AI-Driven Freedom to Operate: Redefining Intellectual Property Strategy for Pharmaceuticals[#]

Layla Barqawi [(1)*]

(1) Researcher,.

Received: 1/2/2026
Accepted: 10/5/2026
Published: 23/7/2026

* *Corresponding Author:*
-

DOI:
https://doi.org/10.59759/law.v5i2.1970

Abstract

The Freedom to Operate (FTO) process is a critical component of intellectual property (IP) management in the pharmaceutical industry. It ensures that companies can develop, manufacture, and commercialize products without infringing on existing patents. With the increasing complexity of patent landscapes, artificial intelligence (AI) has emerged as a transformative tool to enhance the FTO process. AI-driven technologies improve the accuracy and efficiency of assessing potential risks, enabling companies to make more informed decisions about product development and market entry.

AI systems in FTO processes analyze vast datasets, identify potential overlaps with existing patents, and provide detailed maps of the IP environment. These capabilities are particularly valuable for pharmaceutical companies operating in highly competitive and complex regulatory frameworks. AI technologies enable companies to explore markets strategically, design products that minimize infringement risks, and identify opportunities for innovation in areas with limited patent competition.

Another advantage of AI is its ability to monitor changes in the IP landscape in real time, including tracking new patent filings, modifications, and expirations. Predictive capabilities allow businesses to assess the enforceability of patents, aiding decisions related to licensing, challenges to weak patents, or designing around existing claims. These features ensure companies remain proactive in managing their IP risks and maintain a competitive edge.

Despite its benefits, the use of AI in FTO analyses is not without challenges. Ensuring data accuracy, addressing ethical considerations, and incorporating human expertise in interpreting patent claims and legal nuances remain essential. While AI provides significant advancements in speed and precision, human oversight is critical for nuanced decision-making and compliance with legal frameworks.

The methodology employed in this research will be a hybrid approach, combining an extensive review of AI-driven tools and their applications in FTO with practical case studies from the pharmaceutical sector.

[#] A special issue for the Third International Conference, entitled: **Artificial Intelligence, A Legal Vision Towards a Sustainable Future**.

This paper will firstly discuss the current IP landscape and challenges in conducting FTO analyses, particularly in the pharmaceutical industry. Secondly, it will examine the role of AI in addressing these challenges by improving patent search efficiency, enabling real-time monitoring, and enhancing predictive risk assessment. Finally, the paper will evaluate the limitations of AI tools, such as ethical considerations, data quality issues, and the need for human oversight, while proposing recommendations for their effective integration into FTO strategies.

Keywords: Freedom to Operate, Intellectual Property, Artificial Intelligence.

حرية التشغيل المدفوعة بالذكاء الاصطناعي: إعادة تعريف استراتيجية الملكية الفكرية في صناعة الادوية

ليلى برقاوي [1]

(1) باحث، المفرق – الأردن.

ملخص

تعد عملية حرية التشغيل (FTO) عنصراً حاسماً في إدارة الملكية الفكرية في صناعة الأدوية، إذ تضمن قدرة الشركات على تطوير المنتجات وتصنيعها وتسويقها دون التعدي على براءات الاختراع القائمة. ومع تزايد تعقيد مشهد البراءات، برز الذكاء الاصطناعي كأداة تحولية لتعزيز عملية حرية التشغيل إذ تعمل التقنيات المدعومة بالذكاء الاصطناعي على تحسين دقة وكفاءة تقييم المخاطر المحتملة، مما يمكّن الشركات من اتخاذ قرارات أكثر استنارة بشأن تطوير المنتجات ودخول الأسواق.

تقوم أنظمة الذكاء الاصطناعي في عمليات حرية التشغيل بتحليل مجموعات بيانات ضخمة، وتحديد التداخلات المحتملة مع البراءات القائمة، وتقديم خرائط تفصيلية لبيئة الملكية الفكرية. وتُعد هذه القدرات ذات قيمة خاصة لشركات الأدوية التي تعمل ضمن أطر تنظيمية معقدة وتنافسية عالية. كما تمكّن تقنيات الذكاء الاصطناعي الشركات من استكشاف الأسواق بشكل استراتيجي، وتصميم منتجات تقلل من أخطار التعدي، وتحديد فرص الابتكار في المجالات ذات المنافسة البرائية المحدودة.

