The Future of Intellectual Property in AI-Generated Creativity: Authorship, Originality, and Protection

1. Andrew De Smet: Department of Law, KU Leuven, Leuven, Belgium
2. Emily Carter*: Department of Law, University of Oxford, Oxford, United Kingdom
3. Li Wei: Department of International Relations, Peking University, Beijing, China

*Correspondence: e-mail: emily.carter@law.ox.ac.uk

Abstract

The rise of generative artificial intelligence has transformed the nature of creative production, forcing a fundamental re-evaluation of the intellectual property frameworks that govern authorship, originality, and ownership. As large language models, image generators, and multimodal systems increasingly produce complex and aesthetically refined works, traditional copyright doctrines—grounded in human intentionality and expressive labor—struggle to accommodate outputs generated through autonomous or semi-autonomous computational processes. This narrative review synthesizes current legal, ethical, and policy debates to examine how AI-generated creativity challenges long-standing assumptions about what qualifies as a creative work and who may claim authorship or control. The article explores the conceptual divide between human–AI co-creation and fully automated generation, the shifting boundaries of human contribution, and the emerging complexities of originality in contexts where outputs may be statistically novel yet lack human expressive judgment. It analyzes the growing difficulty of evaluating derivative works, substantial similarity, and accidental replication within algorithmic generation, highlighting unresolved tensions in applying traditional infringement standards to non-human creative systems. The review also assesses national regulatory approaches, including developments in the United States, European Union, United Kingdom, Singapore, and China, alongside broader international harmonization challenges involving cross-border disputes and enforcement gaps. Finally, the article discusses future pathways for intellectual property protection, including proposals for AI-assisted authorship categories, hybrid rights frameworks, presumptive human ownership, and transparency obligations for generative systems. By synthesizing these threads, the review underscores the need for adaptable, ethically grounded, and technologically informed legal reforms capable of addressing the evolving dynamics of creativity in an AI-driven era.

Keywords: AI-generated creativity; intellectual property; authorship; originality; copyright; generative AI; machine learning; derivative works; policy frameworks; digital governance.

Received: date: 11 February 2023
Revised: date: 11 March 2023
Accepted: date: 25 March 2023
Published: date: 01 April 2023

Citation: De Smet, A., Carter, E., & Wei, L. (2023). The Future of Intellectual Property in AI-Generated Creativity: Authorship, Originality, and Protection. *Legal Studies in Digital Age*, 2(2), 49-60.

1. Introduction

The rapid acceleration of artificial intelligence systems capable of generating text, images, music, software code, and multimodal creative works has fundamentally expanded the boundaries of contemporary cultural production, an evolution

clearly reflected as generative models demonstrate capacities that rival or surpass traditional human-defined creativity thresholds (Vinchon et al., 2023). As these systems become more deeply embedded in artistic, literary, and commercial workflows, scholarly discussions increasingly highlight the unprecedented scale and velocity of AI-driven content creation, particularly as creative automation becomes normalized in educational settings, digital media environments, and professional industries (Hees et al., 2023; Hutson & Lang, 2023). Within this expanding ecosystem, the proliferation of AI-generated outputs has amplified tensions between long-standing intellectual property regimes and the emerging reality of creative processes that may involve minimal or indirect human input, raising significant interpretive challenges for copyright, originality doctrine, authorship attribution, and ownership allocation across multiple jurisdictions (Birštonas, 2023; Rinkerman, 2023).

Traditional intellectual property frameworks were designed around assumptions of human intentionality, creativity, and personal authorship, assumptions increasingly questioned as AI systems exhibit generative capabilities that can produce expressive patterns without direct human creative direction (Shin, 2023). As scholars argue that AI systems may function as independent creative agents or at least as powerful co-creators, doctrinal debates intensify over whether outputs produced by machine-learning models can satisfy originality thresholds that historically required a degree of human intellectual contribution, a concern that has been amplified by research examining originality risks, derivative work ambiguities, and potential subconscious imitation embedded within data-driven generation processes (Díaz-Noci, 2023; Kulinich & Kondyk, 2023). The resulting friction exposes foundational weaknesses in copyright systems that were not designed to accommodate autonomous computational creativity, particularly as legal scholars emphasize how existing rules regarding fixation, authorship, and expressive control struggle to accommodate complex interactions between human users, automated systems, and algorithmic training datasets (Bukhari et al., 2023; ÇEbİ et al., 2023).

This tension is further complicated by the limited availability of empirical and doctrinal scholarship that systematically evaluates the intersections between generative AI, creative cognition, and intellectual property theory, despite increasing academic interest in the cultural, ethical, and economic implications of automated creativity (Goderdzishvili, 2023; Gross, 2023). Although several studies examine emerging risks associated with value creation and IP governance in AI-based enterprises (Pınarbaşı et al., 2023), current regulatory structures remain fragmented, reactive, and inconsistent across national and international contexts. The lack of unified legal responses creates uncertainty for creators, developers, policymakers, and industries seeking predictable rules for authorship and ownership in environments where human and machine contributions overlap or become indistinguishable, an uncertainty intensified by growing calls for reform across copyright scholarship and policymaking communities (An, 2023; Munshi & Barai, 2022).

