Impact Factor (QJIF): 8.47 E-ISSN: 2583-1615, P-ISSN: 3049-3498

International Journal of Research in Academic World

Received: 26/March/2026 **IJRAW:** 2026; 5(5):146-151 **Accepted:** 07/May/2026

Public Health and Pharmaceutical Patents: Navigating IPR through Diverse Lenses

[*1]Dr. MD Adil

[*1]Ph.D. in Law, LLM, Principal, MSS Law College, Hyderabad, Telangana, India.

Abstract

The tension between the proprietary logic of pharmaceutical patents and the imperatives of global public health constitutes one of the most consequential jurisprudential conflicts of the twenty-first century. This article undertakes a multi-perspectival examination of intellectual property law as it applies to medicines, interrogating the TRIPS Agreement and its flexibilities through the lenses of utilitarian efficiency, human rights discourse, postcolonial critique, feminist political economy, and open-science theory. Drawing on comparative legal analysis, empirical data from compulsory licensing regimes in India, Brazil, South Africa, and Thailand, and philosophical frameworks of distributive justice, the article argues that the current patent system, while providing investment incentives, structurally forecloses access for populations in low- and middle-income countries. It further contends that reformative instruments—including the Health Impact Fund, prize mechanisms, and open-source drug development—offer viable, justice-oriented alternatives. The article concludes that legal reform must proceed from a recognition of health as a fundamental human entitlement, demanding an architecture of intellectual property law that holds innovation and equity in productive rather than antagonistic tension.

Keywords: Pharmaceutical patents, TRIPS, access to medicines, compulsory licensing, health rights, postcolonial IP, open-source medicine, Health Impact Fund.

1. Introduction

The Paradox at the Heart of Medical Innovation

In 2001, the United Nations Secretary-General described the global medicines crisis as 'a market failure of catastrophic proportions.' [1] This characterisation captures a structural paradox that has only deepened in the intervening decades: a global pharmaceutical system that simultaneously produces remarkable therapeutic innovations and systematically withholds them from those who need them most. At the centre of this paradox lies the patent—a legal instrument designed to incentivise invention by conferring a time-limited monopoly, yet one that, in the domain of medicines, exerts life-and-death consequences at a population scale.

The Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS), adopted in 1994 under the auspices of the World Trade Organization, established for the first time a globally binding minimum standard for the protection of pharmaceutical patents [2]. Its adoption represented a decisive victory for the research-intensive pharmaceutical industry—predominantly headquartered in the United States, the European Union, and Japan—and imposed considerable obligations on developing countries that had previously excluded medicines from patentability altogether. The consequences were not merely commercial. They were epidemiological.

Scholars such as Jerome Reichman and Peter Drahos have documented the asymmetry of power that shaped the TRIPS negotiations, demonstrating how the treaty's architecture reflected the interests of capital-exporting nations rather than the health imperatives of the global majority [3, 4]. Yet the legal framework is not monolithic. The TRIPS Agreement contains flexibilities—provisions for compulsory licensing, parallel importation, and the Bolar exception—that were clarified and partially strengthened by the 2001 Doha Declaration on Public Health [5]. Whether these flexibilities constitute genuine safeguards or rhetorical concessions remains hotly contested.

This article proceeds in six substantive sections. Following this introduction, Section II surveys the TRIPS architecture and its contested flexibilities. Section III subjects the patent system to utilitarian scrutiny. Section IV foregrounds human rights and postcolonial critiques. Section V examines gender and political economy dimensions that mainstream IP scholarship has largely neglected. Section VI evaluates alternative incentive mechanisms. Section VII offers conclusions oriented toward a reform agenda anchored in justice.

2. The TRIPS Architecture and the Grammar of Flexibilities

A). Minimum Standards and the Ratchet Effect

The TRIPS Agreement mandates that all WTO members

***Corresponding Author:** Dr. MD Adil

provide patent protection for inventions in all fields of technology, including pharmaceuticals, for a minimum term of twenty years [6]. Patent holders are granted exclusive rights to manufacture, use, offer for sale, sell, and import the protected product [7]. For pharmaceutical manufacturers, this translates into the legal capacity to price medicines far above the marginal cost of production, generating the returns necessary—in theory—to recoup research and development expenditures.