ومن مزايا الذكاء الاصطناعي أيضًا قدرته على مراقبة التغيرات في مشهد الملكية الفكرية بشكل آني، بما في ذلك تتبع طلبات البراءات الجديدة، والتعديلات، وانتهاء الصلاحية. كما تتيح القدرات التنبؤية للشركات تقييم قابلية تنفيذ البراءات، مما يساعد في اتخاذ قرارات تتعلق بالترخيص، أو الطعن في البراءات الضعيفة، أو تصميم حلول بديلة تتجاوز المطالبات القائمة. وتضمن هذه الميزات بقاء الشركات استباقية في إدارة مخاطر الملكية الفكرية والحفاظ على ميزتها التنافسية.

وعلى الرغم من هذه الفوائد، فإن استخدام الذكاء الاصطناعي في تحليلات حرية التشغيل لا يخلو من التحديات. إذ تظل دقة البيانات، ومعالجة الاعتبارات الأخلاقية، وإدماج الخبرة البشرية في تفسير مطالبات البراءات والتفاصيل القانونية، أمورًا ضرورية. فبينما يوفر الذكاء الاصطناعي تقدمًا كبيرًا من حيث السرعة والدقة، يظل الإشراف البشري أمرًا حاسمًا لاتخاذ قرارات دقيقة والامتثال للأطر القانونية.

ستعتمد المنهجية المستخدمة في هذا البحث على نهج هجين يجمع بين مراجعة شاملة للأدوات المدعومة بالذكاء الاصطناعي وتطبيقاتها في حرية التشغيل، مع دراسات حالة عملية من قطاع الأدوية.

ستتناول هذه الورقة أولا المشهد الحالي للملكية الفكرية والتحديات المرتبطة بإجراء تحليلات حرية التشغيل، لا سيما في صناعة الأدوية. ثانيا دور الذكاء الاصطناعي في معالجة هذه التحديات من خلال تحسين كفاءة البحث في البراءات، وإتاحة المراقبة في الوقت الحقيقي، وتعزيز تقييم المخاطر التنبؤية. وأخيرا، سيت تقييم قيود أدوات الذكاء الاصطناعي، مثل الاعتبارات الأخلاقية، ومشكلات جودة البيانات، والحاجة إلى الإشراف البشري، مع تقديم توصيات لدمجها بفعالية في استراتيجيات حرية التشغيل.

الكلمات المفتاحية :حرية التشغيل، الملكية الفكرية، الذكاء الاصطناعي

1. Introduction and Background

The development and commercialisation of pharmaceutical products are closely tied to the legal boundaries established by intellectual property rights, particularly patents. Central to these boundaries is the concept of *Freedom to Operate* (FTO), a legal assessment that seeks to determine whether a given product, method, or process can be developed and brought to market without infringing valid patent rights held by others. An FTO analysis does not ask whether the company holds its own patents, but whether any third-party rights exist that could give rise to legal conflict. It is a preventive exercise, undertaken during various stages of research and development, with the aim of identifying and mitigating legal risk before significant investment is committed or irreversible steps are taken. In pharmaceutical contexts, where the costs of failure are high and regulatory pathways are lengthy, the importance of FTO cannot be overstated.