The purpose of this narrative review is to synthesize and critically evaluate the legal, ethical, and policy debates shaping the future of intellectual property protection for AI-generated creativity. Through descriptive analysis of existing literature, the article explores how authorship, originality, and ownership doctrines are being challenged, reinterpreted, and reshaped in response to generative AI. The central research questions guiding this inquiry examine how traditional IP principles apply to AI-generated works, whether current doctrines can adequately address emerging complexities, and what future-oriented frameworks may be necessary to ensure coherent, equitable, and innovation-supportive regulation of AI-driven creativity.

2. Conceptual Foundations

The conceptual foundations of AI-generated creativity require careful clarification of the technological processes that enable automated production and the legal doctrines that determine how such production is situated within existing intellectual property frameworks. Generative artificial intelligence encompasses systems designed to produce original or seemingly original outputs—such as text, images, sound, or code—through computational models trained on massive datasets, a phenomenon whose creative implications are widely discussed as scholars examine how these systems expand or redefine cognitive and expressive capabilities within technological environments (Vinchon et al., 2023). At the center of these developments are large language models and multimodal generative architectures that rely on machine-learning principles to analyze patterns, probabilistic structures, and representational forms embedded in human-generated content, enabling them to synthesize new works that may superficially resemble human creativity while emerging from algorithmic processes rather than human intuition or intentionality (Liu et al., 2023). As these models increase in sophistication, they generate outputs that challenge conventional distinctions between human-generated and machine-generated expression, particularly because many systems can operate with

varying degrees of autonomy that alter the balance between human intent and machine agency in the creative process (Shin, 2023).

A foundational distinction emerges between human–AI co-creation and fully autonomous content generation, a distinction central to legal debates over authorship and originality. In co-creative settings, users affect outputs through prompting, iterative refinement, or curatorial decision-making, creating a blended creative process in which human conceptual input shapes machine-rendered expression (Militsyna, 2023). Scholars increasingly analyze how these hybrid forms of creativity complicate legal theories that rely on the presence of human intellectual effort, particularly because the degree of human contribution may vary widely among individual use cases (Hutson & Lang, 2023). Fully autonomous generation, by contrast, occurs when systems independently produce content without meaningful human direction beyond initial system design or model training, a mode of production that heightens doctrinal uncertainty because traditional intellectual property law assumes the presence of a human author who exercises creative control over the work (An, 2023). As generative systems evolve toward greater independence, both technologically and operationally, the boundary between user agency and machine-based creativity becomes increasingly ambiguous, raising fundamental questions about the legal status of outputs that may lack a definable human creator (Goderdzishvili, 2023).

Intellectual property law historically rests on several core principles that shape how creative works are recognized and protected. Authorship is a central concept, traditionally associated with the entity—almost always a human—who produces an original work through intellectual effort, a framework increasingly strained by automated production as courts and scholars reconsider what it means for a creator to contribute active, intentional labor to a work's expressive form (Atilla, 2023). Originality, another foundational requirement, traditionally demands a minimal degree of creativity, personal expression, or individualized intellectual contribution, standards that have been destabilized as machine-learning models generate content that may appear original despite lacking human creative spark (Díaz-Noci, 2023; Kulinich & Kondyk, 2023). Fixation, the requirement that a work be captured in a tangible medium, is generally unproblematic for AI-generated outputs, which are inherently fixed through digital processes; however, fixation raises new debates regarding whether the machine or its human operator is responsible for creating the fixed expression (Bysaga et al., 2023).

Traditional copyright theories also emphasize creativity, skill, and labor as markers of protectable authorship, frameworks that become problematic when automated systems generate expressive outputs without direct human intervention, prompting concerns that granting protection may contradict the underlying philosophical justifications for intellectual property (Bukhari et al., 2023). Ownership and transferability further complicate the legal landscape because AI-generated outputs may involve multiple stakeholders, including system developers, users, data curators, and platform providers, creating complex chains of rights and responsibilities that do not align neatly with conventional models of authorship and property (Pınarbaşı et al., 2023). These conceptual tensions highlight the need for clearer doctrinal frameworks capable of addressing the evolving dynamics of AI-driven creativity as legal systems struggle to reconcile traditional intellectual property principles with emerging forms of human–machine creative production.

3. Authorship Challenges in AI-Generated Works

Debates surrounding authorship in AI-generated creative works have intensified as generative systems increasingly produce outputs that reflect high levels of coherence, aesthetic refinement, and conceptual sophistication. Scholars frequently question whether AI systems that function through probabilistic learning, neural network architectures, and data-driven inference mechanisms can meaningfully be characterized as authors in any legal or philosophical sense, particularly as these systems do not possess consciousness, intention, or subjective experience, traits traditionally associated with human creativity (Gross, 2023). The argument against recognizing AI as a legal author frequently emphasizes that creative authorship has always relied on the human capacity to exercise judgment, make artistic choices, and engage in meaningful acts of expression, capacities that are absent in artificial systems whose outputs arise from computational patterning rather than personal intention (Vinchon et al., 2023). Yet some scholars argue that as AI systems become more autonomous, the legal framework may need to adapt to the reality of machine-based content generation, particularly in contexts where human influence is minimal or purely

operational rather than creative (Fernández, 2023). These debates have gained further significance as empirical research demonstrates that human observers often perceive AI-generated art as intentional or creatively valuable, blurring intuitive distinctions between human and machine authorship on psychological and cultural levels (Hees et al., 2023).

