Chapter 13
Safeguarding Educational Innovations Amid AI Disruptions:
A Reassessment of Patenting for Sustained Intellectual Property Protection

Jivulter C. Mangubat
https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6596-1329
Cebu Technological University, Philippines

Milcah R. Mangubat
https://orcid.org/0009-0003-3239-4622
Cebu Technological University, Philippines

Timoteo Bernardo L. Uy
https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4368-3588
Cebu Technological University, Philippines

Dharel P. Acut
https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9608-1292
Cebu Technological University, Philippines

Manuel B. Garcia
https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2615-422X
FEU Institute of Technology, Philippines

ABSTRACT

In an era marked by rapid technological advancement, protecting the intellectual property (IP) of educational innovations has become more critical than ever. This chapter examines the intersection of educational innovation, artificial intelligence (AI), and IP protection. Patents, which safeguard the technical and functional aspects of inventions, are crucial for protecting these advancements amid rapid technological disruptions. As discussed in the chapter, several challenges are posed by AI in generating and managing IP, including the need to redefine inventorship, address skill obsolescence, and ensure

equitable IP frameworks. Despite the importance of addressing these issues to foster innovation, they remain underexplored in the existing literature. Therefore, this chapter calls for a reassessment of existing legal and procedural frameworks to adapt to the evolving IP landscape and sustain the integrity of educational innovations. Overall, this chapter aims to contribute to the development of robust strategies for safeguarding educational innovations in an AI-driven era.

INTRODUCTION

As a social institution, education champions innovation to address the demands of a rapidly changing globalized world (Segarra et al., 2024; Serdyukov, 2017). The need for quality improvement in the curriculum and the desire to produce students with 21st-century competency skills have made innovation the core emphasis in the educational context (Acut et al., 2025; Fuad et al., 2020). As posited by Garcia (2023), school cultures that cultivate innovation should be consequently developed and encouraged extensively. At its core, educational innovation thrives on the ability to formulate and integrate new ideas, tools, and methodologies into teaching and learning. For instance, the integration of technology in classrooms has spurred the development of interactive tools such as gamified learning platforms (Mustafa et al., 2022), personalized education systems (Mishra et al., 2024), serious games (Arif et al., 2025), virtual reality simulations (Petil et al., 2025), machine learning (Maaliw et al., 2023), knowledge-based system (Garcia et al., 2021), and even artificial intelligence (AI) technologies (Hasanah et al., 2025). Through such innovations, educational institutions create assets with significant societal and economic value. These educational assets are intellectual capital that embodies creativity, research, and innovation. They have the potential to reshape industries, create new revenue streams, and establish competitive advantages for institutions. Therefore, these educational innovations often qualify as intellectual property (IP), including patents for technological advancements, copyrights for curriculum designs, and trademarks for branded learning tools.

Protecting assets through IP frameworks is essential to ensure their creators—whether they are educators, researchers, or institutions—retain the rights and benefits derived from their use. Robust IP protection not only incentivizes innovation but also safeguards against unauthorized replication or misuse. However, the IP landscape is evolving with the rise of *artificial inventors*, with advanced AI systems no longer just tools to support human creativity (Garcia, 2024). These AI systems are increasingly capable of producing outputs that resemble those traditionally considered IP, such as algorithms, educational tools, and creative content. While debates are ongoing about whether such machine-generated creations meet the legal and conceptual criteria for IP, their potential to generate valuable innovations cannot be ignored. Some legal experts (e.g., Picht & Thouvenin, 2023) have even argued that the law should be amended to allow the designation of AI systems as inventors to provide clarity in ownership disputes. With the intensifying AI disruptions, a cautious reassessment of IP frameworks is crucial to ensuring fairness and protecting educational innovations.

MAIN FOCUS OF THE CHAPTER

The goal of this chapter is to examine the intersection of AI integration and patent registration for educational innovations. Among the various forms of intellectual property, patents stand out as a powerful tool for protecting innovations. Unlike copyrights, which safeguard creative expressions, or trademarks, which protect brand identity, patents specifically address the technical and functional aspects of new inventions. This specificity makes patents particularly suited for safeguarding educational technologies and methodologies that introduce novel processes, systems, or devices. It also aims to explore how AI technologies are reshaping the IP landscape in terms of opportunities and challenges in safeguarding the integrity of IP processes. Key concerns include skill obsolescence, where reliance on AI-driven tools may erode traditional expertise in patent law and technical assessments, and ethical issues related to recognizing AI-generated inventions as legitimate IP. The chapter seeks to provide a balanced analysis to protect inventors' rights while maintaining high standards in patent registration outcomes.

IMPACT OF AI INTEGRATION ON PATENT REGISTRATION

The integration of AI into the field of IP is significantly transforming how inventions and creative works are managed, protected, and commercialized (Cuntz et al., 2024). According to the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO, 2019), AI technologies are being utilized across various stages of the IP process, including automated patent searches, prior art analysis, and even drafting patent claims. The goal is to improve the speed and accuracy of patent examinations, reducing backlogs and enhancing the quality of granted patents (Setchi et al., 2021). For instance, AI tools can rapidly analyze extensive databases to identify prior art and suggest technical terms to structure patent applications (Elahi et al., 2023). These advancements represent a significant shift in how IP processes are conducted, highlighting the growing influence of AI in shaping modern IP frameworks. However, this transformation raises important considerations for the future of IP practices, particularly in ensuring that existing frameworks can accommodate the evolving role of AI in innovation and patent registration. Adapting to this new landscape is essential to maintain the integrity and fairness of IP systems as AI continues to redefine traditional approaches (Cuntz et al., 2024; Patel & Sahi, 2024; WIPO, 2024).

AI as a Catalyst of Innovation, Design, and Patent Processes

AI is significantly reshaping the landscape of innovation and design, providing new tools and methods to enhance creative processes (Sreenivasan & Suresh, 2024). AI systems have the capability to analyze vast amounts of data and generate novel solutions that would otherwise be beyond the scope of human designers or inventors. In industries such as pharmaceuticals, automotive, and electronics, AI has already been applied to create optimized designs and identify new technological solutions (Malik et al., 2024). This includes the use of AI for generative design, where algorithms autonomously generate design alternatives based on a set of constraints, or AI-based drug discovery, where AI models analyze molecular data to predict the efficacy of potential drugs. AI is not only aiding in creativity but also enabling the development of innovations at a faster pace (Füller et al., 2022). Beyond innovation, AI is also streamlining patent registration processes. Machine learning tools are now being utilized to automate various tasks traditionally handled by patent professionals, such as prior art searches and patent claims drafting

(Setchi et al., 2021). AI-based systems can rapidly search patent databases, identify similar existing patents, and even suggest modifications to claims to ensure that they meet patentability criteria. This efficiency reduces the time and cost associated with patent applications and accelerates the patent grant process. As AI continues to play an active role in the procedural aspects of patenting, the industry faces a significant transformation in how patents are filed, processed, and granted.

Challenges in Determining Inventorship and Ownership

A critical issue arising from the increasing involvement of AI in the innovation process is the challenge of determining inventorship and ownership. In traditional patent systems, the inventor is typically a human who has made a novel contribution to the creation of a product or process. However, as AI systems increasingly generate inventions, questions arise about who should be listed as the inventor in the patent application (Ozin et al., 2023). Can an AI system that generates an invention based on its algorithms be considered an inventor? Current patent laws typically require a human inventor, which means that AI-generated inventions pose a challenge to the existing legal frameworks governing IP. As AI technology becomes more advanced, it becomes increasingly difficult to assign human inventorship to creations that are produced by AI without direct human intervention (Rodrigues, 2020). The issue of ownership is equally complex. If an AI generates an invention, who owns the IP rights? Is it the developer of the AI system, the entity that owns the AI, or the user who provided the data to train the AI? These questions are complicated by the fact that AI-generated inventions often involve collaboration between human inventors and AI systems. Legal scholars and patent professionals are advocating for updates to patent laws to clarify these issues, suggesting that AI systems may need to be recognized as tools used by inventors rather than independent inventors themselves (Ouyang et al., 2022). Until legal frameworks are adjusted, patent offices will continue to grapple with cases where AI plays a central role in the inventive process, leading to potential disputes over patent rights.

