JOURNAL OF LAW, INFORMATION & SCIENCE
ISSN 0729-1485• Vol. 3, Issue 1 (2025) • https://jlisjournal.com/

REVIEW ARTICLE Article ID: JLIS/2025/3/1/008

Intellectual Property and the Governance of Scientific Knowledge: Reassessing Ownership, Access, and Innovation in the Digital Era

Michelle Diana[1], Sara Roudrigues[2]

[1] *Associate Professor, Department of International Intellectual Property and Governance, Royal University of Bosania*

[2] *Associate Professor, Department of International Intellectual Property and Governance, Royal University of Bosania.*

Received: 20 March 2025 **Revised:** 19 May 2025 **Accepted:** 19 June 2025 **Published:** 10August 2025

ABSTRACT

The transformation of scientific knowledge into a predominantly digital, data-intensive, and globally networked resource has generated a fundamental tension within contemporary intellectual property governance. Intellectual property law traditionally seeks to stimulate innovation by granting exclusive rights over certain forms of intellectual creation, yet scientific knowledge derives much of its social and economic value from circulation, verification, cumulative development, and reuse. The digital era has intensified this tension because scientific publications, research data, software, algorithms, genomic information, databases, and technological methods can be reproduced and disseminated at negligible marginal cost while simultaneously acquiring substantial commercial value. This article critically examines the relationship between intellectual property and the governance of scientific knowledge, with particular attention to ownership, access, innovation, open science, data governance, patent rights, copyright, trade secrets, and international regulatory frameworks. It argues that the traditional proprietary model is increasingly inadequate as a comprehensive framework for governing scientific knowledge because it may generate enclosure effects, access barriers, fragmented rights, and asymmetries between knowledge producers and users. At the same time, unrestricted openness cannot provide an adequate solution because scientific research frequently involves privacy, confidentiality, national security, commercial investment, indigenous knowledge, and incentives for costly research and development. The article therefore advocates a calibrated governance model based on differentiated rights, open licensing, responsible intellectual property protection, public-interest exceptions, research exemptions, data stewardship, technology transfer, and stronger institutional mechanisms for publicly funded research. Drawing upon international intellectual property norms, open-science principles, and scholarship on the knowledge commons, the article concludes that the future of intellectual property governance should move from a narrow conception of ownership toward a broader conception of stewardship. Such an approach can preserve legitimate incentives for innovation while treating scientific knowledge as a resource whose ultimate governance must account for public welfare, epistemic integrity, distributive justice, and the global circulation of knowledge.

Keywords: *Intellectual Property; Scientific Knowledge; Open Science; Digital Knowledge; Patents; Copyright; Innovation; Knowledge Commons; Technology Transfer; Access to Knowledge; Digital Governance; Public Interest.*

1. Introduction

Scientific knowledge occupies an unusual position within the architecture of modern societies. It is simultaneously an intellectual product, a public resource, a foundation for technological development, a commercial asset, and an essential component of democratic decision-making. Unlike many conventional commodities, scientific knowledge acquires much of its value through dissemination and cumulative use. A scientific discovery can generate greater social value when it is replicated, challenged, improved, combined with other discoveries, or translated into technological applications. Nevertheless, contemporary legal systems increasingly govern scientific knowledge through intellectual property institutions that are substantially premised upon exclusion, control, ownership, and commercially enforceable rights. This structural tension has become more significant with the digitalization of scientific research. Digital technologies have transformed scientific production from a largely publication-centered enterprise into an ecosystem involving large-scale datasets, algorithms, artificial intelligence, digital repositories, research software, automated laboratories, genomic databases, cloud infrastructure, and globally distributed collaborations. The marginal cost of reproducing and transmitting digital information is extremely low, while the economic and strategic value of such information may be extraordinarily high. The result is a paradox: the technological conditions that make scientific knowledge more accessible have simultaneously strengthened the institutional capacity to control access to it. Intellectual property therefore operates not merely as a mechanism for protecting individual creations but as a governance technology that determines who may access, use, reproduce, commercialize, modify, and redistribute knowledge. The international framework reflects this duality. The Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS) recognizes that intellectual property protection should contribute to technological innovation and the transfer and dissemination of technology while maintaining a balance between rights and obligations (World Trade Organization [WTO], 1994). Article 7 is particularly significant because it frames intellectual property protection as an instrument rather than an end in itself, linking it to technological innovation, technology transfer, social welfare, and the interests of both producers and users of technological knowledge. The contemporary debate therefore cannot be reduced to a simple opposition between property and openness. The central question is how legal institutions should structure access to knowledge while preserving appropriate incentives for research, investment, attribution, and technological development. The rise of open science provides one important response. UNESCO's Recommendation on Open Science, adopted in 2021, conceptualizes open science as an inclusive framework encompassing open scientific publications, research data, educational resources, software, source code, hardware, infrastructures, societal engagement, and dialogue with other knowledge systems (UNESCO, 2021). Its emphasis on openness does not reject intellectual property; instead, it recognizes that copyright, patents, confidentiality, privacy, and other legitimate restrictions may coexist with broader commitments to accessibility and reuse. The legal challenge is therefore one of institutional calibration. Scientific knowledge should neither be treated as an entirely private commodity nor as an undifferentiated public domain. A more sophisticated governance framework must distinguish between different types of knowledge, different stages of research, different forms of intellectual contribution, and different public interests. This article examines that problem through a doctrinal and interdisciplinary analysis of intellectual property and scientific knowledge. It argues that the future of intellectual property governance