Conceptually, the question of whether AI can be an author involves a tension between creativity as a human-centered moral right and creativity as an output-based functional category. Those who oppose AI authorship emphasize that authorship in intellectual property law derives from the act of originating expressive content through intellectual labor, a principle incompatible with algorithmic generation that lacks both personal identity and legal agency (Atilla, 2023). Conversely, some theoretical perspectives highlight that the law has historically adapted to novel forms of production, and that denying authorship to AI-generated works may weaken incentives or cause practical difficulties in assigning rights, particularly when vast sectors of cultural production increasingly rely on automated tools (Bukhari et al., 2023). Others propose that AI authorship need not rely on metaphysical claims about agency or consciousness but could instead serve as a functional legal construct designed to allocate rights and responsibilities in technologically mediated creative ecosystems (Deck, 2023). Despite the appeal of such alternative frameworks, most contemporary legal systems explicitly reject the possibility of AI as an author, maintaining that authorship requires a human origin grounded in individual creativity and expressiveness (Munshi & Barai, 2022). This lack of recognition underscores the difficulty of reconciling traditional legal definitions with the operational realities of generative AI that can produce works indistinguishable from those created by humans.

The tension between machine generation and human authorship becomes particularly pronounced when considering the human contribution standard, a legal and philosophical framework that determines the minimum threshold of human involvement required for a work to qualify as human-authored. Scholarly analyses increasingly highlight how prompting, curatorial selection, and editorial refinement may constitute meaningful creative contributions, particularly when human users engage in iterative experimentation and conceptual shaping that influence the content, structure, and aesthetic qualities of the final output (Militsyna, 2023). The challenge lies in distinguishing between trivial interactions—such as entering a short text prompt—and substantial intellectual contributions that reflect personal expression, judgment, or artistic vision (Hutson & Lang, 2023). Courts and policymakers have struggled to delineate clear standards, especially as AI interfaces become more intuitive and require fewer technical skills, sometimes reducing human input to minimal operational commands that lack creative character (Kulinich & Kondyk, 2023). This complexity deepens in cases involving extensive human–AI collaboration, where creators may conceptualize the work, make aesthetic decisions, or structure the creative process while relying heavily on AI for execution, a dynamic that resembles historical debates over authorship in photography, digital art, or other mechanically assisted creative fields (Shin, 2023).

Determining rightful authorship in such hybrid contexts therefore demands clarity about the nature and extent of human creative control, a point emphasized in contemporary analyses of human–machine creative synergy (Goderdzishvili, 2023). Some scholars contend that authorship should belong to the individual who exercises final curatorial authority or engages in meaningful refinement, arguing that creative ownership should attach to expressive choices rather than the mechanical act of generation (Díaz-Noci, 2023). Others emphasize that the threshold must be sufficiently high to prevent users from obtaining rights over works produced almost entirely by automated processes, which would undermine the originality requirement central to intellectual property law (Bysaga et al., 2023). These contrasting perspectives reveal the difficulty of establishing universally applicable standards as generative technologies evolve rapidly and are integrated into increasingly diverse creative contexts.

Comparative legal perspectives further illustrate the fragmentation of global approaches to authorship in AI-generated works. In the United States, the U.S. Copyright Office has maintained a strict human authorship requirement, repeatedly ruling that AI-generated portions of a work cannot receive copyright protection unless a human author has made creative contributions that are independently protectable, a position reaffirmed through administrative decisions and public guidance documents (Rinkerman, 2023). The EU adopts a similar stance by grounding authorship in the notion of a "personal intellectual creation," a standard that presumes the involvement of human creative judgment and thereby excludes fully autonomous AI outputs from protection (ÇEbİ et al., 2023). The United Kingdom provides a unique approach through section 9(3) of the Copyright, Designs

and Patents Act, which attributes authorship of computer-generated works to the person who makes the arrangements necessary for the creation, a doctrine that has garnered renewed scholarly interest as analysts reconsider the applicability of this provision in the age of generative AI (Atilla, 2023). Japan, meanwhile, has taken a more innovation-oriented approach by emphasizing flexible interpretations of user contributions and promoting policies that support AI research and creative industry development (Liu et al., 2023). China, which has demonstrated strong interest in AI governance more broadly, has begun to articulate legal positions that recognize certain forms of human-AI collaboration as protectable, especially when human direction plays a meaningful role in determining the expressive outcome of the work (An, 2023).

Case law across jurisdictions reflects growing uncertainty, with courts sometimes diverging in their interpretation of originality, human involvement, and the weight given to automated processes. Regulatory guidelines similarly vary as policymakers struggle to balance the protection of human creators, the promotion of technological innovation, and the need for predictable standards in rapidly evolving creative markets (Pınarbaşı et al., 2023). These differences highlight the absence of harmonized global norms and point to emerging debates within WIPO and other international forums over whether coordinated frameworks are necessary to ensure coherent treatment of AI-generated creativity worldwide (Fernández, 2023). As these discussions evolve, the comparative legal landscape reveals a profound divergence in how nations conceptualize authorship, attribute creative responsibility, and regulate the outputs of increasingly autonomous generative systems.