Although the term “Freedom to Operate” is relatively recent, the legal principle it encapsulates is not. The idea that patent rights are exclusionary rather than affirmative has long been recognised in both common law and

civil law systems. Holding a patent does not, in itself, entitle the holder to use the invention if that use would infringe another's rights. A well-known example is that of an improvement patent, where a company may secure a patent on a refined version of an existing drug compound, but cannot commercialise it without a licence from the holder of the original compound patent. This structural limitation is intrinsic to the nature of patent law and has been acknowledged in judicial decisions across multiple jurisdictions.[1]

In the United States, FTO assessments are often part of standard legal and commercial planning, particularly in sectors such as biotechnology and pharmaceuticals.[2] Legal practitioners review the claims of active patents, examine their scope and enforceability, and assess whether a proposed product might fall within those claims. In Europe, FTO analysis must address the added complexity of multiple legal systems operating within the framework of the European Patent Convention, where a single European patent can give rise to separate rights in different states, each subject to local interpretation and enforcement.[3] Countries such as Japan and South Korea have integrated FTO evaluations into broader regulatory and patent strategies, particularly in relation to product approval and international trade.[4]In contrast, several jurisdictions in the Global South are still in the process of building legal and institutional capacity to support effective FTO practices. Nonetheless, as pharmaceutical industries grow and domestic innovation increases, awareness of FTO is gradually expanding beyond traditionally dominant markets.

The pharmaceutical sector presents distinctive challenges for FTO analysis. Patents may cover not only active ingredients but also polymorphs, formulations, dosages, delivery mechanisms, and production

[1] Bouchoux, D. E., Intellectual Property: The Law of Trademarks, Copyrights, Patents, and Trade Secrets (5th edn, Cengage Learning 2019) 393.
[2] Nard, C. A., The Law of Patents (5th edn, Aspen Publishing 2022) 824–829.
[3] Cornish, W. R., Llewelyn, D., and Aplin, T., Intellectual Property: Patents, Copyright, Trade Marks and Allied Rights (9th edn, Sweet & Maxwell 2019) 241.
[4] Yamane, H., 'Freedom to Operate in the Japanese Patent System' (2016) 18(4) Pacific Rim Law & Policy Journal 675.

techniques. These patents are often held by different entities, and their claims may overlap or compete. The result is a legally dense environment where seemingly minor technical changes may carry significant legal implications. Without a careful FTO assessment, companies risk pursuing development paths that lead to infringement disputes, litigation, injunctions, or withdrawal of products already in the market.[1] For this reason, FTO has become a necessary element of legal risk management and strategic planning in pharmaceutical research and development. Its function is neither abstract nor speculative, but grounded in the practical realities of law, regulation, and commercial constraint.

2. Literature Review

The existing literature on Freedom to Operate in the pharmaceutical industry identifies both the strategic importance and the practical complexity of navigating patent landscapes. Authors such as Nard (2022) and Cornish et al. (2019) emphasise that FTO is not simply a patentability concern but a risk-oriented legal inquiry that requires careful interpretation of third-party rights and enforcement potential. Scholars have also documented the challenges presented by patent thickets and strategic filing practices, particularly in high-value therapeutic areas where incremental innovations are frequently patented to extend exclusivity periods. Shapiro (2001) and Grabowski (2002) explore how overlapping and layered rights function as market-entry barriers, with implications for innovation and access. In response to these conditions, commentators including Dutfield (2009) and Gassmann et al. (2008) examine the ways in which pharmaceutical firms manage legal uncertainty through clearance strategies, including in-house legal reviews, external opinions, and increasingly, the use of structured digital tools. More recently, legal scholars such as Vezzoso (2021) and Bostyn (2018) have raised questions about the limits of automated decision-support in this context, pointing to issues of transparency, data reliability, and legal accountability. These

[1] Yamane, H., 'Freedom to Operate in the Japanese Patent System' (2016) 18(4) Pacific Rim Law & Policy Journal 675.

perspectives collectively underscore the evolving nature of FTO as both a legal discipline and a strategic function, and they support the view that while modern tools may support efficiency, the substantive legal judgment remains essential to lawful pharmaceutical development.

3. The Current IP Landscape and Challenges in Conducting FTO Analyses in the Pharmaceutical Industry

The pharmaceutical industry operates within a densely populated intellectual property environment. Patent protection serves as the principal mechanism for securing commercial advantage and recouping the high costs of research and development. As a result, pharmaceutical firms seek patent protection for a broad range of subject matter, including not only active pharmaceutical ingredients (APIs), but also intermediates, formulations, methods of synthesis, dosage regimens, delivery systems, and manufacturing processes.[1] The cumulative effect is a legal landscape characterised by overlapping rights, multiple layers of protection, and strategic patenting behaviour.