should move from an ownership-centered model toward a stewardship-oriented model in which exclusivity is justified by its contribution to innovation and social welfare, while access is protected wherever restrictions cannot be adequately justified. Such a framework is particularly important for developing countries, where unequal access to scientific literature, technologies, research infrastructure, and intellectual property can reproduce global knowledge inequalities.

2. Intellectual Property as a Governance Architecture for Scientific Knowledge

Intellectual property law is commonly presented as a collection of private rights protecting inventions, literary and artistic works, trademarks, designs, confidential information, and related subject matter. In practice, however, intellectual property constitutes a governance architecture that allocates control over knowledge resources among researchers, universities, corporations, governments, publishers, investors, and the public. The justification for granting exclusive rights is generally connected to incentive theory: because knowledge can often be copied without compensating its creator, legal exclusivity is expected to encourage investment in research and development by allowing innovators to capture part of the value generated by their inventions (Landes & Posner, 2003). Patent law exemplifies this logic by exchanging disclosure for a time-limited exclusive right. Copyright similarly provides authors with exclusive rights while permitting socially valuable limitations and exceptions. Trade secrets protect commercially valuable information through confidentiality rather than public disclosure. These mechanisms perform different regulatory functions and should not be treated as interchangeable. The governance problem arises when legal exclusivity expands beyond its incentive function and begins to operate as a barrier to cumulative research. Scientific innovation is inherently cumulative: contemporary research frequently depends upon previous discoveries, experimental methods, datasets, software, biological materials, and publicly disseminated findings. Merges (1996) famously described intellectual property as part of a broader institutional framework within which cumulative innovation takes place. Excessive fragmentation of rights can produce what Heller and Eisenberg (1998) termed an “anticommons” problem, where multiple overlapping rights make it difficult to assemble the permissions required for further research. This concern is particularly relevant in biotechnology, pharmaceuticals, digital research, and complex technologies involving multiple patents and datasets. Patent protection can stimulate investment in uncertain and expensive research, especially where commercialization requires substantial capital expenditure. However, patent claims over research tools, diagnostic technologies, biological materials, or foundational technological platforms may also affect downstream research. The legal system must therefore distinguish between protection that facilitates investment and protection that obstructs cumulative discovery. Copyright raises a different but related concern. Scientific facts, discoveries, theories, mathematical principles, and ideas generally do not receive copyright protection as such, but the expression of those ideas can be protected. The distinction becomes difficult in the digital environment because scientific publishing increasingly involves databases, structured datasets, software, graphical representations, metadata, and machine-readable research outputs. The expansion of contractual restrictions and technological protection measures can create practical control beyond the formal scope of copyright. As Boyle (2003) observed in the broader context of the information society, the