AI-Enhanced Tools and Skill Obsolescence in Patent Professionals

The integration of AI into patent processes has the potential to cause skill obsolescence among patent professionals, including patent agents and examiners. AI-powered tools, such as those used for prior art searches, patent drafting, and examination, have automated many of the time-consuming and repetitive tasks traditionally performed by patent professionals (Coombs et al., 2020). These tools can quickly analyze vast databases, identify relevant patents, and even help draft patent applications by suggesting improvements to the claim language. As AI-driven systems become more advanced, there is a concern that patent professionals may no longer be required to perform these tasks manually, leading to a reduction in demand for specific skill sets. While AI enhances the efficiency and accuracy of patent work, it also poses a risk to the long-term viability of some patent professions. Patent agents and examiners who rely on manual research and drafting may find their roles diminished as AI tools take over these functions. To adapt, patent professionals will need to develop new skills that focus on the more complex and creative aspects of patent law, such as strategic patent portfolio management, legal interpretation, and AI ethics in patenting (Kim et al., 2022). This shift towards AI-enabled patenting processes will also require ongoing training and professional development to ensure that patent agents and examiners remain relevant in an increasingly automated environment. Consequently, education in IP law may

need to evolve to incorporate AI knowledge and legal implications related to AI-driven innovation and automation in the patenting process (Poddar & Rao, 2024).

Role of AI in Identifying Patent Misuse and Fraudulent Applications

AI is playing an increasingly important role in detecting and preventing misuse in the patent system, including fraudulent patent applications and violations of prior art (WIPO, 2024). AI-enhanced tools can efficiently scan patent applications, compare them to vast databases of existing patents, and flag potential instances of plagiarism or infringement. One of the key benefits of AI in this area is its ability to quickly identify prior art. AI can assess large volumes of data from global patent filings, academic research papers, and other technical sources. It helps maintain the integrity of the patent system by ensuring patent applications are thoroughly vetted against existing inventions, preventing the approval of patents that are not genuinely novel. This process aids in upholding the quality and fairness of patents granted, ensuring that only genuine innovations are recognized and protected. AI can also assist in identifying fraudulent applications by analyzing patterns in patent filings. For instance, it can detect suspicious behavior, such as multiple applications filed by the same entity for similar inventions or the systematic use of certain claim types that are often associated with patent trolling (i.e., filing frivolous patents with the intent of exploiting the legal system for financial gain). The ability to detect fraudulent activity early in the patent process is crucial in preventing the abuse of the patent system, which could otherwise hinder innovation and economic growth (Ohlhausen, 2016). AI can also assist in enforcing patent rights by identifying infringements more quickly, allowing patent holders to protect their IPs and maintain the competitive advantages afforded by their patents (Cuntz et al., 2024). As the patent system continues to embrace AI, its role in safeguarding against misuse will likely become more central to maintaining fairness and integrity in patent law.

FUNDAMENTALS OF PATENT REGISTRATION

Overview of Patent Types

Patents are legal protections granted to inventors for their novel creations. It gives them exclusive rights to their inventions for a specified period (Krauß & Kuttenkeuler, 2021; Saha & Bhattacharya, 2011). For industrial designs, utility models, and inventions, obtaining a patent is essential for securing a competitive advantage and safeguarding the commercial value of new products and technologies (Ikeuchi & Motohashi, 2022; Tarasenko, 2023). Invention patents (often called utility patents) are the most common, which protect new and useful inventions, ranging from mechanical devices to software algorithms (Singh et al., 2009). To qualify for a utility patent, the invention must be novel, non-obvious, and useful. This category is crucial in fostering technological advancements and economic growth (Wandhe, 2024). Securing exclusive rights to an invention allows inventors to control its use and commercialization, providing them with a temporary monopoly in the market. Beyond invention patents, there are other IP protections suited for different types of innovation. Utility models (also known as innovation patents in some jurisdictions) are comparable to invention patents but have lower requirements for novelty and inventive steps. They typically protect incremental innovations and are granted a shorter term of protection, making them ideal for more straightforward or less radical innovations. On the other hand,

industrial designs protect the aesthetic and ornamental aspects of a product (e.g., its shape, color, or surface decoration) but not its functionality. Its key goal is to encourage creators to invest in the visual appeal of their products (WIPO, 2022). Together, these various types of patent help safeguard a wide range of IP across industries.

Purpose of Patent Protection

The primary purpose of patent protection is to encourage and reward innovation. Patents grant inventors exclusive rights over their creations, serving as an incentive for developing new technologies and solutions while fostering creativity and driving progress (Caplanova, 2020). These rights allow inventors to prevent others from making, using, or selling their inventions without permission, ensuring they can profit from their efforts and investments. The ability to license or sell patent rights also opens avenues for collaboration, leading to the commercialization of inventions and the growth of industries. Another significant purpose of patent systems is to foster fair competition and maintain the balance between exclusivity and public knowledge. Requiring patents to disclose technical details about inventions ensures that knowledge becomes publicly available, enabling others to build upon existing ideas (de Rassenfosse et al., 2024). This transparency fosters further innovation and technological advancement by making foundational knowledge accessible to the public. Additionally, patents help maintain a competitive market by protecting original inventions, ensuring that companies are rewarded for their creativity rather than being undercut by unauthorized imitation (Cappelli et al., 2023). Ultimately, patents support the broader ecosystem of innovation by ensuring that creators and innovators can benefit from their contributions while also advancing the collective body of knowledge (OECD, 2015).

The Patent Registration Process

The process of patent registration involves several stages, each designed to assess the novelty and utility of an invention. It begins with the filing of a patent application, which includes a detailed description of the invention, supporting drawings, and claims that define its scope. A critical part of the application is conducting a thorough prior art search, which examines existing patents and publications to ensure the invention is novel. This step is crucial to avoid filing for an invention that has already been patented. Once the application is submitted, the patent office conducts an examination to determine if the invention meets the requirements of novelty, non-obviousness, and industrial applicability. This examination may involve additional back-and-forth between the applicant and the examiner (WIPO, 2022). If the invention is approved, the patent is granted, and the inventor is provided with exclusive rights for a specific period (usually 20 years for utility patents). After receiving the patent, inventors are responsible for enforcing their rights, meaning they must take action if others infringe upon their patent. In some cases, patents can be challenged by competitors or other stakeholders through opposition procedures. The process is complex and often requires the expertise of patent agents to navigate successfully to ensure that all legal requirements are met and the invention is adequately protected (Caplanova, 2020).