4. Originality and Creativity in the Age of AI

Debates about originality in AI-generated works have become central to contemporary intellectual property scholarship as generative systems expand in scope, sophistication, and cultural influence. Originality traditionally requires a minimal degree of human creativity and personal expression, a standard increasingly difficult to assess in contexts where content emerges from machine-learning processes rather than human authorship (Kulinich & Kondyk, 2023). Many scholars argue that AI-generated works exist at the boundary between reproduction and transformation, particularly because generative models rely on vast training datasets composed of human-created materials that shape the probabilistic structures guiding output generation (Díaz-Noci, 2023). This reliance raises concerns about whether AI outputs represent genuine creative transformation or merely statistical recombinations of existing works, a problem heightened by uncertainties surrounding dataset composition, embedded stylistic patterns, and the possibility of latent plagiarism embedded within algorithmic synthesis (Bukhari et al., 2023). As the mechanics of generative systems become more opaque, questions intensify regarding whether originality can truly exist without the human creative spark traditionally required in intellectual property doctrine (Militsyna, 2023).

A key debate centers on the distinction between statistical originality and creative originality. Statistical originality refers to the mathematical uniqueness of an output relative to the training data, a measure of novelty based on probability distributions rather than intentional creative choices. Creative originality, by contrast, relies on the presence of subjective expressive judgment, a feature conventionally tied to human cognition (Hees et al., 2023). Scholars highlight how generative systems may achieve extremely sophisticated forms of novelty without human intention, yet these outputs may fail to satisfy legal originality thresholds because they lack the individualized intellectual contribution that copyright law presumes in creative works (Atilla, 2023). Others argue that originality should be reinterpreted in light of technological evolution, particularly as human–machine collaboration becomes ubiquitous and the boundaries of creative labor shift toward conceptual direction, prompting, and editing rather than manual production (Hutson & Lang, 2023). The ongoing struggle to reconcile these competing frameworks underscores the difficulty of applying historically human-centered originality standards to algorithmically generated content.

The problem of derivative works and substantial similarity further complicates assessments of originality in AI-generated outputs. Scholars note that generative systems may inadvertently replicate portions of copyrighted works contained in their training datasets, especially when the model is exposed to highly repetitive stylistic patterns or overrepresented materials that skew probabilistic outputs (Bysaga et al., 2023). In some cases, models may reproduce content that closely resembles specific copyrighted works, raising concerns about accidental replication and unintentional infringement (Díaz-Noci, 2023). This problem is exacerbated by the architectural features of certain generative systems, particularly those that rely on dense training

data or reinforcement learning mechanisms that increase output uniformity and stylistic similarity (Liu et al., 2023). As a result, courts and legal scholars increasingly grapple with whether such outputs constitute derivative works or represent independent creative expressions, especially when the degree of similarity exceeds what would typically be expected from human authors drawing inspiration from existing works.

The concept of substantial similarity becomes particularly complex in AI contexts because the absence of human intention challenges traditional analyses of copying, which often hinge on whether a creator deliberately reproduced protected material (An, 2023). With generative systems lacking intention, courts must evaluate similarity through objective structural or stylistic comparisons rather than subjective assessments of creative purpose. Scholars also emphasize that the predictability of generative models may weaken claims of originality, especially if multiple users can produce nearly identical outputs using similar prompts, suggesting that such works lack the personal imprint typically required in copyright law (Gross, 2023). Critics argue that this reproducibility reflects a deeper issue: the absence of human creative spark that distinguishes expressive works from algorithmic artifacts generated through automated processes (Goderdzishvili, 2023). As generative technologies continue to evolve, the tension between similarity, uniqueness, and creative agency is likely to intensify, revealing gaps in existing legal standards for derivative works.

Beyond legal questions of originality and similarity, ethical dimensions of AI-generated creativity have become increasingly significant as generative systems are deployed across cultural, artistic, and commercial domains. Concerns about cultural appropriation arise when models trained on culturally specific artistic traditions produce outputs that mimic these styles without proper attribution, permission, or contextual understanding, raising questions about the exploitation of marginalized creative communities (Fernández, 2023). Bias embedded in training datasets further affects the ethical landscape, as generative outputs may inadvertently replicate or amplify racial, gender, or cultural stereotypes present within the original data sources (Shaista Peerzada Saurabh, 2023). These ethical challenges underscore the need for transparency in dataset composition, responsible training practices, and mechanisms to ensure that generative systems do not perpetuate structural inequalities in creative representation (Pınarbaşı et al., 2023).

Attribution presents another complex ethical dilemma, particularly in cases where AI-generated works incorporate stylistic elements derived from identifiable artists or communities without acknowledgment or compensation. Scholars caution that failure to address these attribution issues may erode trust within creative industries, devalue human artistic labor, and undermine cultural authenticity (Deck, 2023). The difficulty of tracing the origin of algorithmically generated elements compounds this problem, as users and creators may be unaware of the extent to which specific cultural or artistic influences are embedded within the system's outputs (Vinchon et al., 2023). As debates about attribution, fairness, and transparency continue to develop, the ethical challenges surrounding AI-generated creativity reinforce the need for reimagining intellectual property frameworks that can protect both human creators and cultural integrity while accommodating the growing influence of automated creative processes.