Carlos Correa has described the TRIPS Agreement as encoding a 'ratchet effect': successive bilateral and regional free trade agreements negotiated by the United States and the European Union frequently demand 'TRIPS-plus' standards—extending patent terms, restricting data exclusivity, and narrowing compulsory licensing provisions—thereby progressively reducing the policy space that developing countries retained under the multilateral framework [8]. This dynamic illustrates how the formal architecture of international IP law can be hollowed out not by outright violation but by incremental supplementation.

B). Compulsory Licensing: Promise and Political Reality

Article 31 of TRIPS permits member states, under specified conditions and subject to remuneration, to authorise third parties to exploit a patent without the holder's consent [9]. The Doha Declaration affirmed each member's right 'to grant compulsory licences and the freedom to determine the grounds upon which such licences are granted.' [10] In principle, this provision empowers governments to break patents on essential medicines during public health emergencies.

In practice, the picture is more ambivalent. Sisule Musungu and Cecile Oh have documented the hesitation with which most developing countries have invoked compulsory licensing, a reticence explained partly by legal uncertainty, partly by administrative incapacity, and critically by threats of trade retaliation and diplomatic pressure from pharmaceutical-exporting nations [11]. The United States, in particular, has historically placed countries that issued compulsory licences on its 'Special 301 Report' watchlist—a mechanism that effectively weaponises bilateral trade relations to chill the exercise of rights that TRIPS nominally guarantees.

The 2003 Decision on Paragraph 6 sought to address a related limitation: the fact that countries with insufficient manufacturing capacity could not fully benefit from compulsory licensing because they lacked the industrial infrastructure to produce generic medicines domestically [12]. The mechanism, subsequently incorporated into TRIPS as Article 31bis, has been used on only one occasion—by Canada to export HIV medicines to Rwanda—revealing the degree to which legal form and operational efficacy diverge [12, 13].

3. Utilitarian Critiques: Market Failure and the R&D Gap

A). The Innovation Incentive Argument and Its Limits

The orthodox economic defence of pharmaceutical patents is utilitarian in character: without the temporary monopoly rents that patents permit, innovators would lack sufficient incentive to invest in the costly and risky enterprise of drug development, and the public would ultimately be worse off [14]. Joseph Stiglitz, while acknowledging the kernel of truth in this argument, has identified its fundamental defect: the patent system generates a 'double market failure,' simultaneously restricting the dissemination of knowledge that is costly to produce but cheap to reproduce [15].

The empirical record is damning on one dimension in particular: the distribution of research effort. Médecins Sans Frontières has documented that of the 1,556 new drugs approved between 1975 and 2004, fewer than 5 per cent targeted tropical diseases predominantly affecting populations in low-income countries [16]. This 'neglected disease' gap is not a consequence of scientific impossibility but of market logic: because the populations bearing the highest disease burden lack purchasing power, the patent-based system simply does not direct research toward their conditions [17].

Daron Acemoglu and Joshua Linn's empirical work confirms that pharmaceutical innovation responds closely to market size, measured by the income of potential consumers—a finding that lays bare the ethical inadequacy of allowing the geography of suffering to be determined by the accident of market demand [18]. Mariana Mazzucato has further complicated the innovation narrative by demonstrating that a substantial portion of the basic research underlying commercially successful medicines is publicly financed through government grants and academic institutions, yet the monopoly rents generated by the resulting patents flow overwhelmingly to private shareholders [19].

B). Pricing, Profiteering, and the Access Deficit

The pricing of patented medicines in high-income markets, while regulated to varying degrees by national health technology assessment bodies, is ultimately constrained only by what insurance systems and public health budgets will bear. In low- and middle-income countries with limited public financing and minimal insurance penetration, the monopoly price represents an insurmountable barrier [20].