LEGAL AND ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS

Issues of Originality, Inventor Recognition, and Copyright for AI-Generated Content

The integration of AI into the patent registration process raises fundamental legal questions, particularly regarding originality, inventor recognition, and copyright for AI-generated inventions (Al-Busaidi et al., 2024). In traditional patent systems, a human inventor is required to demonstrate original contributions to a novel invention, and this individual is typically credited as the inventor. However, with AI systems increasingly playing a dominant role in the generation of new ideas, the question arises: *who owns the rights to inventions created by AI*? Some argue that AI systems should be regarded as tools rather than inventors, with the credit for AI-generated inventions attributed to the human(s) responsible for programming or operating the AI. Others, however, argue that AI-generated inventions should be treated as distinct, with AI being given recognition as the inventor, which would require substantial changes to existing IP laws. In addition to inventorship, copyright issues emerge when considering the extent to which AI can claim authorship of original works (Guadamuz, 2017). Traditionally, copyright law protects the rights of creators of original works, such as literature, art, or inventions. However, as AI systems become capable of generating original content in various fields, such as writing, music composition, and visual arts, questions about ownership and copyright arise. If AI is solely responsible for generating an invention or piece of content, does the creator of the AI system or the user who inputted the data hold the copyright? Legal scholars and policymakers are grappling with these questions, and some jurisdictions have already begun to explore amendments to existing laws to account for AI-generated works. As AI becomes more sophisticated, the legal framework will need to evolve to reflect the role AI plays in creativity and innovation.

Bias in AI-Driven Patent Examinations

The use of AI in patent examinations presents the potential for bias in patent decision-making processes. AI algorithms are trained on historical data, which means they can inadvertently perpetuate existing biases that may have been present in earlier patent filings (Javed & Li, 2024). For instance, if an AI system is primarily trained on patents from specific industries, it may fail to recognize novel inventions that are outside of these established patterns. This could disproportionately disadvantage inventors from underrepresented fields or regions, as their inventions may not be properly assessed. Additionally, AI systems may struggle to understand the cultural context or societal impact of inventions, leading to the marginalization of certain types of innovations. For example, inventions that address specific needs in developing countries may be overlooked by AI-driven systems that are biased toward technologies more relevant to wealthy nations. Moreover, the lack of diverse data in the training sets used to develop patent examination algorithms may result in the automation of patenting processes that overlook certain types of inventions, such as those that involve unconventional or interdisciplinary approaches. Biases in AI algorithms can also affect the way patent claims are interpreted, leading to the rejection of legitimate patents or the approval of patents for inventions that are not genuinely novel (Ferrero Guillén & Breckwoldt Jurado, 2023). Therefore, it is essential to ensure that AI-driven patent examination systems are trained on a diverse, representative set of data to minimize biases and provide fair treatment to all inventors.

This also calls for transparent and explainable AI systems, where patent examiners can understand the rationale behind the AI's decisions, thereby mitigating the risk of biases influencing patent outcomes.

Ethical Dilemmas in Patent Registration

The introduction of AI into the patent registration process raises a host of ethical dilemmas that must be addressed to ensure fairness, accountability, and transparency. One of the key ethical concerns is the issue of fairness in the allocation of IP rights (Rodrigues, 2020). AI systems that generate inventions may not always consider the human impact of new technologies, potentially overlooking social, cultural, or environmental consequences. For instance, AI may prioritize efficiency or profitability over broader ethical concerns, such as equity or public health, in the patenting of specific technologies. This issue of fairness also extends to the dissemination of patent rights, as certain groups, such as small inventors or those from developing countries, may be disadvantaged by the rapid pace and complexity of AI-driven patent systems. Another critical ethical consideration is accountability in AI-driven patenting processes. If an AI system makes an error in the examination or approval of a patent, it is often unclear who is responsible for that mistake. In traditional patent systems, patent examiners are held accountable for their decisions, but with AI-assisted systems, accountability becomes more complex. Should the creators of the AI system be held responsible for errors in patenting decisions, or should the patent examiners who rely on AI take responsibility? Furthermore, the transparency of AI systems in patenting is a significant concern. Patent applicants and stakeholders need to understand how decisions are made, and the use of AI in patent examinations must be accompanied by clear guidelines on how AI algorithms are developed, trained, and evaluated. Ethical practices in patent registration require that AI systems be both transparent and accountable to ensure that innovation is safeguarded in a way that promotes just outcomes.

Regulatory Challenges in Adapting Patent Laws

As AI technologies continue to evolve, regulatory challenges in adapting patent laws to reflect AI-driven innovation become more pressing (Poddar & Rao, 2024). Current patent systems are primarily designed around human inventors, and many aspects of IP law do not yet account for the unique challenges presented by AI-generated inventions. The legal recognition of AI as an inventor or co-inventor is a contentious issue that requires careful legal analysis and potential changes to patent laws. Some jurisdictions have already begun to explore the possibility of recognizing AI as a tool in the invention process, but this raises further questions about who ultimately owns the patent rights for AI-generated inventions. Governments and regulatory bodies must grapple with the question of how to properly update existing laws to reflect the fact that AI systems are now capable of generating significant inventions, sometimes without direct human input. In addition to defining inventorship, patent laws will need to be revised to address the challenges of patent enforcement and disputes related to AI-generated patents (Ouyang et al., 2022). Given the complexity of AI technologies and the potential for AI systems to produce novel ideas across various industries, patent offices may need to develop specialized procedures for reviewing and granting patents that involve AI technologies. Additionally, the global nature of AI-driven innovation poses challenges for patent harmonization across different jurisdictions, as patent laws and standards vary significantly between countries. As a result, international cooperation and coordination will be necessary to create a unified regulatory framework that can effectively govern AI-driven pat-

ents (Cuntz et al., 2024). The regulatory changes needed to address AI's role in patenting must strike a balance between fostering innovation, protecting IP, and ensuring fairness across diverse stakeholders.

PITFALLS IN PATENT REGISTRATION AMID AI DISRUPTIONS

Risks of Skill Obsolescence

The integration of AI technologies into the patent registration process presents significant challenges, particularly in terms of skill obsolescence. As AI tools become more adept at automating tasks such as patent searches, prior art analysis, and the drafting of patent claims, there is a growing concern that specific traditional skills required by patent professionals could diminish or even become redundant. Patent agents, examiners, and attorneys who once relied on their expertise to assess the novelty and patentability of inventions may find their roles evolving or becoming obsolete. For instance, AI-driven systems can perform repetitive and time-consuming tasks at a much faster pace and with greater accuracy, thus reducing the need for manual intervention in routine processes. This shift toward automation could have implications for job opportunities within the patent industry. As more patent-related tasks are handled by AI, human workers may find fewer roles that require their expertise. In some cases, this could lead to job displacement, particularly for professionals who have specialized in areas that can now be automated. Additionally, the evolution of AI may necessitate a transformation in the skill sets required for patent professionals, requiring them to adapt and gain proficiency in working alongside AI systems or understanding the intricacies of AI-driven patent processes. The risk of skill obsolescence calls for continuous upskilling and reskilling efforts (Gantalao et al., 2025) to ensure that human expertise remains a valuable asset in the patent industry.

Misuse of AI in Patent Search and Examination Processes

One of the most significant risks associated with the increasing reliance on AI in patent registration is the potential misuse of AI in patent search and examination processes. While AI technologies can significantly enhance efficiency by automating patent searches and processing large volumes of data, they are not infallible. Automated search tools powered by AI may overlook critical prior art, misinterpret patent claims, or fail to recognize nuances in the technology being examined. AI systems, particularly those not trained on diverse datasets or those relying on outdated information, may generate incomplete or erroneous results, leading to the approval of patents that should not be granted or the rejection of valid applications. Moreover, AI-generated patent applications pose a risk in that they may lack the human insight that typically characterize innovative inventions. AI may be able to optimize existing ideas or combine existing technologies in novel ways, but it may struggle with genuinely novel inventions that require human intuition and creativity. Over-reliance on AI tools in the patent process could lead to an inaccurate reflection of true innovation, where inventions that rely too heavily on AI-generated suggestions could be approved, diminishing the human-driven essence of technological progress. Thus, AI should be used as an assistive tool, not a substitute for human judgment and expertise.