5. Intellectual Property Protection Models for AI-Generated Works

Legal debates surrounding the protection of AI-generated works increasingly focus on how traditional and alternative intellectual property frameworks can accommodate outputs that emerge from hybrid or autonomous creative processes. Traditional copyright models remain the primary foundation for regulating creative works, yet these models were designed around human authorship and personal intellectual contribution, standards that struggle to account for algorithmic production. The human authorship requirement remains central to most legal systems, which generally insist that copyright protection must originate from a natural person who exercises creative judgment or makes expressive decisions (Atilla, 2023). This requirement poses significant difficulties for AI-generated works because generative systems produce expressive outputs without subjective intention or conscious decision-making, leaving scholars to argue that fully autonomous outputs cannot meet the threshold for human originality (Kulinich & Kondyk, 2023). Even in contexts where users interact extensively with generative tools, questions arise about whether prompting or curatorial oversight constitutes sufficient intellectual labor to justify authorship, a

problem illustrated in ongoing policy discussions and administrative decisions that reaffirm the importance of human creative input (Bukhari et al., 2023).

Ownership allocation becomes particularly complex in co-creation contexts where humans and AI systems jointly shape the expressive character of a work. Scholars note that determining rightful ownership requires clarity regarding the nature of user involvement, especially when users engage in concept selection, iterative refinement, or artistic decision-making while relying on AI to execute the final expression (Militsyna, 2023). Some legal analyses emphasize that ownership should attach to individuals who make meaningful contributions, arguing that conceptual control or aesthetic judgment may suffice even if the mechanical execution is largely automated (Hutson & Lang, 2023). Others caution that granting ownership too easily may undermine the originality doctrine by allowing protection for machine-generated works that lack genuine human expressiveness (Díaz-Noci, 2023). Licensing models for AI outputs further complicate this landscape because many platforms specify ownership through contractual terms that assign rights either to users, platform operators, or shared regimes based on the nature of service use, with some providers granting broad usage rights while others claim partial or total ownership of generated content (Pınarbaşı et al., 2023). These contractual structures illustrate how platform governance increasingly shapes the practical distribution of rights in AI-driven creative ecosystems.

Beyond copyright, the implications of AI-generated creativity extend to patent and trademark regimes, particularly as AI systems demonstrate capacities for generating inventions, concepts, or brand elements. AI-generated inventions raise fundamental questions because patent law requires inventorship to be attributed to a human who conceives the inventive step, a requirement that excludes algorithms from being named inventors regardless of their technical contributions (Rinkerman, 2023). Scholars observe that while AI-assisted inventions are increasingly common, the inability to recognize AI as an inventor forces legal systems to attribute inventorship to designers, operators, or those who interpret the system's outputs, even when these human contributions may be limited or tangential to the inventive process (Munshi & Barai, 2022). Trademark law faces similar challenges as AI-generated brand elements—such as logos, slogans, or product designs—become widespread, raising concerns about originality, distinctiveness, and the potential for automated generation to produce marks that unintentionally resemble existing protected elements (Gross, 2023). The risk of similarity heightens the likelihood of confusion and infringement, particularly because AI systems may inadvertently replicate stylistic patterns embedded in their training data, thereby complicating trademark examination and enforcement processes (Liu et al., 2023).

As traditional copyright, patent, and trademark frameworks struggle to accommodate the complexities of AI-driven creativity, scholars increasingly explore alternative IP and non-IP mechanisms as potential means of protection. Database rights provide one such avenue, especially within jurisdictions that recognize the substantial investment required to curate and structure training datasets used to develop generative models (Bysaga et al., 2023). These rights protect the labor and resources involved in assembling large-scale datasets even when the contents themselves are not original, creating a supplementary layer of protection that indirectly supports AI-generated creativity by safeguarding the underlying data infrastructure. Neighboring rights offer another possible mechanism, as some jurisdictions extend protection to individuals involved in production or dissemination even when they are not traditional authors, raising the possibility of granting related rights to users or developers who facilitate AI-based creation (An, 2023). However, such proposals remain controversial because neighboring rights were historically designed for performers, broadcasters, or producers, not algorithmically generated content.

Trade secret protection has emerged as a critical tool for safeguarding the proprietary components of AI systems, including training datasets, model architectures, and algorithmic parameters. Because many developers decline to disclose dataset sources or model training methodologies, trade secrets allow companies to protect competitive advantages while avoiding the transparency obligations that accompany some forms of IP protection (Pınarbaşı et al., 2023). Yet reliance on trade secrets exacerbates concerns about bias, accountability, and opacity, particularly as undisclosed training data may incorporate copyrighted works, culturally sensitive materials, or inaccurate information (Shaista Peerzada Saurabh, 2023). Contractual frameworks, including terms of service, licensing agreements, and platform-based ownership regimes, further shape the distribution of rights by determining how users can exploit AI-generated outputs. Some platforms grant users broad rights to reproduce or commercialize outputs, while others reserve ownership or impose restrictions on derivative use, reflecting an

increasingly fragmented regulatory environment shaped more by private contracts than public law (Deck, 2023). As generative AI becomes essential to creative, commercial, and industrial processes, these alternative mechanisms highlight how the future of IP protection may rely as much on contractual and technical governance as on traditional legal doctrines.