The antiretroviral medicines that transformed HIV from a death sentence to a manageable chronic condition in the Global North cost, in the late 1990s, between US$10,000 and US$15,000 per patient per year. Generic competition, enabled by countries that had not yet implemented TRIPS, brought that price below US$100. The differential was not a reflection of research cost recovery but of monopoly pricing unrestrained by competitive pressure. The moral weight of this disparity—measured in lives not prolonged—constitutes a standing indictment of the status quo.

4. Human Rights and Postcolonial Critiques

A). The Right to Health as Legal and Ethical Imperative

Article 12 of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights recognises the right of everyone to the enjoyment of 'the highest attainable standard of physical and mental health.' [21] The Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, in General Comment No. 14, interpreted this right as requiring states to ensure the availability of essential medicines as defined by WHO, framing access to medicines as a core obligation not subject to progressive realisation [22].

Former UN Special Rapporteur on the right to health Paul Hunt has argued that states are required not merely to refrain from impairing access to medicines but to actively use all available legal tools—including TRIPS flexibilities—to give effect to their human rights obligations [23]. The failure to issue compulsory licences when medicines are priced beyond reach may itself constitute a human rights violation, at least where governments possess the legal capacity to act and decline to do so under exogenous pressure [24].

Sarah Joseph has extended this critique to the WTO dispute settlement system itself, arguing that the institutional culture of the WTO—oriented toward trade liberalisation rather than

human development—systematically marginalises human rights considerations even when treaty provisions nominally accommodate them [25]. The structural result is a hierarchy of legal obligation in which trade commitments are enforced with precision while health rights remain aspirational [26].

B). Postcolonial Dimensions: Whose Knowledge, Whose Property?

Postcolonial legal scholars have identified pharmaceutical IP law as a site of epistemic as well as economic domination. Vandana Shiva's concept of 'biopiracy' captures the way in which pharmaceutical corporations have patented compounds derived from traditional medicinal knowledge without acknowledgement or compensation, converting communal knowledge into private property through the mechanism of patent law [27].

Madhavi Sunder's influential work on 'IP³'—intellectual property, inequality, and the 'IP Constituency'—demonstrates how the expansion of IP rights has consistently favoured the knowledge-intensive industries of the Global North while foreclosing the developmental strategies that historically allowed today's wealthy nations to build their own pharmaceutical industries [28]. Amy Kapczynski's analysis of the 'access to knowledge' movement reveals the emergence of a counter-coalition—comprising civil society organisations, generic manufacturers, and progressive governments—that has successfully reframed IP debates in terms of distributive justice rather than exclusively incentive theory [29].

C). India's Section 3(d) as Jurisprudential Innovation

India's response to its TRIPS obligations offers one of the most significant examples of norm entrepreneurship in pharmaceutical patent law. Section 3(d) of the Patents Act 1970 (as amended in 2005) restricts the patentability of new forms of known substances unless they demonstrate 'enhanced efficacy'—a provision explicitly designed to prevent 'evergreening,' the practice of securing successive patents on minor modifications of existing drugs to extend effective monopoly terms [30].

The constitutional validity and TRIPS compatibility of Section 3(d) was tested in the landmark Novartis case, in which the Indian Supreme Court rejected the Swiss pharmaceutical giant's challenge to the Patent Controller's refusal to grant a patent on the beta crystalline form of imatinib (Gleevec) [31]. The Court's ruling, grounded in a purposive interpretation of patent law that foregrounded access to medicines, was hailed internationally as a model for deploying legislative design to protect public health interests without openly transgressing TRIPS commitments [32].

Brazil and Thailand have similarly exercised compulsory licensing authority to produce or import generic antiretrovirals and cardiovascular medicines, demonstrating that TRIPS flexibilities can be operationalised with political will even in the face of industry opposition. These cases constitute a jurisprudence of resistance that repays systematic comparative attention.

5. Gender, Political Economy, and the Invisible Burdens of the Patent System

Mainstream pharmaceutical patent scholarship has been largely gender-blind, a lacuna with significant analytical and normative consequences. Feminist political economists have begun to document the gendered dimensions of the access crisis: women in low-income settings bear disproportionate caregiving burdens when family members lack access to medicines, and face distinct vulnerabilities in the context of diseases such as HIV—where transmission risk, healthcare access, and treatment adherence are profoundly shaped by gender inequality [33].