expansion of intellectual property can produce an “enclosure” of information resources that historically remained relatively open. The governance significance of this process is substantial. A scientific article behind a paywall, a dataset subject to restrictive licensing, a research tool protected by patents, or an algorithm treated as a trade secret can each create different forms of access restriction. These restrictions may be legally distinct but socially interconnected. The contemporary intellectual property system must therefore be evaluated not merely by asking whether a particular right is legally valid but also by examining how combinations of rights affect the overall circulation of scientific knowledge. The TRIPS framework itself provides support for such a balanced approach. Its objectives recognize the importance of innovation, dissemination, technology transfer, and social and economic welfare, while Article 8 permits members to adopt measures necessary to protect public interests, including public health, within the framework of the Agreement (WTO, 1994). Intellectual property should accordingly be understood as a regulatory instrument embedded within a larger social system rather than as an absolute manifestation of private ownership.

3. Ownership, Access, and the Emergence of Scientific Knowledge Commons

The concept of ownership becomes particularly complex when applied to scientific knowledge. Conventional property law assumes that ownership creates a relatively clear relationship between an owner and a tangible or identifiable resource. Knowledge is different because it can be simultaneously possessed and shared by innumerable users without being physically depleted. The economic characteristics of knowledge therefore complicate conventional property assumptions. Scientific knowledge is often non-rivalries, one researcher’s use does not necessarily prevent another researcher from using the same information. It may also be cumulative, meaning that its value increases when combined with additional knowledge. These characteristics have encouraged scholars to conceptualize knowledge as a commons rather than merely as a commodity (Hess & Ostrom, 2007). The knowledge-commons approach does not imply that all knowledge should automatically be free from legal control. Rather, it emphasizes the importance of institutional arrangements that enable communities to create, preserve, govern, and share knowledge resources. Scientific research provides numerous examples of such arrangements. Universities, research institutions, scholarly societies, public laboratories, repositories, open-source communities, and international research collaborations frequently operate through norms of attribution, reciprocity, peer review, disclosure, and shared use. Open access publishing represents a major institutional development within this broader transformation. The Budapest Open Access Initiative (2002), the Bethesda Statement (2003), and the Berlin Declaration (2003) helped establish normative foundations for making scholarly literature freely accessible. More recently, UNESCO's Recommendation on Open Science has expanded the concept beyond publications to include research data, software, educational resources, hardware, infrastructures, and participatory scientific processes (UNESCO, 2021). The significance of this development is not merely technological. It represents a shift in the normative conception of scientific knowledge from a resource whose circulation is primarily mediated by commercial publishers toward a resource increasingly understood as part of global scientific infrastructure. UNESCO expressly recognizes that greater access to scientific knowledge can reduce duplication, improve research productivity, facilitate collaboration, and increase the social impact of scientific

findings (UNESCO, 2021). Yet open access also creates difficult governance questions. Who pays for publication when readers do not? Article-processing charges may shift costs from consumers to researchers and institutions, potentially disadvantaging scholars in lower-income countries. UNESCO itself has recognized the risks associated with high publication charges, unequal research systems, exploitation, and privatization of research data (UNESCO, 2021). Moreover, openness can conflict with privacy, confidentiality, intellectual property, national security, commercial interests, and protection of indigenous or culturally sensitive knowledge. The appropriate policy response is therefore not absolute openness but responsible openness. Scientific knowledge should be open wherever openness enhances research and public welfare and where no compelling countervailing interest exists. Where restrictions are justified, they should be proportionate, transparent, reviewable, and limited in duration and scope. UNESCO's framework explicitly recognizes that restrictions may be justified for reasons including privacy, human-subject protection, national security, confidentiality, intellectual property, personal information, and protection of sacred or secret indigenous knowledge (UNESCO, 2021). This approach suggests that the knowledge commons should not be conceived as a space without governance. On the contrary, it requires sophisticated governance capable of differentiating legitimate protection from unnecessary enclosure. The objective is to construct institutional arrangements in which scientific knowledge remains sufficiently open to support cumulative innovation while preserving legitimate interests in attribution, privacy, security, investment, and cultural integrity.