6. Regulatory and Policy Responses

Regulatory and policy responses to AI-generated creativity have expanded rapidly as governments, international organizations, and industry actors attempt to reconcile traditional intellectual property doctrines with emerging technological realities. National legislative approaches provide valuable insight into how jurisdictions conceptualize authorship, originality, and ownership when creative works emerge from automated or hybrid processes. In the United States, policymakers consistently reaffirm the principle that copyright protection requires human authorship, a position reflected in administrative decisions and public guidance specifying that AI-generated outputs lacking meaningful human creative input fall outside the scope of protectable works (Rinkerman, 2023). This trajectory emphasizes the preservation of established originality doctrine but has been criticized for failing to address the complexities of human–machine creative collaboration, especially as prompting and iterative refinement become integral components of the creative workflow (Militsyna, 2023). The European Union advances a parallel position grounded in the notion of personal intellectual creation, while simultaneously exploring broader AI governance mechanisms through regulatory instruments that focus on risk management, accountability, and transparency in automated systems (ÇEbİ et al., 2023). This dual approach reflects a commitment to harmonizing fundamental copyright principles with emerging technological standards, yet scholars warn that strict authorship requirements may leave significant gaps in protection for outputs that do not fit neatly into human-centered models (Bysaga et al., 2023).

The United Kingdom occupies a distinctive space within this debate through the longstanding provision in its copyright law that assigns authorship of computer-generated works to the individual who undertakes arrangements necessary for creation, a rule increasingly revisited in light of generative AI's growing autonomy (Atilla, 2023). While this provision offers a potentially adaptable model, analysts argue that its vague criteria may prove inadequate for determining creative responsibility in contemporary AI systems characterized by opaque internal processes and probabilistic generation (Hutson & Lang, 2023). Beyond Europe and the United States, Singapore has become a prominent innovator in AI governance by promoting flexible legal interpretations that support technological development while encouraging responsible data practices, offering a model that balances innovation with safeguards aimed at mitigating ethical and economic risks (Liu et al., 2023). China likewise demonstrates increasing engagement with AI-centered intellectual property debates through policy experiments and regulatory proposals that emphasize both industrial growth and legal clarity, particularly in contexts involving commercial AI-generated content or large-scale training datasets (An, 2023). Across these jurisdictions, national responses reveal significant strengths in doctrinal consistency and technological adaptability but also substantial weaknesses, including uncertainty regarding enforceability, inconsistencies in treatment of hybrid works, and insufficient attention to attribution and ethical concerns (Fernández, 2023).

International harmonization remains one of the most challenging dimensions of AI-related intellectual property governance. Global copyright systems were developed under conditions in which authorship and originality were presumed to be human-centered, leaving international organizations to debate how much flexibility should be introduced to accommodate algorithmic creativity. WIPO's ongoing discussions illustrate growing disagreement among member states about whether AI-generated works require new categories of protection, modifications to existing frameworks, or a combination of both (Pınarbaşı et al., 2023). These debates highlight tensions between countries that emphasize innovation incentives and those that prioritize safeguarding human creativity. Cross-border infringement issues add further complexity, as AI systems trained in one jurisdiction may generate outputs in another using datasets that include copyrighted works sourced globally, raising questions about which laws govern infringement, how damages should be assessed, and who bears responsibility for violations (Díaz-Noci, 2023). Enforcement becomes increasingly difficult because algorithmic transparency is limited and generative systems can produce similar outputs for different users, complicating determinations of authorship, copying, and liability (Gross, 2023). The lack of shared legal standards risks creating regulatory fragmentation that may hinder the development of consistent

international protections and undermine efforts to address cultural, ethical, and economic concerns associated with automated creativity.

In light of these challenges, scholars and policymakers have proposed a range of future-oriented protection models designed to clarify authorship, enhance transparency, and ensure fair attribution in hybrid creative environments. One prominent proposal involves establishing a new category of "AI-assisted authorship," which would recognize the distinctive nature of works created through human-machine collaboration while preserving the requirement of meaningful human contribution (Militsyna, 2023). Such a category could articulate clear standards for what constitutes creative input, allowing courts and regulators to distinguish between trivial prompting and substantive artistic direction. Other proposals advocate hybrid authorship frameworks that explicitly allocate rights among users, developers, and platform operators depending on their contributions to the creative process, a model that reflects the distributed nature of generative workflows (Deck, 2023). Some scholars support presumptive human ownership for outputs generated through consumer or professional tools, arguing that users should benefit from default rights unless evidence indicates otherwise (Hutson & Lang, 2023). Transparency obligations also feature prominently in many reform proposals, particularly as analysts emphasize that disclosure of training data sources, model capabilities, and generation procedures is essential for resolving attribution dilemmas, reducing bias, and ensuring ethical integrity in AI-mediated creativity (Shaista Peerzada Saurabh, 2023). Collectively, these proposals highlight the need for regulatory innovation that acknowledges the transformative nature of AI-generated creativity while safeguarding human artistic contributions and cultural authenticity.

