailored patent frameworks that specifically address the unique characteristics of emerging technologies such as blockchain, quantum computing, and biotech innovations. By establishing clearer and more targeted patentability criteria, such reforms could help prevent the patent system from hindering innovation while ensuring that inventors are properly rewarded for their contributions to technological progress (Adaka & Olubiyi, 2022).

Alongside the technical and legal challenges of patenting new technologies such as AI, there are significant ethical concerns regarding the implications of patenting these innovations. One of the central debates involves the question of AI as an inventor. If an AI system is capable of generating inventions independently, who owns the intellectual property rights to these inventions? Should the creators of the AI be considered the inventors, or should the AI itself be granted some form of legal status? This raises important ethical questions about the role of machines in creative processes and whether it is fair to assign ownership of

inventions to entities that may not have a true understanding of intellectual property or the consequences of their actions. The issue of accountability becomes even more complex when considering the potential for AI to be used in ways that could harm society, such as in the creation of malicious software or systems with unintended consequences. Patent law must grapple with the ethical implications of granting exclusive rights over such technologies, and policymakers will need to consider whether existing frameworks are sufficient or whether new laws are required to address these concerns. Furthermore, there are ongoing debates about the accessibility of patented AI technologies, particularly in industries where these innovations could have significant social benefits, such as healthcare or education. The ethical considerations of patent law in the context of AI and other emerging technologies may play a pivotal role in shaping future legal reforms (Chang, 2020).

8. Conclusion

Patent law has played a crucial role in the development and commercialization of new technologies, particularly in the digital economy. As this field continues to evolve with the rise of software, AI, and other emerging technologies, patent law faces significant challenges in adapting to the unique characteristics of these innovations. Through the analysis of current frameworks and their limitations, it is clear that patent laws will need to evolve to address the complexities of patenting abstract and algorithm-driven inventions. While the current system incentivizes innovation by providing exclusive rights to inventors, the increasing complexity of AI systems and digital technologies suggests that further reforms may be necessary to ensure the system remains effective.

The future of patent law in these sectors will likely depend on how well legal systems can balance the protection of intellectual property with the need for technological progress and public access. Legal frameworks may need to become more flexible and responsive to the rapid pace of innovation, ensuring that patenting systems do not stifle competition or limit access to critical technologies. As the patent landscape becomes increasingly global, efforts to harmonize patent laws across jurisdictions will also play a key role in shaping the future of intellectual property in the digital economy.

For the future, there are numerous areas where further academic inquiry and policy development are needed. One significant area is the question of AI inventorship and the ethical implications of granting patents to machines. Additionally, exploring the impact of patent law on startup innovation, particularly in the context of patent thickets and licensing practices, could help identify strategies for making the patent system more accessible and equitable. Continued research into the intersection of patent law and emerging technologies will be essential for ensuring that the legal framework remains conducive to innovation while also addressing the broader social, ethical, and economic implications of new technological developments.

References

Abadi, H. H. N., & Pecht, M. (2020). Artificial Intelligence Trends Based on the Patents Granted by the United States Patent and Trademark Office. *IEEE Access*, *8*, 81633-81643. https://doi.org/10.1109/access.2020.2988815

Adaka, E. E., & Olubiyi, I. A. (2022). Lessons for Nigeria: Determining Authorship and Inventorship of Artificial Intelligence Generated Works. *Journal of Intellectual Property and Information Technology Law (Jipit)*, *2*(1), 15-48. https://doi.org/10.52907/jipit.v2i1.203

Alstott, J., Triulzi, G., Yan, B., & Luo, J. (2016). Mapping Technology Space by Normalizing Patent Networks. *Scientometrics*, *110*(1), 443-479. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-016-2107-y

Chang, S.-H. (2020). Technical Trends of Artificial Intelligence in Standard-Essential Patents. *Data Technologies and Applications*, *55*(1), 97-117. https://doi.org/10.1108/dta-10-2019-0178

Damioli, G., Roy, V., & Vértesy, D. (2021). The Impact of Artificial Intelligence on Labor Productivity. *Eurasian Economic Review*, *11*(1), 1-25. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40821-020-00172-8

Fink, C., Khan, M., & Zhou, H. (2015). Exploring the Worldwide Patent Surge. *Economics of Innovation and New Technology*, *25*(2), 114-142. https://doi.org/10.1080/10438599.2015.1055088

Fraser, E. S. (2016). Computers as Inventors – Legal and Policy Implications of Artificial Intelligence on Patent Law. *Script-Ed*, *13*(3), 305-333. https://doi.org/10.2966/scrip.130316.305

Hlongwa, L., & Talamayan, F. (2023). Patenting Sociality: Uncovering the Operational Logics of Facebook Through Critical Patent Analysis. *Media Culture & Society*, *45*(6), 1135-1155. https://doi.org/10.1177/01634437231154759

Hötte, K., Tarannum, T., Verendel, V., & Bennett, L. T. (2022). Exploring Artificial Intelligence as a General Purpose Technology With Patent Data -- A Systematic Comparison of Four Classification Approaches. https://doi.org/10.48550/arxiv.2204.10304

Lee, C.-W., & Chen, S. H. (2021). AI Technology Application in Medical Care of NSCLC Based on Patent Trend Analysis. 99-115. https://doi.org/10.47260/amae/1166

Matulionyte, R., & Lee, J.-A. (2022). Copyright in AI-generated Works: Lessons From Recent Developments in Patent Law. *Script-Ed*, *19*(1), 5-35. https://doi.org/10.2966/scrip.190122.5

Meskó, B., Benjamens, S., Dhunnoo, P., & Görög, M. (2023). Forecasting Artificial Intelligence Trends in Health Care: Systematic International Patent Analysis. *Jmir Ai*, *2*, e47283. https://doi.org/10.2196/47283

Nguyen, N. D., & Quan, D. (2023). Artificial Intelligence and Inventorship Under the Patent Law Regime: Practical Development From Common Law Jurisdictions. *Vietnamese Journal of Legal Sciences*, *8*(1), 25-54. https://doi.org/10.2478/vjls-2023-0002

Nnawulezi, U. (2023). Protection of Patent Holders' Rights in Indonesia: Between Theories and Practices. *Journal of Private and Commercial Law*, *7*(1), 19-44. https://doi.org/10.15294/jpcl.v7i1.38639

Oleš, T. (2024). Analyzing Automation Technologies and Their Tasks in Patent Texts Using Natural Language Processing. 187-196. https://doi.org/10.53465/edamba.2023.9788022551274.187-196

Uhm, D., Ryu, J.-B., & Jun, S. (2020). Patent Data Analysis of Artificial Intelligence Using Bayesian Interval Estimation. *Applied Sciences*, *10*(2), 570. https://doi.org/10.3390/app10020570

Wang, Z., Lei, Z., & Lee, W.-C. (2014). Exploring Legal Patent Citations for Patent Valuation. 1379-1388. https://doi.org/10.1145/2661829.2662029

Yang, X., & Yu, X. (2020). Preventing Patent Risks in Artificial Intelligence Industry for Sustainable Development: A Multi-Level Network Analysis. *Sustainability*, *12*(20), 8667. https://doi.org/10.3390/su12208667