This layered approach is often referred to as a "patent thicket"—a complex web of interrelated rights that can make it difficult for new entrants to ascertain whether their intended product or process may be introduced without legal risk.[2] In practice, this means that an FTO analysis in the pharmaceutical sector requires a highly detailed and methodical review of patent claims, including attention to expired, pending, and soon-to-expire rights across multiple jurisdictions. It also demands expertise in both legal interpretation and scientific detail. For example, a single compound may be covered by patents claiming different crystalline forms

[1] Grabowski, H. G., 'Patents and New Product Development in the Pharmaceutical and Biotechnology Industries' (2002) 56(2) Science and Public Policy 86.
[2] Shapiro, C., 'Navigating the Patent Thicket: Cross Licenses, Patent Pools, and Standard Setting' (2001) 1 Innovation Policy and the Economy 119.

(polymorphs), and those forms may themselves be subject to claims relating to solubility, stability, or bioavailability.[1]

Jurisdictional diversity further complicates FTO analysis. Patent rights are territorial, meaning that an assessment must be conducted for each country in which the product is intended to be marketed or manufactured. Differences in claim construction, patentability criteria, and enforcement mechanisms can lead to inconsistent outcomes.[2] For example, while certain methods of treatment may be patentable in the United States, they are generally excluded from patent protection under European law.[3] This divergence necessitates not only legal review but also strategic consideration of how and where to launch a product.

Another challenge arises from the lack of a unified or fully transparent global patent database. Although various national and regional databases exist, they differ in terms of accessibility, search functionality, and the quality of information provided. Patent assignments, licensing arrangements, and legal status updates are not always publicly available or easy to interpret.[4] In addition, pharmaceutical companies may use divisional and continuation applications to extend the life of their patent portfolios, sometimes in ways that obscure the scope of protection or delay the emergence of generic competition.[5] This creates a moving target for FTO analysts attempting to determine whether a freedom to operate exists.

[1] Gassmann, O., Reepmeyer, G., and von Zedtwitz, M., Leading Pharmaceutical Innovation: Trends and Drivers for Growth in the Pharmaceutical Industry (2nd edn, Springer 2008) 103.
[2] Torremans, P. L. C., Holyoak and Torremans Intellectual Property Law (9th edn, OUP 2019) 325.
[3] European Patent Convention 2000, Art 53(c); cf. 35 USC §101 (US Patent Act).
[4] Abbott, F. M., 'The Problem of Disclosure in Patent Law: Certainty and Information Asymmetry' (2014) 13(2) Chicago-Kent Journal of Intellectual Property 144.
[5] Kapczynski, A., 'The Cost of Price: Why and How to Get Beyond Intellectual Property Internalism' (2012) 59(4) UCLA Law Review 970.

The complexity of FTO is also shaped by the growing role of biologics and personalised medicine. Biologics, which are derived from living organisms, often involve complex manufacturing techniques and are protected by both product and process patents. Their legal protection can extend beyond conventional patent claims to include regulatory exclusivities and trade secrets, which may not be readily detectable through standard patent searches.[1] As a result, the assessment of FTO in biologics is not merely a question of identifying patent numbers, but of understanding entire production systems and the legal regimes that surround them.

In addition, the high costs associated with FTO analyses have become a concern, particularly for smaller firms and academic institutions. Legal fees, patent database subscriptions, technical consultations, and multi-jurisdictional reviews can result in significant expenditure.[2] This raises questions about access to innovation and the equitable distribution of legal and commercial opportunity. The burden of legal uncertainty may deter entry into high-value therapeutic areas, limiting the development of alternative or lower-cost treatments.