4. Patents, Scientific Innovation, and the Problem of Access

The patent system occupies the center of the debate concerning intellectual property and scientific innovation because it creates a legally enforceable temporary monopoly in exchange for disclosure of an invention. Its fundamental justification is instrumental: society tolerates exclusivity because disclosure and incentives are expected to increase technological progress. The disclosure function is particularly important for science because patent documents can constitute a significant source of technical information. At the same time, patent rights can create access barriers where protected technologies are essential to subsequent research, medical treatment, agricultural development, or technological adaptation. The relationship between patents and scientific innovation is consequently neither uniformly positive nor uniformly negative. It varies according to technological sector, market structure, research costs, patent scope, duration, licensing conditions, and availability of alternative technologies. Pharmaceuticals provide perhaps the clearest example. Drug development involves substantial financial investment, extensive regulatory requirements, high failure rates, and long development periods, creating a strong argument for patent incentives. Yet the resulting exclusivity may also contribute to high prices and unequal access, particularly where medicines are essential to public health. The international legal system has attempted to address this tension through TRIPS flexibilities. The 2001 Doha Declaration on the TRIPS Agreement and Public Health affirmed that TRIPS should be interpreted and implemented in a manner supportive of members' rights to protect public health and access medicines, while recognizing the importance of intellectual property for pharmaceutical innovation (WTO, 2001). Compulsory licensing, exhaustion doctrines, and the special mechanism for exporting medicines to countries lacking manufacturing capacity demonstrate that patent rights are not

absolute under international law. The 2017 entry into force of the TRIPS amendment concerning compulsory licensing for pharmaceutical exports further institutionalized one mechanism for improving access to medicines (WTO, 2017). The COVID-19 pandemic intensified these questions. The global distribution of vaccines, therapeutics, diagnostic technologies, manufacturing capabilities, and technical knowledge demonstrated that intellectual property is only one component of innovation governance. Manufacturing capacity, supply chains, regulatory infrastructure, technology transfer, financing, know-how, and international cooperation are equally important. The WTO's 2022 Ministerial Conference decision concerning COVID-19 vaccines demonstrated continuing efforts to reconcile patent protection with exceptional public-health needs (WTO, 2022). The experience suggests that patent law should be integrated with broader innovation policies rather than treated as a self-sufficient mechanism. Another important issue concerns patents over research tools. Where a patented technology is necessary for researchers to conduct experiments, restrictive licensing can create transaction costs and delay scientific work. Research exemptions vary considerably among jurisdictions, making international collaborative research legally complex. Universities and public research institutions therefore require clearer policies governing patent ownership, licensing, and use. Publicly funded research deserves particular attention. Where taxpayers finance a substantial proportion of research, an exclusive commercial right may be difficult to justify if the resulting technology becomes inaccessible to the public or if licensing conditions prevent broad dissemination. This does not mean that publicly funded research should never be patented. Commercialization can transform discoveries into useful products, attract private investment, and create employment. The appropriate principle is instead one of public-interest conditionality. Patent protection arising from public funding should be accompanied, where appropriate, by licensing obligations, affordability commitments, non-exclusive licensing, research-use rights, technology-transfer requirements, or safeguards against non-use. Such a model would preserve commercial incentives while preventing public research from becoming unnecessarily enclosed. The central policy question should therefore shift from "Who owns the patent" to "What governance conditions ensure that the patent performs its legitimate innovation function without undermining access and cumulative research".

5. Copyright, Digital Research, Data, Software, and Algorithmic Knowledge

The digitalization of science has blurred traditional distinctions among publications, databases, software, data, and research infrastructure. Scientific research increasingly depends upon computational methods in which data, code, algorithms, models, and publications form an interconnected ecosystem. Intellectual property law, however, does not treat these components uniformly. Copyright can protect original expression and software code, while database-related rights may arise in some jurisdictions. Patents can protect qualifying technical inventions, although patentability standards differ internationally. Trade secret law can protect confidential algorithms, datasets, methods, and business information where secrecy requirements are satisfied. Contract law and technological protection mechanisms can impose further restrictions. This fragmentation creates significant governance challenges. Scientific reproducibility depends not merely upon access to final publications but increasingly upon access to underlying data, methodological protocols, software, source code, and computational environments. A publication describing an empirical