Impact of AI Bias on Patent Decision-Making

AI systems, while powerful, are not immune to inherent biases that can affect patent decision-making. As AI algorithms are trained on historical patent data, they may perpetuate biases present in the datasets, leading to unfair or discriminatory outcomes. For example, if the training data mainly consists of patents from specific industries, regions, or demographics, AI systems may unintentionally favor inventions from those groups and overlook contributions from others. In the context of patent examination, such biases could result in the unfair rejection of patent applications that originate from underrepresented or emerging fields or from inventors with less established reputations. The biases in AI algorithms could also manifest in the approval process, where certain types of inventions or specific technological approaches are given precedence over others, leading to skewed patent grants. Certain technologies related to AI, machine learning, or big data may be granted patents more easily than innovations in other fields simply because the AI algorithm has been trained to prioritize those domains. This issue stresses the importance of ensuring that AI systems used in patent examinations are trained on diverse, representative, and unbiased data. Patent offices must employ human oversight to mitigate the impact of AI bias and ensure that patent decisions are based on fairness and impartiality.

Infrastructural Limitations

The growing use of AI in patent registration also presents significant infrastructural challenges for patent offices worldwide. Many patent offices are still operating with legacy systems that were not designed to handle the complexities of AI-driven applications. As AI-generated inventions become more prevalent, patent offices may struggle to keep up with the increasing volume of submissions that require specialized tools and processes for review. The technical requirements for effectively implementing AI tools—such as powerful computing resources, specialized software, and trained personnel—may also be beyond the capacity of some patent offices, particularly in developing countries (Mesquita Machado & Winter, 2023). In addition to technological infrastructure, there are policy challenges in adapting the patent registration system to accommodate AI-driven innovations. Existing legal frameworks may not be sufficient to address the unique characteristics of AI-generated inventions, such as the question of who holds the rights to inventions produced by AI systems. To effectively handle AI-driven patent filings, patent offices will need to invest in updating their regulatory infrastructure, developing specialized procedures for handling AI-generated patents, and ensuring that their personnel are adequately trained in the complexities of AI technology. Without addressing these infrastructural limitations, the patent system may struggle to keep pace with AI-driven innovation, ultimately hindering the growth of AI technologies and the protection of IP rights.

STRATEGIES FOR SAFEGUARDING CREATIVITY AND IP

The rapid development of AI technologies has outpaced existing legal frameworks, which necessitates thoughtful reforms to address the unique dynamics of AI-driven innovations. Ensuring the protection of IP in this evolving landscape requires a multi-faceted approach, including policy reforms, proper attribution guidelines, professional upskilling, and inter-agency collaboration. By balancing the promotion of innovation with the prevention of system abuse, these strategies can safeguard creativity and IP in the

AI era while fostering an equitable and forward-looking patent ecosystem. Table 1 and the succeeding discussions outline key strategies and recommendations for navigating the intersection of AI and IP law.

Table 1. Strategies for safeguarding IP in the age of AI

Strategy	Description	Key Actions
Policy recommendations for AI and patent law reform	Reform patent laws to address AI-driven innovations, clarifying AI's role in inventorship and ensuring appropriate protection for AI-generated inventions while maintaining patent law principles.	● Clarify inventorship definitions for AI-generated inventions. ● Establish international coordination for AI patent laws. ● Develop rigorous examination standards for AI-generated patents.
Proper attribution for AI-assisted inventions	Develop guidelines for recognizing AI's role in invention processes, ensuring human inventors are credited while acknowledging AI's contributions. Joint inventorship arrangements may also be considered.	● Develop clear guidelines for AI's role in patent filings. ● Recognize joint inventorship where both human and AI contributions are significant. ● Introduce sections to patent filings acknowledging AI's involvement.
Upskilling and AI training in IP law education	Integrate AI-focused curricula in IP law education and provide continuous upskilling programs for professionals to understand the intersection of AI and patent law. Collaboration between academic institutions and industry is essential for practical training.	● Create AI and patent law-specific curricula for IP law students. ● Develop professional development programs for current patent professionals. ● Collaborate with industry leaders to create training modules.
Best practices for using AI tools in patent registration	Establish guidelines for responsibly using AI in patent searches, claim drafting, and prior art analysis. AI should assist, not replace human expertise, with transparency, accountability, and ethical use. Regular updates and diverse datasets are key to reducing biases.	● Set clear guidelines for AI tools in patent searches and drafting. ● Ensure human oversight of AI-generated results. ● Regularly update AI systems with diverse data sets to reduce bias.
Inter-agency collaboration	Foster collaboration between patent offices, regulatory bodies, academic institutions, and technology developers to integrate AI tools effectively, share best practices, and offer specialized training for patent professionals.	● Encourage partnerships between patent offices, academia, and tech developers. ● Develop joint training programs for patent professionals. ● Share best practices across jurisdictions.

Policy Recommendations for AI and Patent Law Reform

As AI continues to impact the patent landscape, it is essential for policymakers to reform existing patent laws to account for the unique challenges posed by AI-driven innovations (Poddar & Rao, 2024). Policy recommendations should focus on ensuring that AI-generated inventions are given appropriate protection while maintaining the core principles of patent law. One key reform could involve clarifying the role of

AI in patent creation, particularly in terms of inventorship. Current patent laws generally require human inventors, which may not align with the growing prevalence of AI systems contributing significantly to innovation. Legislative changes could involve adjusting the definitions of inventorship to recognize AI as a tool used by human creators, ensuring that the rights and protections afforded to inventions reflect the evolving nature of innovation. Furthermore, new guidelines could establish procedures for handling AI-generated patents, ensuring that the patent system is equipped to process applications from AI-driven technologies without stifling innovation or overcomplicating the process.

Alongside changes to the patent system, policies must address the balance between promoting innovation and preventing abuse of the system. Some AI tools may be used to generate inventions that are derivative or lack true novelty, which could result in a flood of low-quality patent applications. To safeguard the integrity of the system, regulatory reforms should include rigorous examination processes for AI-generated patents, ensuring that only genuinely innovative ideas are granted IP rights. Additionally, international coordination on AI patent laws could help create uniform standards across jurisdictions, ensuring that inventors and businesses can protect their innovations effectively in a global marketplace. By updating patent laws to reflect the realities of AI's role in innovation, policymakers can help ensure the continued evolution of patent law while safeguarding fairness and encouraging technological progress.

Proper Attribution for AI-Assisted Inventions

A significant challenge in AI-driven patent registration is the issue of proper attribution. As AI becomes increasingly capable of autonomously contributing to innovation, determining who should be credited for an AI-assisted invention becomes more complex. Patent law traditionally requires that the inventor be a human being, but AI systems, with their ability to generate novel solutions and assist in the development of inventions, challenge this framework. While the AI itself cannot be an inventor under current law, human creators who leverage AI tools must still be appropriately recognized for their contributions. A potential solution is to acknowledge the role of AI in the invention process while ensuring that the human contributors—whether they are the original developers of the AI, the individuals using the AI, or both—retain the rights to the invention. One approach to ensuring proper attribution would be to develop clear guidelines for recognizing AI's contribution without diminishing the role of human inventors. For instance, patent filings could include sections where inventors describe the role of AI in the creation of the invention, acknowledging the AI's assistance while also detailing the human contributions that led to the final product. Joint inventorship arrangements could also be considered, where both human and AI contributions are recognized, even if the AI is not formally named as an inventor. This model would preserve the integrity of the inventor recognition system while accounting for the evolving role of AI in technological innovation. These efforts would ensure that human creators are not overlooked while also fostering transparency and ethical practices in the patent process.