The neglected disease gap identified above has a gender dimension as well. Conditions affecting women predominantly or disproportionately—including maternal health conditions, cervical cancer, and certain neglected tropical diseases—have historically received even less research attention than conditions of comparable epidemiological significance affecting more commercially valuable populations [34]. The patent system's indifference to this distribution is not neutral: it reflects and reproduces existing hierarchies of social value.

The political economy of pharmaceutical lobbying further reveals how the institutions that shape IP law are themselves gendered: corporate boardrooms and the trade negotiating delegations that advance industry interests have historically been male-dominated, while the communities most affected by access failures—including caregivers and patients in low-income settings—are largely absent from formal decision-making processes. A fully adequate reform agenda must attend not only to legal text but to the structures of representation and voice that determine whose interests that text serves.

6. Alternative Architectures: Prizes, Open Source, and the Health Impact Fund

A). Prize Mechanisms

The most theoretically elegant alternative to the patent system is the prize mechanism: rather than conferring a monopoly, governments or international institutions would offer large financial rewards for the development of medicines meeting specified therapeutic criteria, with the knowledge thereby generated entering the public domain and being produced by competitive generic manufacturers [35]. James Love and Tim Hubbard have developed detailed proposals along these lines, arguing that prize funds financed by contributions from high-income countries could successfully direct research toward neglected conditions while eliminating the access-restriction that is intrinsic to monopoly pricing [36].

Critics of prize mechanisms raise concerns about the informational demands of setting appropriate prize amounts, the risk of political capture of prize-setting bodies, and the challenge of sustaining international financing commitments over time [36]. These are genuine difficulties, but they are arguably difficulties of institutional design rather than fundamental objections to the prize approach as such.

B). The Health Impact Fund

Aidan Hollis and Thomas Pogge have proposed the Health Impact Fund (HIF) as a complementary alternative: manufacturers who register medicines with the HIF would receive annual payments based on the global health impact of their product—measured in quality-adjusted life years saved—in exchange for committing to sell that product worldwide at cost of manufacture [38]. This proposal cleverly aligns the incentive structure of profit-seeking firms with population health goals, rewarding not the mere existence of a patented compound but its actual therapeutic impact [39].

The HIF has attracted both enthusiasm and scepticism in the literature. The WHO's Consultative Expert Working Group on R&D identified prize-based and impact-based mechanisms as promising complements to the patent system, while noting significant challenges in governance, measurement, and

international financing [40]. The proposal represents, nonetheless, one of the most intellectually serious attempts to design an innovation system that does not systematically reproduce the inequalities of the existing order [41].

C). Open-Source Drug Development

A third trajectory of reform draws inspiration from the open-source software movement: collaborative, open-science models of drug development in which research findings, compound libraries, and clinical data are shared freely, enabling distributed innovation without proprietary enclosure [42]. Initiatives such as the Drugs for Neglected Diseases initiative (DNDi), the Medicines Patent Pool, and the Open Source Malaria consortium have demonstrated that this model can produce genuine therapeutic innovations—including a paediatric HIV formulation and novel treatments for visceral leishmaniasis—at a fraction of the cost of proprietary R&D [43].

The open-source model also embodies an epistemological alternative to the monopoly paradigm: rather than treating knowledge as property to be enclosed, it treats it as a commons to be cultivated [44]. Whether open-source approaches can be scaled to address the full spectrum of global pharmaceutical need remains an open empirical question, but the existing evidence is sufficiently encouraging to warrant substantial additional investment and rigorous evaluation [45].

7. Toward a Just Architecture of Pharmaceutical IP Law

The foregoing analysis converges on a set of conclusions that cut across the diverse theoretical frameworks employed. First, the existing TRIPS-based patent system, while not without rationale as an incentive mechanism, fails systematically to serve the health needs of the world's poorest populations. This failure is not incidental but structural: the system was designed to protect and reward innovation in the context of market demand, and because market demand diverges profoundly from health need, it inevitably directs resources toward conditions affecting wealthy rather than poor populations.