result may be formally accessible while remaining practically difficult to reproduce if the underlying dataset or code is unavailable. The open-science movement responds to this problem by promoting openness across the research lifecycle. UNESCO defines open scientific knowledge broadly enough to include publications, research data, metadata, software, source code, hardware, and related materials, provided that they are in the public domain or made available under appropriate open licenses (UNESCO, 2021). This approach reflects an important transformation in the meaning of "access." Access should no longer mean simply the ability to read an article. It increasingly requires the ability to inspect, verify, reuse, adapt, and build upon the materials necessary to understand scientific claims. Digital technologies also introduce a new dimension: machine access. Scientific datasets may be legally "available" but technically difficult to process because they lack interoperability or machine-readable formats. Consequently, digital knowledge governance requires attention to technical standards as well as legal rights. The FAIR principles, findability, accessibility, interoperability, and reusability, have become particularly influential in this context. The legal system must also recognize that data cannot be treated as a homogeneous category. Public scientific data, personal data, commercially sensitive information, genomic information, indigenous knowledge, and national-security information require different governance arrangements. An indiscriminate open-data policy could create privacy harms or enable exploitative extraction of information from vulnerable communities. Conversely, excessive restrictions may undermine research and innovation. The governance of scientific data should therefore be based upon data minimization where appropriate, purpose limitation, consent and ethical oversight, anonymisation or pseudonymisation, secure access mechanisms, and differentiated licensing. Software creates another important challenge. Open-source software demonstrates that innovation can flourish through licensing models that permit modification and redistribution while preserving attribution and community norms. Open-source licensing does not eliminate intellectual property; it strategically uses intellectual property to create permissions rather than merely restrictions. This is an important conceptual development because it demonstrates that intellectual property rights can be designed to facilitate sharing. The same logic can be applied to scientific research through open licenses, standardized data-use agreements, patent pools, non-exclusive licenses, and public-interest licensing. Algorithmic science adds another layer. Proprietary algorithms may represent commercially valuable assets, but opacity can impede scientific reproducibility and accountability. In areas such as artificial intelligence, biomedical modelling, climate science, and automated decision-making, the legal governance of scientific knowledge increasingly intersects with questions of transparency and explainability. The future framework must therefore move beyond a binary distinction between proprietary and public information. It should recognize a spectrum of access models, ranging from unrestricted public-domain availability to open licenses, research-community access, controlled access, confidential licensing, and full proprietary secrecy. Such differentiated governance is more consistent with the actual structure of contemporary scientific research than a single ownership model.

6. International Governance, Equity, and the Global Knowledge Divide

The governance of scientific knowledge cannot be effectively understood within national borders because scientific research, intellectual property rights, academic publishing, and

digital information flows are inherently transnational. International institutions such as the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO), WTO, UNESCO, the World Health Organization, and regional organizations have consequently become important actors in constructing the normative environment within which knowledge is produced and exchanged. TRIPS represents the most significant multilateral framework for intellectual property because it establishes minimum standards across a broad range of rights while recognizing the relationship between intellectual property, technological innovation, dissemination, and social welfare (WTO, 1994). Yet harmonization of minimum standards does not eliminate distributive inequalities. Countries differ dramatically in research infrastructure, patent portfolios, publishing capacity, technological capabilities, financial resources, and institutional access to scientific information. Strong intellectual property protection may therefore generate different consequences depending upon a country's position within the global knowledge economy. Developed economies with strong research institutions and large technology companies may derive significant benefits from global intellectual property protection, whereas developing countries may experience higher costs when accessing protected technologies, scientific publications, medicines, agricultural innovations, and research tools. This does not justify weakening intellectual property protection indiscriminately. Rather, it reinforces the importance of technology transfer and capacity-building as integral elements of international intellectual property governance. Article 7 of TRIPS expressly recognizes technology transfer and dissemination as objectives of the intellectual property system (WTO, 1994). International law should therefore encourage licensing structures, collaborative research, institutional partnerships, scientific mobility, open repositories, and capacity-building initiatives that allow developing countries to participate not merely as consumers of scientific knowledge but as producers and co-creators. The digital divide further complicates this challenge. Access to scientific knowledge depends upon broadband infrastructure, institutional subscriptions, digital repositories, computational resources, research training, language accessibility, and technological literacy. Open access can reduce some barriers but cannot eliminate structural inequalities. A researcher may have unrestricted access to an article but lack the laboratory infrastructure required to reproduce the research. Similarly, open datasets may be technically available but unusable without computational capacity. Global knowledge equity therefore requires a broader conception of access that encompasses infrastructure, skills, financing, and institutional capacity. UNESCO's Open Science framework explicitly links openness with reducing science, technology, and innovation gaps and emphasizes equitable access and reciprocal sharing between developed and developing countries (UNESCO, 2021). Indigenous and local knowledge introduces an additional dimension. Conventional intellectual property categories often struggle to protect knowledge that is collectively held, transmitted across generations, or embedded in cultural practices. At the same time, placing such knowledge entirely into the public domain may facilitate misappropriation and commercial exploitation. A future international framework should therefore incorporate community rights, benefit-sharing, prior informed consent, attribution, defensive protection, and sui generis mechanisms where appropriate. Scientific knowledge governance must also address the risk of “data colonialism,” in which institutions with greater technological capacity extract datasets from less powerful communities without reciprocal benefits. Open science should not become a justification for unrestricted extraction. UNESCO