Upskilling and AI Training in IP Law Education

As AI continues to reshape the patent landscape, there is a pressing need for ongoing education and professional development in the field of IP law. Patent professionals, including patent agents, attorneys, and examiners, must acquire the necessary skills and knowledge to navigate the complexities introduced by AI-driven innovation. This aspect can be achieved through the integration of AI-focused curricula in IP law education, where students learn about the intersection of AI and patent law and gain an understanding

of the technological advancements that are transforming the patent process. Furthermore, continuous upskilling programs should be developed for current professionals to ensure they remain up to date with AI tools and their implications for patent filing, examination, and enforcement. Training programs should focus on equipping patent professionals with both a technical understanding of AI technologies and the ability to apply legal frameworks to AI-generated inventions. These programs could include instruction on AI algorithms, machine learning, and the ethical and legal considerations of AI in patent law. Additionally, partnerships between academic institutions, patent offices, and industry leaders could foster a collaborative environment for developing training modules that are tailored to the needs of the patent industry. By ensuring that IP law professionals are proficient in AI technologies and aware of their legal implications, the patent system can continue to operate effectively while keeping pace with innovation.

Best Practices for Using AI Tools in Patent Registration

AI tools offer significant advantages for patent registration, particularly in the areas of patent searches, claim drafting, and prior art analysis. However, to ensure that these tools are used responsibly and effectively, best practices must be established. One essential guideline is that AI should be viewed as an assistive technology rather than a replacement for human expertise. AI tools should be used to enhance the efficiency and accuracy of patent searches, enabling patent professionals to quickly identify relevant prior art, but they should not be solely relied upon to make patentability decisions. Human oversight remains crucial in validating AI-generated results and ensuring that patent applications adhere to legal requirements. Best practices also include regularly updating AI systems with high-quality, diverse datasets to reduce biases and improve the accuracy of their output. Another critical practice involves ensuring that AI tools are used transparently and ethically. Patent offices and law firms must establish guidelines that promote fairness, accountability, and transparency in the use of AI during the patent registration process. This includes ensuring that the AI systems used in patent examinations are free from bias and that their decision-making processes can be explained and audited. AI tools should also be designed with built-in safeguards to prevent errors that could lead to unjust patent decisions. By following these best practices, the patent system can benefit from AI's capabilities while minimizing risks such as bias, errors, and over-reliance on automation.

Inter-Agency Collaboration

Given the evolving role of AI in patent registration, collaboration is essential for the successful integration of AI tools and processes (Broekhuizen et al., 2023). Patent offices, regulatory bodies, academic institutions, and technology developers must work together to ensure that AI technologies are effectively and ethically integrated into the patent system. By collaborating on the development of AI-driven tools for patent search, examination, and fraud detection, agencies can create standardized solutions that ensure consistency and fairness across jurisdictions. These partnerships could also promote the sharing of best practices and foster innovation in AI applications tailored to the needs of the patent system. Additionally, collaboration between patent offices and education providers is key to developing training programs for patent professionals. By combining the expertise of patent professionals with AI researchers and developers, educational institutions can offer specialized training that equips professionals with the necessary knowledge to work alongside AI tools effectively. This approach would help create a more dynamic, forward-thinking patent ecosystem capable of handling the complexities of AI-driven

innovation while maintaining high standards of quality and fairness in patent registration. Inter-agency collaboration, therefore, is essential in preparing for the challenges and opportunities that AI integration brings to the patent system.

CASE STUDIES AND EXAMPLES

Notable Cases Involving AI-Generated Patents and Disputes

One of the landmark cases involving AI-generated patents is the 2019 dispute surrounding the Device for the Autonomous Bootstrapping of Unified Sentience (DABUS) system. DABUS, an AI developed by Dr. Stephen Thaler, created two inventions: (1) a beverage container and (2) a flashing light for emergency vehicles. Thaler filed patents for these inventions in multiple countries, naming DABUS as the inventor. However, patent offices in several jurisdictions, including the United States and the European Union, rejected these applications, stating that only a human inventor could be named in a patent application. The United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO) initially rejected Thaler's patent application, asserting that inventorship must be attributed to a natural person. However, Thaler appealed, and in 2021, a US district court ruled in his favor, stating that the patent law does not specify that the inventor must be a person. This case highlights the tension between existing patent law, which presumes human inventorship, and the reality of AI's role in creating new innovations (Thaler v. USPTO, 2021).

Another significant case occurred in the European Patent Office (EPO), where similar patent applications by DABUS were rejected on the grounds of not having a human inventor. The High Court of Justice in the UK ruled in 2020 that an AI system could not be named as the inventor, reaffirming the stance that patent law requires human inventors. However, the case sparked debates within the IP community, leading to calls for legal reforms to adapt to the role of AI in innovation. This situation also brought attention to the broader issue of ownership and attribution, particularly with AI systems capable of generating complex inventions that may otherwise be difficult to ascribe to a single human inventor. These cases demonstrate a significant challenge in patent law and underscore the need for more transparent policies surrounding AI-generated inventions and the concept of inventorship (European Patent Office, 2020).

Lessons Learned of AI's Role in Patent Registration

The ongoing legal battles over AI-generated patents have highlighted several critical lessons for patent law and the role of AI in the innovation process. A key takeaway is that existing patent laws are not equipped to handle the complexities of AI-driven inventions. The DABUS case particularly underscores the need for legal reform to accommodate AI's contributions to the innovation process. In these disputes, the central issue is not the novelty of the invention but the attribution of inventorship. As AI systems like DABUS become more advanced, the traditional notion of inventorship—which presumes human agency—faces increasing challenges. One solution that has been proposed is the creation of a new category of AI-assisted patents, which would clearly define how to handle the contribution of AI

to inventions, ensuring that human inventors still receive proper recognition while acknowledging AI's role as a tool in the creative process.

Another lesson learned is the importance of international coordination in patent law (Tsay & Liu, 2020). The DABUS case was heard in multiple jurisdictions, with varying outcomes, illustrating the lack of uniformity in how patent offices approach AI-driven inventions (Schwartz & Rogers, 2022). This has led to calls for greater collaboration between national patent offices and international bodies such as the WIPO to create a cohesive legal framework that can accommodate the growing presence of AI in innovation. Establishing clear guidelines for AI involvement in invention would help patent systems globally keep pace with technological advancements while ensuring that patents are granted fairly and in line with the spirit of the law (WIPO, 2020). The case also underscores the importance of understanding the intersection of technology and law, as patent law must evolve to address the challenges AI brings to IP.

Case Studies Highlighting Skill Obsolescence and Legal Adaptation

The integration of AI tools into patent processes is driving significant changes in the way patent professionals work, with some experts predicting the obsolescence of specific skills. For example, AI-driven platforms like *PatentCloud* and *Derwent Innovation* use machine learning to assist patent professionals in performing complex tasks such as prior art searches, patentability assessments, and claim analysis. These tools have reduced the time and effort required for these tasks, enabling patent agents to focus on higher-level activities like legal strategy and client consultation. However, this shift has raised concerns about job displacement and the diminishing need for traditional patent examination skills. In response, many patent professionals are now focusing on upskilling by learning how to effectively use AI tools, and professional organizations like the American Intellectual Property Law Association (AIPLA) have begun offering training on AI's impact on patent law and practice. Moreover, the increasing reliance on AI has led to changes in how patent offices and legal firms operate. For instance, the USPTO has invested in AI and machine learning technologies to enhance the examination process. By automating routine tasks such as prior art searches, the USPTO has been able to improve the efficiency and accuracy of patent reviews, reducing backlogs and speeding up the granting process. This shift towards automation has sparked discussions within the legal community about the future role of human patent examiners and the potential for AI-driven patent examination to become the norm. As a result, patent professionals are being encouraged to embrace a new skill set that combines the technical knowledge of AI with traditional legal expertise. Patent education programs now include AI-related courses to prepare future professionals for the evolving landscape (USPTO, 2020). These developments point to a hybrid model in which AI complements rather than replaces human expertise, requiring patent professionals to acquire new technological competencies.