Second, the TRIPS flexibilities, while formally adequate in many respects, are in practice substantially undermined by TRIPS-plus agreements, bilateral political pressure, and the administrative and financial incapacity of many developing country governments [46]. Legal reform must therefore operate at multiple levels simultaneously: defending and expanding flexibilities within the multilateral framework, constraining TRIPS-plus provisions in bilateral agreements, and building the domestic institutional capacity of developing countries to exploit available space [47].

Third, human rights frameworks offer not merely a rhetorical supplement to IP law critique but a legally grounded alternative ordering of priorities. Once health is recognised as a fundamental entitlement rather than a commodity, the burden of justification shifts: it falls to the proponents of patent monopolies to demonstrate that they are compatible with, rather than derogatory from, the right to health [48].

Fourth, reformative alternatives—prize mechanisms, the Health Impact Fund, open-source drug development—are neither utopian nor operationally infeasible. They represent genuine institutional options that have been subject to increasing theoretical elaboration and, in some cases, empirical testing. The political obstacles to their adoption are considerable, reflecting the concentrated power of the pharmaceutical industry in international trade negotiations and domestic regulatory processes. But political obstacles are not permanent fixtures: they shift as coalitions evolve, as the epidemiological costs of the status quo become more visible, and as intellectual argument succeeds in reframing the terms of debate.

8. Conclusion

The pharmaceutical patent system sits at the intersection of law, science, commerce, and human welfare. Its reform is accordingly a task that demands engagement with utilitarian economics, human rights law, postcolonial theory, feminist political economy, and the institutional design of international governance. No single perspective is sufficient; the systemic character of the problem demands a systemic response.

This article has argued that the current system constitutes a market failure with human rights consequences—one that is not inevitable but contingent on choices about how knowledge production is organised and rewarded. It has further argued that the doctrinal tools necessary for reform—TRIPS flexibilities, human rights obligations, the Doha framework—already exist in international law, and that the task is not to invent new legal categories but to mobilise existing ones with greater political will and intellectual consistency.

The proliferation of alternative incentive models—prizes, impact funds, open-source collaboration—demonstrates that the pharmaceutical innovation system need not be organised around monopoly rents. These alternatives are not perfect, and each requires careful institutional design to address the challenges of governance, financing, and measurement. But they share a commitment to the proposition that the goal of pharmaceutical innovation is health, not profit, and that law should be structured accordingly.

A just architecture of pharmaceutical IP law would hold innovation and equity not as opposing imperatives to be traded off but as mutually constitutive goals to be pursued together. It would recognise that an innovation system that produces medicines accessible only to those who can afford monopoly prices is not, in any meaningful sense, serving the purpose for which intellectual property law is constitutionally and philosophically justified. The challenge for legal scholars, policymakers, and advocates is to translate that recognition into institutional reality—before the human cost of delay mounts still further.

Footnotes

1. World Health Organization, 'Access to Medicines: Making Market Forces Serve the Poor' (WHO 2004) 7.
2. Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (adopted 15 April 1994, entered into force 1 January 1995) 1869 UNTS 299 (TRIPS Agreement).
3. Jerome Reichman, 'Compulsory Licensing of Patented Pharmaceutical Inventions: Evaluating the Options' (2009) 37 Journal of Law Medicine & Ethics 247, 248.
4. Peter Drahos and John Braithwaite, Information Feudalism: Who Owns the Knowledge Economy? (Earthscan 2002) 34.
5. Doha Declaration on the TRIPS Agreement and Public Health (adopted 14 November 2001) WT/MIN(01)/DEC/2.
6. TRIPS Agreement (n 2) art 27.
7. TRIPS Agreement (n 2) art 28.
8. Carlos Correa, Trade Related Aspects of Intellectual