explicitly warns against unfair or inequitable extraction of data and knowledge and recognizes the need to protect indigenous and traditional knowledge (UNESCO, 2021). International governance should therefore be based on principles of reciprocity, fairness, transparency, capacity-building, and shared benefits. The ultimate objective should be a global knowledge system in which intellectual property facilitates participation in scientific progress rather than reinforcing a permanent division between knowledge-rich and knowledge-dependent societies.

7. Toward a Stewardship-Based Model of Intellectual Property Governance

The central challenge for intellectual property in the digital era is not whether ownership should disappear but how ownership should be subordinated to the broader objectives that justify intellectual property protection. The conventional language of "ownership" tends to suggest an absolute entitlement to control a resource. Scientific knowledge, by contrast, requires a more relational understanding. Researchers rely upon communities of knowledge; technological innovation depends upon cumulative discoveries; publicly funded research draws upon collective resources; and digital knowledge can be reproduced and disseminated globally. These characteristics suggest a stewardship model in which intellectual property rights are understood as instruments carrying social responsibilities. Such a model would preserve exclusive rights where they are necessary to incentivize investment, but would impose stronger expectations of accessibility, responsible licensing, and public benefit where knowledge has significant social value. First, publicly funded research should generally be subject to open-access requirements, while permitting narrowly defined exceptions for privacy, security, commercialization, and other legitimate interests. UNESCO has encouraged Member States to ensure that publicly funded research outputs, including publications, data, software, source code, and hardware, are openly licensed or placed in the public domain, subject to justified restrictions (UNESCO, 2021). Second, intellectual property institutions should promote differentiated licensing. Not every innovation requires exclusive licensing. Non-exclusive licenses, patent pools, research-use licenses, humanitarian licenses, and open licenses can preserve incentives while expanding access. Third, research exemptions should be strengthened and clarified internationally so that legitimate scientific experimentation is not unnecessarily obstructed by patent rights. Fourth, competition law should be used more actively where intellectual property rights are deployed strategically to prevent follow-on innovation or to create unreasonable barriers to technology transfer. Fifth, data governance should distinguish between commercial data, public research data, personal data, and culturally sensitive knowledge rather than applying a single ownership model to all information. Sixth, universities and research institutions should adopt transparent intellectual property policies that recognize both commercialization and public dissemination as legitimate institutional objectives. The success of university technology transfer should not be measured exclusively by patent counts or licensing revenues but also by social impact, accessibility, collaborative research, technology diffusion, and public benefit. Seventh, international institutions should strengthen mechanisms for technology transfer and scientific capacity-building in developing countries. The objective should be to enable participation in knowledge production rather than merely facilitate access to knowledge produced elsewhere. Eighth, open science should be supported through sustainable funding models. A transition