FUTURE DIRECTIONS AND PERSPECTIVES

Emerging Trends in AI and IP Protection

The integration of AI into IP protection is rapidly reshaping the landscape, creating new possibilities for patenting processes. One of the emerging trends is the increasing use of AI-driven patenting tools that automate various stages of the process, such as patent searches, prior art identification, and patent

drafting. These tools help patent professionals speed up routine tasks while improving their accuracy and efficiency. As AI technology advances, we are likely to see more sophisticated algorithms that can predict patentability with greater precision, offering new opportunities for early-stage innovation assessment and global patent strategies. Another trend is AI-enhanced patent portfolio management, where companies are leveraging machine learning to monitor and evaluate their existing patents and identify gaps in their portfolios. This growing reliance on AI will enable businesses to optimize their IP protection strategies and maximize their competitive edge in fast-moving markets (Li et al., 2022). Looking ahead, AI is also expected to play a significant role in the protection of AI-generated inventions, with some experts suggesting that new patent laws may emerge to better account for AI's involvement in innovation. As the number of AI-created inventions continues to rise, there will be increased pressure to develop new frameworks that address the legal complexities of attributing inventorship to non-human entities. Moreover, the global harmonization of patent laws concerning AI will become a priority as patent offices around the world work toward creating consistent regulations for AI-generated inventions. These trends suggest that AI will not only enhance traditional patenting processes but also transform the way IP protection is viewed and applied in an era where machines contribute directly to creative processes (WIPO, 2023).

Role of AI in Patent Offices and Legal Frameworks

As AI becomes more integral to patent offices around the world, its impact on patenting procedures will continue to evolve. Patent examination is one area where AI has already begun to make a significant difference, with AI tools being used to conduct automated prior art searches and patentability assessments. These AI-assisted systems can analyze vast datasets and flag similar patents or innovations that might otherwise go unnoticed, improving the efficiency and thoroughness of the examination process. In the future, AI could play an even more active role in the entire patent lifecycle, from initial filing to post-grant reviews. By automating routine tasks and providing predictive analysis, AI has the potential to significantly reduce patent backlogs and shorten the time between filing and approval, benefiting both applicants and patent offices. However, the increasing reliance on AI raises important questions about the adequacy of current legal frameworks to manage these technological advancements. The current patent law system was designed with the assumption that human inventors would be the primary drivers of innovation. As AI-driven inventions become more common, legal frameworks will need to evolve to address issues such as inventorship, ownership, and the legal status of AI systems as inventors. This may involve redefining patent laws to ensure they remain relevant and fair in an environment where AI plays a more prominent role. Furthermore, there may be a need for international cooperation among patent offices to harmonize AI-related regulations, ensuring that patents are granted consistently across jurisdictions and that AI-generated inventions are protected globally.

New Challenges and Opportunities in Protecting Creativity

As AI continues to impact patent registration, new challenges and opportunities will emerge in protecting creativity and innovation. One of the key challenges is ensuring that the authenticity of AI-driven innovations is maintained. With AI playing an increasing role in generating ideas and designs, it is crucial to establish clear guidelines that prevent over-reliance on automation and ensure that human creativity is not overshadowed by machine-driven processes. Protecting the integrity of the patent system will require a balance between recognizing AI's contribution and safeguarding human inventorship.

Addressing the issue of AI-generated inventions and ownership rights will require the creation of legal frameworks that clarify how patents should be attributed when AI is involved, particularly when there is no clear human inventor. On the other hand, AI presents numerous opportunities to future-proof IP protection. One such opportunity is the development of AI-powered tools that can assist in the identification of emerging technologies and predict market trends, helping innovators stay ahead of the curve. Patent offices and companies can more effectively manage IP portfolios, spot potential infringements early, and align their patent strategies with technological advancements. Moreover, AI tools can help patent professionals navigate the increasingly complex global patent landscape, where patents for similar inventions are filed in multiple jurisdictions. As AI continues to evolve (Garcia et al., 2025), there will be a need for adaptive policy frameworks that embrace innovation while protecting the rights of inventors. This will involve a shift towards dynamic legal models that can accommodate the fast-paced nature of AI-driven technological change and ensure that patent law remains an effective tool for protecting creativity in the 21st century.

CONCLUSION

As the boundaries of human and AI-generated creations blur, the importance of robust IP protections becomes even more pronounced. Patents, with their focus on protecting technical and functional aspects, remain a vital mechanism for ensuring the exclusivity and value of educational advancements in a rapidly evolving technological landscape. This chapter has emphasized the critical need to reassess patent frameworks to address the disruptions brought by AI. While AI offers immense potential to streamline and enhance patent processes, it also challenges traditional notions of inventorship and ownership. This dual-edged transformation demands thoughtful legal and procedural adaptations to ensure fairness, accountability, and the integrity of intellectual property systems. In the field of education, where innovation directly impacts societal progress, maintaining a robust and equitable patent system is essential to incentivize creativity and ensure that groundbreaking ideas are not only recognized but also protected. As AI continues to shape the future of IP, collaboration among policymakers, educators, and legal experts will be essential to establish frameworks that balance innovation with fairness. By safeguarding educational innovations through patents and adapting to the disruptions brought by AI, we can ensure that the benefits of these advancements are preserved for future generations.

REFERENCES

Acut, D. P., Gamusa, E. V., Pernaa, J., Yuenyong, C., Pantaleon, A. T., Espina, R. C., Sim, M. J. C., & Garcia, M. B. (2025). AI Shaming Among Teacher Education Students: A Reflection on Acceptance and Identity in the Age of Generative Tools. In *Pitfalls of AI Integration in Education: Skill Obsolescence, Misuse, and Bias*. IGI Global., DOI: 10.4018/979-8-3373-0122-8.ch005

Al-Busaidi, A. S., Raman, R., Hughes, L., Albashrawi, M. A., Malik, T., Dwivedi, Y. K., Al- Alawi, T., AlRizeiqi, M., Davies, G., Fenwick, M., Gupta, P., Gurpur, S., Hooda, A., Jurcys, P., Lim, D., Lucchi, N., Misra, T., Raman, R., Shirish, A., & Walton, P. (2024). Redefining Boundaries in Innovation and Knowledge Domains: Investigating the Impact of Generative Artificial Intelligence on Copyright and Intellectual Property Rights. *Journal of Innovation & Knowledge*, *9*(4), 1–28. DOI: 10.1016/j.jik.2024.100630

Arif, Y. M., Nugroho, F., Aini, Q., Fauzan, A. C., & Garcia, M. B. (2025). A Systematic Literature Review of Serious Games for Physical Education: Technologies, Implementations, and Evaluations. In *Global Innovations in Physical Education and Health*. IGI Global., DOI: 10.4018/979-8-3693-3952-7.ch001

Broekhuizen, T., Dekker, H., de Faria, P., Firk, S., Nguyen, D. K., & Sofka, W. (2023). AI for Managing Open Innovation: Opportunities, Challenges, and a Research Agenda. *Journal of Business Research*, *167*, 1–14. DOI: 10.1016/j.jbusres.2023.114196