7. Conclusion

The rapid evolution of generative artificial intelligence has fundamentally reshaped the landscape of creative production, challenging long-standing legal assumptions about authorship, originality, and ownership. As algorithms become increasingly capable of producing expressive works that resemble or even surpass human-generated compositions, intellectual property frameworks face a conceptual and practical turning point. The traditional foundations of creativity in law—intent, personal expression, skill, and labor—no longer fit neatly within environments where outputs can emerge without a clear human imagination or conscious decision-making. These disruptions reveal the need for a deeper re-examination of the values underlying intellectual property protection and the purposes it serves in modern cultural and economic systems.

The central challenge lies in reconciling existing doctrines with new creative realities. Intellectual property law was built on the premise that creative works originate from human minds, yet generative systems now demonstrate the capacity to analyze, synthesize, and produce content at scale. This disconnect creates uncertainty for creators, developers, industries, and policymakers, all of whom require predictable rules to navigate the growing presence of AI in artistic, scientific, commercial, and cultural fields. The questions raised by AI go beyond doctrinal interpretation and touch on broader philosophical debates about what it means to create, who is recognized as an author, and how societies attribute value to creative expression. These debates will continue to shape both legal reform and cultural discourse in the years ahead.

Exploring the issue of authorship highlights the core of the challenge. Human–AI collaboration complicates the process of identifying who should be credited for a work and to what extent. Creative direction, prompt engineering, selection, and curation now play a significant role in guiding AI outputs, blurring the distinction between human intention and algorithmic execution. Determining authorship requires clarifying the boundaries of meaningful human contribution, distinguishing between incidental interaction and genuine creative agency. As generative tools become more intuitive, the difficulty of articulating these boundaries will only increase, making authorship one of the most contested areas in future policy discussions.

Originality and creativity face similar pressures. Intellectual property law expects works to reflect an individual's personal expression, yet algorithmic models operate through pattern recognition and statistical recombination rather than intentional creative choices. Although AI-generated works can display novelty, complexity, and aesthetic coherence, their lack of human consciousness raises questions about whether traditional originality standards can or should be applied. The distinction between transformation and reproduction becomes increasingly subtle as models trained on large datasets incorporate stylistic elements, thematic patterns, and expressive variations from pre-existing works. These issues highlight the need for updated originality criteria capable of addressing the reality of algorithmic synthesis while preserving the integrity of human creative interests.

Protection models also require rethinking. Traditional copyright rules often fail to address outputs without a clear human author, prompting proposals for new categories of rights or hybrid frameworks that reflect the shared nature of AI-driven creation. Policymakers must consider how rights should be allocated among users, developers, and platform operators, particularly when all parties contribute in different ways to the creation and dissemination of AI-generated content. At the same time, patent and trademark systems must confront similar tensions as AI begins to play a larger role in generating inventions and brand elements. The boundaries of inventorship, distinctiveness, and creativity will need clearer articulation as automated systems contribute more extensively to innovation and identity formation across industries.

Regulatory responses across jurisdictions reveal both promising developments and significant gaps. Some countries emphasize strict human authorship requirements to preserve traditional principles, while others explore more flexible interpretations that support technological growth. However, no single jurisdiction has yet produced a comprehensive solution, leaving creators and industries to navigate inconsistent national policies and uncertain international standards. The lack of harmonization presents challenges for global enforcement, especially as AI systems operate across borders, training on data sourced worldwide and generating outputs with unclear legal provenance. International cooperation will be essential to addressing these complexities, ensuring that protections remain meaningful in a global, digital environment.

Ethical concerns further complicate the legal landscape. Issues such as cultural appropriation, embedded bias, attribution fairness, and transparency highlight the broader societal implications of AI-generated creativity. Ethical governance will need to evolve alongside legal frameworks to ensure that the use of generative technologies promotes inclusion, respects cultural heritage, and maintains accountability for automated systems. As AI becomes increasingly integrated into creative industries, ethical considerations will play a central role in shaping public trust and legitimizing regulatory choices.

Ultimately, the future of intellectual property protection in AI-generated creativity depends on the ability of law and policy to adapt thoughtfully to technological transformation. This requires balancing the need to protect human creators, promote innovation, and ensure equitable cultural participation. It also requires recognizing that AI is not simply a tool but a transformative medium that reshapes how societies understand creativity, authorship, and value. A forward-looking regulatory approach must embrace this complexity, developing flexible and principled frameworks that reflect the evolving nature of creative production. In doing so, policymakers can ensure that intellectual property systems remain relevant, fair, and supportive of both human ingenuity and technological progress in the decades to come.

Ethical Considerations

All procedures performed in this study were under the ethical standards.

Acknowledgments

Authors thank all participants who participate in this study.

Conflict of Interest

The authors report no conflict of interest.

Funding/Financial Support

According to the authors, this article has no financial support.