from subscription-based publishing to article-processing charges alone risks reproducing inequality in a different form. Public and non-profit infrastructures, institutional repositories, community-led journals, and public digital platforms should therefore receive greater support. Finally, legal governance should become more adaptive. Digital technologies evolve faster than legislative cycles, and rigid legal rules can quickly become obsolete. Regulatory sandboxes, periodic review mechanisms, stakeholder consultation, and evidence-based policy evaluation can help maintain an appropriate balance between innovation and access. The deeper normative principle is that intellectual property should serve society rather than society serving intellectual property. TRIPS itself provides an important foundation for this interpretation by connecting intellectual property protection with technological innovation, technology transfer, dissemination, social welfare, and balance between rights and obligations (WTO, 1994). Open science similarly demonstrates that greater openness can improve scientific quality, collaboration, productivity, and social impact without requiring the abolition of intellectual property (UNESCO, 2021). The appropriate future is therefore neither unrestricted proprietary control nor unrestricted openness. It is a pluralistic governance system in which different forms of knowledge receive different forms of protection and access according to their characteristics, risks, social importance, and contribution to innovation. The conceptual transition from ownership to stewardship is important because it changes the question from who possesses scientific knowledge to how scientific knowledge should be governed for legitimate purposes. Such a transition can reconcile the economic logic of innovation with the social logic of scientific progress. In the digital era, the most successful intellectual property system will not necessarily be the one that creates the strongest rights, but the one that creates the most effective institutional conditions for knowledge to circulate, be verified, recombined, commercialized where appropriate, and ultimately contribute to human welfare.

8. Conclusion

The governance of scientific knowledge has entered a period of structural transformation. Digital technologies have increased the speed, scale, and economic significance of knowledge production while simultaneously reducing the technological barriers to reproduction and dissemination. Intellectual property law remains essential because research and innovation frequently require substantial investment, legal certainty, attribution, and mechanisms for commercialization. Yet exclusivity cannot be treated as an unconditional social objective. Scientific knowledge is cumulative, collaborative, and often publicly funded, and its value frequently depends upon circulation rather than exclusion. The principal challenge for contemporary intellectual property governance is therefore to establish a principled equilibrium between proprietary incentives and knowledge access. The analysis demonstrates that patents, copyright, trade secrets, open licenses, research exemptions, public-interest limitations, technology-transfer mechanisms, and open-science infrastructures should be regarded as complementary components of a broader governance system. International law already contains important foundations for this approach. TRIPS links intellectual property protection with innovation, technology transfer, dissemination, and social welfare, while UNESCO's Open Science Recommendation establishes a global normative commitment to making scientific knowledge more accessible, inclusive, equitable, and reusable. The future of

scientific knowledge governance should build upon these principles through a stewardship-based model. Under such a model, intellectual property remains legitimate where exclusivity performs a demonstrable innovation function, but it becomes subject to stronger expectations of proportionality, accessibility, responsible licensing, and public benefit where the knowledge involved has substantial social significance. This approach is particularly important in relation to publicly funded research, pharmaceuticals, research tools, scientific databases, software, artificial intelligence, and technologies essential to addressing global challenges. A stewardship model also offers a more equitable framework for developing countries by connecting intellectual property protection with technology transfer, capacity-building, reciprocal scientific collaboration, and access to research infrastructure. Ultimately, scientific progress cannot be reduced to the creation of proprietary assets. The social value of science lies in the capacity of knowledge to circulate, be scrutinized, reproduced, adapted, and translated into solutions. Intellectual property should therefore be designed not as a legal barrier around knowledge but as a calibrated institutional mechanism that determines when control is necessary and when access should prevail. The central principle for the digital era should be clear: **knowledge may be owned in law, but scientific knowledge must remain governed in the public interest.**

Declarations

Conflict of interest: The author declares that they have no conflict of interest.

Funding: This review received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial or not-for-profit sectors.

Ethical approval: Not applicable. This article is a review of published literature and did not involve human participants or animal subjects.

Data availability: No new data were generated or analysed in support of this review. All sources relied upon are cited in the References.

Use of AI tools: No generative artificial intelligence tool was used in the conception, drafting or analysis of this article. The authors take full responsibility for the content.

Author contributions: Author contributed to the conception of the review, the survey of the literature, and the drafting and revision of the manuscript. Author read and approved the final version.