Consequently, FTO analyses are inherently provisional. They represent a snapshot in time and are subject to change based on new patent filings, litigation outcomes, oppositions, and regulatory developments.[3] A favourable FTO opinion today may be undermined by a newly issued patent or a successful appeal reinstating a previously rejected claim. This shifting legal environment requires companies to engage in ongoing monitoring and periodic reassessment, further contributing to the time and cost burdens of the process.

[1] Roin, B. N., 'Unpatentable Drugs and the Standards of Patentability' (2014) 87(3) Texas Law Review 503.
[2] Rai, A. K., 'Regulating Scientific Research: Intellectual Property Rights and the Norms of Science' (1999) 94(1) Northwestern University Law Review 77.
[3] Eisenberg, R. S., 'Why the Gene Patenting Controversy Persists' (2011) 89(1) Academic Medicine 66.

4. Addressing FTO Challenges Through Technological Tools: Search Efficiency, Monitoring, and Risk Assessment

The difficulties associated with conducting comprehensive FTO analyses—especially in the pharmaceutical context—have prompted the development and adoption of advanced computational tools that assist legal and technical teams in navigating large volumes of patent information. While these tools vary in design and functionality, their contribution lies in improving the efficiency of search processes, providing continuous updates on relevant developments, and offering structured assessments of legal risk. Though not a substitute for legal interpretation, such systems support more informed and timely decision-making.

One of the most persistent difficulties in FTO work is the breadth and complexity of patent literature. Pharmaceutical patents are often drafted in highly technical and abstract language, with broad claims that require careful construction. In this context, traditional keyword-based searches may be insufficient to capture relevant results, particularly when patent drafters use non-standard terminology or obscure phrasing to broaden the scope of protection.[1] Contemporary tools that utilise structured classification systems and semantic search methodologies have significantly improved the precision and recall of patent searches. These systems allow users to search not only by keywords but by legal status, technical field, assignee, or even litigation history.[2] In pharmaceutical FTO analyses, this enhanced search capacity allows counsel to detect potential conflicts earlier, assess the significance of claim language, and prioritise follow-up review more effectively.

Beyond search, another essential function is real-time monitoring. Patent landscapes are dynamic: applications are filed daily, claims are amended or withdrawn, and oppositions or re-examinations can affect the enforceability of existing rights. Relying solely on periodic manual

[1] Parchomovsky, G. and Wagner, R. P., 'Patent Portfolios' (2005) 154(1) University of Pennsylvania Law Review 1.

[2] Dutfield, G., Intellectual Property Rights and the Life Science Industries: Past, Present and Future (2nd edn, Routledge 2009) 229.

searches creates a risk of missing key developments. Automated monitoring systems can track specific technologies, applicants, or jurisdictions and alert legal teams to new filings or legal events that may affect FTO assessments.[1] This is particularly valuable in therapeutic areas that are subject to high rates of patent activity or where litigation is ongoing.

A further contribution lies in structured risk assessment. Once relevant patents are identified, the question becomes how to assess the degree of legal risk posed by those patents. While this task ultimately rests with legal experts, some systems now offer structured summaries that highlight key features such as claim breadth, prosecution history, and related disputes. These features assist in forming a preliminary view of patent strength or vulnerability. For instance, a patent that has been narrowed during prosecution or that has survived opposition proceedings may be viewed differently from one with untested and broad claims.[2] Likewise, a patent family with extensive global coverage and multiple continuation filings may suggest a higher likelihood of active enforcement. Structured data on such features provides a helpful starting point for legal analysis and prioritisation.

These tools also facilitate strategic decision-making beyond the immediate legal review. For example, if a potentially relevant patent is identified but appears vulnerable to challenge, a firm may consider filing for revocation, initiating licensing discussions, or designing around the protected features.[3] Similarly, a competitor's filing activity may inform a company's own patenting strategy or market entry timing. Although these decisions depend on multiple factors, including regulatory and commercial considerations, the availability of up-to-date and structured patent data supports a more agile and coordinated legal response.