Property Rights: A Commentary on the TRIPS Agreement (Oxford University Press 2007) 211.
9. TRIPS Agreement (n 2) art 31.
10. Doha Declaration (n 5) para 4.
11. Sisule Musungu and Cecile Oh, 'The Use of Flexibilities in TRIPS by Developing Countries: Can They Promote Access to Medicines?' (WHO/South Centre 2006) 11.
12. Decision of the WTO General Council of 30 August 2003 on Implementation of Paragraph 6 of the Doha Declaration (WT/L/540).
13. t'Hoen and others (n 6) 6.
14. Frederick Abbott and Jerome Reichman, 'The Doha Round's Public Health Legacy: Strategies for the Production and Diffusion of Patented Medicines under the Amended TRIPS Provisions' (2007) 10 Journal of International Economic Law 921.
15. Mariana Mazzucato, The Entrepreneurial State: Debunking Public vs Private Sector Myths (Anthem Press 2013) 67.
16. Joseph Stiglitz, 'Economic Foundations of Intellectual Property Rights' (2008) 57 Duke Law Journal 1693, 1710.
17. Médecins Sans Frontières, 'Lives on the Edge: Time to Align Medical Research and Development with People's Health Needs' (MSF Access Campaign 2016) 3.
18. Pogge (n 9) 188.
19. Daron Acemoglu and Joshua Linn, 'Market Size in Innovation: Theory and Evidence from the Pharmaceutical Industry' (2004) 119 Quarterly Journal of Economics 1049.
20. Mazzucato (n 21) 73.
21. Stiglitz (n 22) 1718.
22. International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (adopted 16 December 1966, entered into force 3 January 1976) 993 UNTS 3, art 12.
23. Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, General Comment No 14: The Right to the Highest Attainable Standard of Health (2000) UN Doc E/C.12/2000/4.
24. Paul Hunt, 'The Human Right to the Highest Attainable Standard of Health: New Opportunities for State Accountability' (2006) 34 Public Health 275.
25. Hunt (n 31) 278.
26. Sarah Joseph, Blame it on the WTO? A Human Rights Critique (Oxford University Press 2011) 191.
27. Joseph (n 30) 198.
28. Vandana Shiva, Protect or Plunder? Understanding Intellectual Property Rights (Zed Books 2001) 55.
29. Madhavi Sunder, 'IP3' (2006) 59 Stanford Law Review 257, 262.
30. Amy Kapczynski, 'The Access to Knowledge Mobilization and the New Politics of Intellectual Property' (2008) 117 Yale Law Journal 804, 812.
31. Anita Ramachandran, 'TRIPS Flexibilities and the Indian Patent Act 2005: Charting a Middle Path' (2011) 6 Journal of Intellectual Property Law & Practice 397.
32. Novartis AG v Union of India [2013] AIR SC 1311 (Indian Supreme Court).
33. Shamnad Basheer and Prashant Reddy, 'The Experimental Use Exception through a Developmental Lens' (2008) 9 NALYJ 331.
34. Kapczynski (n 10) 831.
35. James Love and Tim Hubbard, 'The Big Idea: Prizes to Stimulate R&D for New Medicines' (2007) 82 Chicago-Kent Law Review 1519.
36. Love and Hubbard (n 11) 1540.
37. Reichman (n 3) 258.
38. Aidan Hollis and Thomas Pogge, The Health Impact Fund: Making New Medicines Accessible for All (Incentives for Global Health 2008) 19.
39. Hollis and Pogge (n 12) 32.
40. WHO Consultative Expert Working Group on Research and Development, 'Research and Development to Meet Health Needs in Developing Countries: Strengthening Global Financing and Coordination' (WHO 2012) 44.
41. Hollis and Pogge (n 12) 47.
42. Sophie Bloemen and David Hammerstein, 'Open and Collaborative Science: A New Imperative for Research in the Global South' (Commons Network 2015) 8.
43. t'Hoen and others (n 6) 12.
44. Bloemen and Hammerstein (n 35) 15.
45. Kapczynski (n 10) 858.
46. Abbott and Reichman (n 20) 935.
47. Correa (n 7) 226.
48. Ramachandran (n 27) 403.