References

An, X. (2023). Legal Rights Protection of Artificial Intelligence Generated Works From the Perspective of Copyright. *The Frontiers of Society Science and Technology*, *5*(18). https://doi.org/10.25236/fsst.2023.051805

Atilla, S. (2023). Dealing With AI-generated Works: Lessons From the CDPA Section 9(3). *Journal of Intellectual Property Law & Practice*, *19*(1), 43-54. https://doi.org/10.1093/jiplp/jpad102

Birštonas, R. (2023). Risks to Employees' Intellectual Property Rights Posed by Artificial Intelligence. *Journal of the University of Latvia Law*, *16*, 49-59. https://doi.org/10.22364/jull.16.03

Bukhari, S. W. R., Hassan, S., & Aleem, Y. (2023). Impact of Artificial Intelligence on Copyright Law: Challenges and Prospects. *Journal of Law & Social Studies*, *5*(4), 647-656. https://doi.org/10.52279/jlss.05.04.647656

Bysaga, Y. M., Byelov, D. M., & Zaborovskyi, V. V. (2023). Artificial Intelligence and Copyright and Related Rights. *Uzhhorod National University Herald Series Law*, *2*(76), 299-304. https://doi.org/10.24144/2307-3322.2022.76.2.47

ÇEbİ, E., Reisoğlu, P., & Goktas, E. (2023). The Influence of Artificial Intelligence on Copyright Law. *Isslp*, *2*(2), 33-41. https://doi.org/10.61838/kman.isslp.2.2.5

Deck, A. (2023). Perspective Chapter: The Creative Surrogate. https://doi.org/10.5772/intechopen.110855

Díaz-Noci, J. (2023). Merging or Plagiarizing? The Role of Originality and Derivative Works in AI-aimed News Production. *Hipertext Net Revista Académica Sobre Documentación Digital Y Comunicación Interactiva*(26), 69-76. https://doi.org/10.31009/hipertext.net.2023.i26.11

Fernández, D. M. M. (2023). Prospective Research in the Field of Teaching Creative Skills to Artificial Intelligence. *2*(3), 34-45. https://doi.org/10.59214/cultural/3.2023.34

Goderdzishvili, T. G. T. (2023). Artificial Intelligence and Creative Thinking, the Future of Idea Generation. *Economics*, *105*(3-4), 63-73. https://doi.org/10.36962/ecs105/3-4/2023-63

Gross, E.-C. (2023). The Creative Paradox of AI: Enabler or Disruptor of Human Imagination? *Series Vii - Social Sciences and Law*, 69-74. https://doi.org/10.31926/but.ssl.2023.16.65.1.7

Hees, J. V., Grootswagers, T., Quek, G. L., & Varlet, M. (2023). Human Perception of Art in the Age of Artificial Intelligence. https://doi.org/10.31234/osf.io/kvsu3

Hutson, J., & Lang, M. (2023). Content Creation or Interpolation: AI Generative Digital Art in the Classroom. *Metaverse*, *4*(1), 13. https://doi.org/10.54517/m.v4i1.2158

Kulinich, O., & Kondyk, D. (2023). Impact of Artificial Intelligence on the Criteria of Originality in Copyright Law. *University Scientific Notes*, 43-56. https://doi.org/10.37491/unz.93-94.4

Liu, J., Niu, Y., Jia, Z., & Wang, R. (2023). Assessing the Ethical Implications of Artificial Intelligence Integration in Media Production and Its Impact on the Creative Industry. *Medaad*, *2023*, 32-38. https://doi.org/10.70470/medaad/2023/005

Militsyna, K. (2023). Human Creative Contribution to AI-Based Output – One Just Can('t) Get Enough. *GRUR International*, *72*(10), 939-949. https://doi.org/10.1093/grurint/ikad075

Munshi, M. F., & Barai, S. (2022). IP Rights to AI-Generated Works: Barriers Presented by Existing Law and Reformations Needed. *Canadian Journal of Business and Information Studies*, 37-46. https://doi.org/10.34104/cjbis.022.037046

Pınarbaşı, F., Çakır, F. S., Gültekin, D. G., Yazıcı, M., & Adıgüzel, Z. (2023). Examination of the Effects of Value Creation, Intellectual Property And organizational Creativity On artificial Intelligence Focused Enterprises. *Business Process Management Journal*, *30*(1), 317-337. https://doi.org/10.1108/bpmj-07-2023-0551

Rinkerman, G. (2023). Artificial Intelligence and Evolving Issues Under US Copyright and Patent Law. *Interactive Entertainment Law Review*, *6*(2), 48-65. https://doi.org/10.4337/ielr.2023.0002

Shaista Peerzada Saurabh, R. W. (2023). AI and Copyright. *TJJPT*, *44*(3), 3431-3439. https://doi.org/10.52783/tjjpt.v44.i3.2053

Shin, H. (2023). The Artistic Potential of Artificial Intelligence Considered Through Review of AlphaGo. *Korean Soc Cult Converg*, *45*(8), 509-520. https://doi.org/10.33645/cnc.2023.08.45.08.509

Vinchon, F., Gironnay, V., & Lubart, T. (2023). The Creative AI-Land: Exploring New Forms of Creativity. https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-3226749/v1