[1] Barton, J. H., 'Reforming the Patent System' (2000) 287(5460) Science 1933.
[2] Helmers, C. and McDonagh, L., 'Patent Litigation in the UK: An Empirical Survey 2000–2008' (2013) 5(1) Journal of Intellectual Property Law & Practice 48.
[3] Cook, T., A User's Guide to Patents (6th edn, Bloomsbury 2020) 274–276.

Despite these advantages, such tools must be used with caution. Their output depends heavily on the quality of the underlying data and the precision of search parameters. More importantly, they do not replace legal interpretation or professional judgment. The scope of a patent claim, the relevance of prior art, and the likelihood of enforcement remain legal questions that cannot be fully automated.[1] As such, these systems should be understood as support mechanisms—useful for managing complexity and improving efficiency, but always subject to validation by qualified experts.

5. Limitations and Responsible Use of Computational Tools in FTO Practice

While the increasing use of computational tools in patent analysis has brought improvements in efficiency and organisation, it is important to recognise the limitations of such systems, particularly when relied upon in legally sensitive contexts such as FTO assessments. These limitations fall broadly into three categories: ethical considerations, concerns about the quality and completeness of data, and the continuing need for human oversight and interpretive judgment. A realistic appraisal of these issues is essential for the responsible integration of such tools into professional legal practice.

The first area of concern relates to transparency and accountability. Patent-related decisions have real legal and financial consequences, and there is a growing concern that the use of opaque or unexamined systems may obscure the basis of those decisions.[2] When legal teams rely on outputs from automated tools without understanding how results are generated or filtered, they risk delegating core legal responsibilities to processes that cannot be interrogated or verified. In FTO contexts—where infringement risk may determine whether a product proceeds to market or

[1] Thomas, J. R., 'Collusion and Collective Action in the Patent System: A Network Perspective' (2013) 36(1) Harvard Journal of Law & Technology 95.

[2] Vezzoso, S., 'Ethics, Algorithms and Patents: The Role of Transparency in Automated Decision-Making' (2021) 12(2) European Journal of Risk Regulation 350.

not—this lack of transparency raises important ethical questions.[1] Legal professionals have duties not only to their clients, but also to courts and regulatory authorities. These duties include a requirement to provide reasoned advice based on verifiable sources and applicable law. Systems that provide unexplainable or untraceable conclusions cannot be safely relied upon for these purposes.

A second limitation concerns data reliability. The utility of any tool depends on the quality, accuracy, and currency of the data it uses. While public patent registers provide substantial information, they are not always complete or up to date, particularly with respect to patent ownership changes, licensing arrangements, or litigation status.[2] Furthermore, some jurisdictions lack robust online systems, making it difficult to compile comprehensive data for global FTO assessments. Tools that rely on such incomplete datasets may generate results that appear definitive but are in fact misleading. This can expose firms to unexpected infringement risk or missed commercial opportunities.

In addition to legal and technical concerns, there is also a structural limitation: these tools are not capable of legal reasoning. They cannot interpret claim language in context, assess the validity of a patent based on emerging prior art, or weigh litigation outcomes in multiple jurisdictions.[3] Patent law is inherently interpretive, and the same claim may be construed differently by different courts, depending on local rules of construction, expert evidence, and factual background. In such an environment, professional judgment cannot be substituted. It is not the speed of analysis but the soundness of reasoning that determines the quality of legal advice.

[1] Susskind, R., Tomorrow's Lawyers: An Introduction to Your Future (3rd edn, OUP 2021) 96–98.

[2] Kur, A. and Dreier, T., European Intellectual Property Law: Text, Cases and Materials (2nd edn, Edward Elgar 2021) 283.

[3] Bostyn, S. J. R., 'Interpreting Patent Claims Across Jurisdictions: Legal Certainty or Fragmentation?' (2018) 50(1) International Review of Intellectual Property and Competition Law 1.