Caplanova, A. (2020). Intellectual Property. In Pacheco-Torgal, F., Rasmussen, E., Granqvist, C.-G., Ivanov, V., Kaklauskas, A., & Makonin, S. (Eds.), *Start-Up Creation* (2nd ed., pp. 81–105). Woodhead Publishing., DOI: 10.1016/B978-0-12-819946-6.00005-9

Cappelli, R., Corsino, M., Laursen, K., & Torrisi, S. (2023). Technological Competition and Patent Strategy: Protecting Innovation, Preempting Rivals and Defending the Freedom to Operate. *Research Policy*, *52*(6), 1–14. DOI: 10.1016/j.respol.2023.104785

Coombs, C., Hislop, D., Taneva, S. K., & Barnard, S. (2020). The Strategic Impacts of Intelligent Automation for Knowledge and Service Work: An Interdisciplinary Review. *The Journal of Strategic Information Systems*, *29*(4), 1–30. DOI: 10.1016/j.jsis.2020.101600

Cuntz, A., C., F., & H., S. (2024). *Artificial Intelligence and Intellectual Property: An Economic Perspective*. World Intellectual Property Organization. https://doi.org/https://www.wipo.int/edocs/pubdocs/en/wipo-pub-econstat-wp-77-en-artificial-intelligence-and-intellectual-property-an-economic-perspective.pdf

de Rassenfosse, G., Pellegrino, G., & Raiteri, E. (2024). Do Patents Enable Disclosure? Evidence From the Invention Secrecy Act. *International Journal of Industrial Organization*, *92*, 1–16. DOI: 10.1016/j.ijindorg.2023.103044

Elahi, M., Afolaranmi, S. O., Martinez Lastra, J. L., & Perez Garcia, J. A. (2023). A Comprehensive Literature Review of the Applications of AI Techniques Through the Lifecycle of Industrial Equipment. *Discover Artificial Intelligence*, *3*(1), 1–78. DOI: 10.1007/s44163-023-00089-x

Ferrero Guillén, R., & Breckwoldt Jurado, A. (2023). Vagueness in Artificial Intelligence: The 'Fuzzy Logic' of AI-Related Patent Claims. *Digital Society : Ethics, Socio-Legal and Governance of Digital Technology*, *2*(1), 1–25. DOI: 10.1007/s44206-022-00032-0

Fuad, D. R. S. M., Musa, K., & Hashim, Z. (2020). Innovation Culture in Education: A Systematic Review of the Literature. *Management in Education*, *36*(3), 135–149. DOI: 10.1177/0892020620959760

Füller, J., Hutter, K., Wahl, J., Bilgram, V., & Tekic, Z. (2022). How AI Revolutionizes Innovation Management – Perceptions and Implementation Preferences of AI-Based Innovators. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, *178*, 1–22. DOI: 10.1016/j.techfore.2022.121598

Gantalao, L. C., Calzada, J. G. D., Capuyan, D. L., Lumantas, B. C., Acut, D. P., & Garcia, M. B. (2025). Equipping the Next Generation of Technicians: Navigating School Infrastructure and Technical Knowledge in the Age of AI Integration. In *Pitfalls of AI Integration in Education: Skill Obsolescence, Misuse, and Bias*. IGI Global., DOI: 10.4018/979-8-3373-0122-8.ch009

Garcia, M. B. (2023). Fostering an Innovation Culture in the Education Sector: A Scoping Review and Bibliometric Analysis of Hackathons. *Innovative Higher Education*, *48*(4), 739–762. DOI: 10.1007/s10755-023-09651-y PMID: 37361114

Garcia, M. B. (2024). The Paradox of Artificial Creativity: Challenges and Opportunities of Generative AI Artistry. *Creativity Research Journal*, ●●●, 1–14. DOI: 10.1080/10400419.2024.2354622

Garcia, M. B., Mangaba, J. B., & Tanchoco, C. C. (2021). Virtual Dietitian: A Nutrition Knowledge-Based System Using Forward Chaining Algorithm. *2021 International Conference on Innovation and Intelligence for Informatics, Computing, and Technologies (3ICT)*, 309-314. DOI: 10.1109/3ICT53449.2021.9581887

Garcia, M. B., Rosak-Szyrocka, J., Yılmaz, R., Metwally, A. H. S., Acut, D. P., Ofosu-Ampong, K., Erdoğdu, F., Fung, C. Y., & Bozkurt, A. (2025). Rethinking Educational Assessment in the Age of Generative AI: Actionable Strategies to Mitigate Academic Dishonesty. In *Pitfalls of AI Integration in Education: Skill Obsolescence, Misuse, and Bias*. IGI Global., DOI: 10.4018/979-8-3373-0122-8.ch001

Guadamuz, A. (2017). Artificial Intelligence and Copyright. *WIPO Magazine*. https://www.wipo.int/web/wipo-magazine/articles/artificial-intelligence-and-copyright-40141

Hasanah, N. A., Aziza, M. R., Junikhah, A., Arif, Y. M., & Garcia, M. B. (2025). Navigating the Use of AI in Engineering Education Through a Systematic Review of Technology, Regulations, and Challenges. In *Pitfalls of AI Integration in Education: Skill Obsolescence, Misuse, and Bias*. IGI Global., DOI: 10.4018/979-8-3373-0122-8.ch016

Ikeuchi, K., & Motohashi, K. (2022). Linkage of Patent and Design Right Data: Analysis of Industrial Design Activities in Companies at the Creator Level. *World Patent Information*, *70*, 1–6. DOI: 10.1016/j.wpi.2022.102114

Javed, K., & Li, J. (2024). Artificial Intelligence in Judicial Adjudication: Semantic Biasness Classification and Identification in Legal Judgement (SBCILJ). *Heliyon*, *10*(9), 1–17. DOI: 10.1016/j.heliyon.2024.e30184 PMID: 38737247

Kim, D., Alber, M., Kwok, M. W., Mitrović, J., Ramirez-Atencia, C., PÉrez, J. A. R., & Zille, H. (2022). Clarifying Assumptions About Artificial Intelligence Before Revolutionising Patent Law. *GRUR International, 71*(4), 295-321. DOI: 10.1093/grurint/ikab174

Krauß, J., & Kuttenkeuler, D. (2021). When to File for a Patent? The Scientist's Perspective. *New Biotechnology*, *60*, 124–129. DOI: 10.1016/j.nbt.2020.10.006 PMID: 33091617

Maaliw, R. R., Mabunga, Z. P., Veluz, M. R. D. D., Alon, A. S., Lagman, A. C., Garcia, M. B., Lacatan, L. L., & Dellosa, R. M. (2023). An Enhanced Segmentation and Deep Learning Architecture for Early Diabetic Retinopathy Detection. *2023 IEEE 13th Annual Computing and Communication Workshop and Conference (CCWC)*, 0168-0175. DOI: 10.1109/CCWC57344.2023.10099069

Malik, S., Muhammad, K., & Waheed, Y. (2024). Artificial Intelligence and Industrial Applications- A Revolution in Modern Industries. *Ain Shams Engineering Journal*, *15*(9), 1–11. DOI: 10.1016/j. asej.2024.102886

Mesquita Machado, T., & Winter, E. (2023). Artificial Intelligence and Patents in Brazil: Overview on Patentability and Comparative Study on Patent Filings. *World Patent Information*, *72*, 1–11. DOI: 10.1016/j.wpi.2023.102177