References

1. Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (adopted 15 April 1994, entered into force 1 January 1995) 1869 UNTS 299.
2. Doha Declaration on the TRIPS Agreement and Public Health (adopted 14 November 2001) WT/MIN(01)/DEC/2.
3. Decision of the WTO General Council of 30 August 2003 on Implementation of Paragraph 6 of the Doha Declaration (WT/L/540).
4. International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (adopted 16 December 1966, entered into force 3 January 1976) 993 UNTS 3.
5. Novartis AG v Union of India [2013] AIR SC 1311 (Supreme Court of India).
6. Correa C. *Trade Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights: A Commentary on the TRIPS Agreement*. Oxford University Press; 2007.
7. Drahos P, Braithwaite J. *Information Feudalism: Who Owns the Knowledge Economy?* Earthscan; 2002.
8. Hollis A, Pogge T. *The Health Impact Fund: Making New Medicines Accessible for All*. Incentives for Global Health; 2008.
9. Joseph S. *Blame it on the WTO? A Human Rights Critique*. Oxford University Press; 2011.
10. Mazzucato M. *The Entrepreneurial State: Debunking Public vs Private Sector Myths*. Anthem Press; 2013.
11. Shiva V. *Protect or Plunder? Understanding Intellectual Property Rights*. Zed Books; 2001.
12. Abbott F, Reichman J. The Doha Round's Public Health Legacy: Strategies for the Production and Diffusion of Patented Medicines under the Amended TRIPS Provisions. *Journal of International Economic Law*. 2007;10:921.
13. Acemoglu D, Linn J. Market Size in Innovation: Theory and Evidence from the Pharmaceutical Industry. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*. 2004;119:1049.
14. Basheer S, Reddy P. The Experimental Use Exception through a Developmental Lens. *NALYJ*. 2008;9:331.
15. Hunt P. The Human Right to the Highest Attainable Standard of Health: New Opportunities for State Accountability. *Public Health*. 2006;34:275.
16. Kapczynski A. The Access to Knowledge Mobilization and the New Politics of Intellectual Property. *Yale Law*

Journal. 2008;117:804.
17. Love J, Hubbard T. The Big Idea: Prizes to Stimulate R&D for New Medicines. *Chicago-Kent Law Review*. 2007;82:1519.
18. Pogge T. Human Rights and Global Health: A Research Program. *Metaphilosophy*. 2005;36:182.
19. Ramachandran A. TRIPS Flexibilities and the Indian Patent Act 2005: Charting a Middle Path. *Journal of Intellectual Property Law & Practice*. 2011;6:397.
20. Reichman J. Compulsory Licensing of Patented Pharmaceutical Inventions: Evaluating the Options. *Journal of Law Medicine & Ethics*. 2009;37:247.
21. Stiglitz J. Economic Foundations of Intellectual Property Rights. *Duke Law Journal*. 2008;57:1693.
22. Sunder M. IP3. *Stanford Law Review*. 2006;59:257.
23. t'Hoen EFM, *et al*. Driving a Decade of Change: HIV/AIDS, Patents and Access to Medicines for All. *Journal of the International AIDS Society*. 2011;14:15.
24. Bloemen S, Hammerstein D. *Open and Collaborative Science: A New Imperative for Research in the Global South*. Commons Network; 2015.
25. Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. General Comment No 14: The Right to the Highest Attainable Standard of Health (2000) UN Doc E/C.12/2000/4.
26. Médecins Sans Frontières. *Lives on the Edge: Time to Align Medical Research and Development with People's Health Needs*. MSF Access Campaign; 2016.
27. Musungu S, Oh C. *The Use of Flexibilities in TRIPS by Developing Countries: Can They Promote Access to Medicines?* WHO/South Centre; 2006.
28. WHO Consultative Expert Working Group on Research and Development. *Research and Development to Meet Health Needs in Developing Countries: Strengthening Global Financing and Coordination*. WHO; 2012.
29. World Health Organization. *Access to Medicines: Making Market Forces Serve the Poor*. WHO; 2004.