Mishra, N., Garcia, P. S., Habal, B. G. M., & Garcia, M. B. (2024). Harnessing an AI-Driven Analytics Model to Optimize Training and Treatment in Physical Education for Sports Injury Prevention. *Proceedings of the 8th International Conference on Education and Multimedia Technology*, 309-315. DOI: 10.1145/3678726.3678740

Mustafa, A. S., Alkawsi, G. A., Ofosu-Ampong, K., Vanduhe, V. Z., Garcia, M. B., & Baashar, Y. (2022). Gamification of E-Learning in African Universities: Identifying Adoption Factors Through Task-Technology Fit and Technology Acceptance Model. In Portela, F., & Queirós, R. (Eds.), *Next-Generation Applications and Implementations of Gamification Systems* (pp. 73–96). IGI Global., DOI: 10.4018/978-1-7998-8089-9.ch005

OECD. (2015). *The Innovation Imperative: Contributing to Productivity, Growth and Well-Being*. OECD Publishing., DOI: 10.1787/9789264239814-

Ohlhausen, M. K. (2016). Patent Rights in a Climate of Intellectual Property Rights Skepticism. *Harvard Journal of Law & Technology*, *30*(1), 103–124. https://jolt.law.harvard.edu/assets/articlePDFs/v30/30HarvJLTech103.pdf

Ouyang, X., Sun, Z., & Xu, X. (2022). Patent System in the Digital Era - Opportunities and New Challenges. *Journal of Digital Economy*, *1*(3), 166–179. DOI: 10.1016/j.jdec.2022.12.003

Ozin, G. A., Qian, C., & MacIntosh, J. G. (2023). Can AI Be an Inventor in Materials Discovery? *Matter*, *6*(10), 3117–3120. DOI: 10.1016/j.matt.2023.08.015

Patel, P. C., & Sahi, G. K. (2024). AI Patent Approvals in Service Firms, Patent Radicalness, and Stock Market Reaction. *Journal of Service Research*, *10946705241230840*. Advance online publication. DOI: 10.1177/10946705241230840

Petil, E. D., Florece, M. E. A., Gomez, M. G. A., Villaruel, K. B., Fernandez, H. G. C. Q., Dela Cruz, C. M. B., & Ferrer-Rafols, R. B. (2025). Virtual Reality in Physical Education: An Innovative Approach to Optimize Physical and Mental Health. In *Global Innovations in Physical Education and Health*. IGI Global., DOI: 10.4018/979-8-3693-3952-7.ch005

Picht, P. G., & Thouvenin, F. (2023). AI and IP: Theory to Policy and Back Again – Policy and Research Recommendations at the Intersection of Artificial Intelligence and Intellectual Property. *IIC - International Review of Intellectual Property and Competition Law, 54*(6), 916-940. DOI: 10.1007/s40319-023-01344-5

Poddar, A., & Rao, S. R. (2024). Evolving Intellectual Property Landscape for AI-Driven Innovations in the Biomedical Sector: Opportunities in Stable IP Regime for Shared Success. *Frontiers in Artificial Intelligence*, *7*, 1–15. DOI: 10.3389/frai.2024.1372161 PMID: 39355146

Rodrigues, R. (2020). Legal and Human Rights Issues of AI: Gaps, Challenges and Vulnerabilities. *Journal of Responsible Technology*, *4*, 1–12. DOI: 10.1016/j.jrt.2020.100005

Saha, C. N., & Bhattacharya, S. (2011). Intellectual Property Rights: An Overview and Implications in Pharmaceutical Industry. *Journal of Advanced Pharmaceutical Technology & Research*, *2*(2), 88–93. DOI: 10.4103/2231-4040.82952 PMID: 22171299

Schwartz, D. L., & Rogers, M. (2022). "Inventorless" Inventions? The Constitutional Conundrum of AI-Produced Inventions. *SSRN*, *35*(2), 531–479. https://jolt.law.harvard.edu/assets/articlePDFs/v35/3.-Schwartz-Rogers-Inventorless-Inventions.pdf. DOI: 10.2139/ssrn.4025434

Segarra, J. R., Mengual-Andres, S., & Cortijo Ocaña, A. (Eds.). (2024). *Educational Innovation to Address Complex Societal Challenges*. IGI Global., DOI: 10.4018/979-8-3693-3073-9

Serdyukov, P. (2017). Innovation in Education: What Works, What Doesn't, and What to Do About it? *Journal of Research in Innovative Teaching & Learning*, *10*(1), 4–33. DOI: 10.1108/JRIT-10-2016-0007

Setchi, R., Spasić, I., Morgan, J., Harrison, C., & Corken, R. (2021). Artificial Intelligence for Patent Prior Art Searching. *World Patent Information*, *64*, 1–12. DOI: 10.1016/j.wpi.2021.102021

Singh, A., Hallihosur, S., & Rangan, L. (2009). Changing Landscape in Biotechnology Patenting. *World Patent Information*, *31*(3), 219–225. DOI: 10.1016/j.wpi.2009.03.004

Sreenivasan, A., & Suresh, M. (2024). Design Thinking and Artificial Intelligence: A Systematic Literature Review Exploring Synergies. *International Journal of Innovation Studies*, *8*(3), 297–312. DOI: 10.1016/j.ijis.2024.05.001

Tarasenko, L. (2023). Legislative Reforms on Patents, Utility Models and Industrial Designs in Ukraine. *Competition and Intellectual Property Law in Ukraine*, 373-414. DOI: 10.1007/978-3-662-66101-7_15

Tsay, M.-Y., & Liu, Z.-W. (2020). Analysis of the Patent Cooperation Network in Global Artificial Intelligence Technologies Based on the Assignees. *World Patent Information*, *63*, 1–17. DOI: 10.1016/j.wpi.2020.102000

Wandhe, P. (2024). The Intellectual Property Landscape: Safeguarding Innovations Derived From Basic Science. In Trivedi, S., Grover, V., Balusamy, B., & Ganguly, A. (Eds.), *Unleashing the Power of Basic Science in Business* (pp. 285–310). IGI Global., DOI: 10.4018/979-8-3693-5503-9.ch015

WIPO. (2019). WIPO Technology Trends 2019 – Artificial Intelligence. *World Intellectual Property Organization*. DOI: 10.34667/tind.29084

WIPO. (2022). WIPO Guide to Using Patent Information. *World Intellectual Property Organization*. DOI: 10.34667/tind.46546

WIPO. (2024). Patent Landscape Report: Generative Artificial Intelligence. *World Intellectual Property Organization*. DOI: 10.34667/tind.49740

KEY TERMS AND DEFINITIONS

Artificial Intelligence: The simulation of human intelligence processes by machines, especially computer systems, to perform tasks such as learning, reasoning, and problem-solving.

Educational Innovation: The process of introducing new ideas, methods, or tools to improve teaching, learning, and educational outcomes.

Educational Patents: Patents that specifically protect inventions related to education, such as novel teaching methods, educational technologies, or tools designed to enhance learning.

Innovation Management: The systematic process of creating, organizing, and implementing new ideas and technologies within organizations to drive growth and improve efficiency.

Intellectual Property: Legal protections granted to creators and inventors to safeguard their creations, such as inventions, designs, literary works, and trademarks.

Inventorship: The legal recognition of individuals or entities who contribute to the creation of a patentable invention, typically requiring a direct contribution to the inventive concept.

Ownership: The legal right or title to a piece of property, including intellectual property, that grants control over its use, transfer, or commercialization.

Patent: A legal right granted by a government that provides an inventor exclusive rights to make, use, or sell an invention for a specific period in exchange for disclosing it to the public.