For these reasons, the integration of computational tools into FTO assessments must be approached with caution. The goal should not be to replace legal review but to support it with better-structured data, improved access to documentation, and more efficient identification of relevant materials.[1] Legal teams should adopt internal protocols for verifying results, tracing the origin of recommendations, and cross-checking outputs against authoritative sources. Equally important is the development of professional standards for the responsible use of such tools, including training in their appropriate limits and careful documentation of their role in legal analysis.

Where feasible, cooperation with national patent offices and regulatory authorities may help improve data availability and harmonisation. Greater transparency in patent ownership, litigation status, and licensing terms would enhance the effectiveness of both traditional and modern FTO methods.[2] Institutions offering legal education and continuing professional development should also ensure that practitioners are equipped to engage critically with new technologies, not as passive recipients but as active evaluators of the tools they use.

6. Conclusion and Recommendations

The Freedom to Operate assessment remains an essential component of legal and commercial planning within the pharmaceutical industry. As patent landscapes grow increasingly complex and as regulatory pathways become more demanding, the risks associated with patent infringement, enforcement actions, and delayed market entry have become more pronounced. In this environment, the role of legal due diligence—specifically in the form of FTO analysis—is both strategic and indispensable. While the emergence of computational tools has offered

[1] Oppenheim, J. and Taylor, M., Patent Strategy for Researchers and Research Managers (2nd edn, Wiley 2002) 109–112.

[2] Grosse Ruse-Khan, H., The Protection of Intellectual Property in International Law (OUP 2016) 417–420.

practical means of enhancing patent search capabilities, real-time monitoring, and risk prioritisation, these developments must be situated within a broader framework that continues to prioritise human oversight, legal interpretation, and professional accountability.

The limitations of these tools—particularly in relation to data integrity, interpretive capacity, and ethical transparency—demonstrate that their function is necessarily auxiliary. Their outputs must be subject to critical review, contextual understanding, and verification by qualified professionals. The use of such tools does not relieve counsel of their duties to the client or to the legal system; rather, it reinforces the need for careful scrutiny and methodical practice in the assessment of third-party rights.

In light of these findings, it is recommended that FTO processes continue to be grounded in legal expertise, supported—but not displaced—by technological aids. Internal protocols should be established to ensure that the results produced by search and monitoring tools are traceable, explainable, and aligned with primary legal sources. Where tools are adopted, they should be selected with an understanding of their technical and legal limitations, and their integration into practice should be documented and regularly reviewed.

Efforts should also be directed toward improving the accessibility and quality of patent data, particularly with respect to ownership changes, licensing terms, and legal status updates. Collaboration between industry stakeholders, patent offices, and regulatory bodies may be necessary to achieve a more transparent and coherent global patent infrastructure. At the same time, legal professionals involved in FTO work must be equipped with the necessary training to engage critically with the technologies they employ, ensuring that their judgment remains central to the process.

Furthermore, given the jurisdictional nature of patent rights and the variability of legal interpretation across borders, FTO strategies must be developed with close attention to local law and enforcement practice. A comprehensive analysis in one jurisdiction cannot be assumed to apply to others without independent review. Finally, FTO assessments must be recognised as dynamic and ongoing processes. Changes in patent filings,

regulatory decisions, or judicial interpretations can alter the legal landscape, requiring firms to maintain vigilance through continuous monitoring and periodic reassessment.

In sum, the future of FTO practice in the pharmaceutical industry lies in the careful balancing of emerging methods with enduring legal standards. Technological support may improve efficiency and clarity, but the core of FTO remains a legal task—one that demands diligence, sound reasoning, and an ongoing commitment to lawful and informed innovation.

References

- Abbott, F. M., 'The Problem of Disclosure in Patent Law: Certainty and Information Asymmetry' (2014) 13(2) *Chicago-Kent Journal of Intellectual Property* 144.
- Barton, J. H., 'Reforming the Patent System' (2000) 287(5460) *Science* 1933.
- Bostyn, S. J. R., 'Interpreting Patent Claims Across Jurisdictions: Legal Certainty or Fragmentation?' (2018) 50(1) *International Review of Intellectual Property and Competition Law* 1.
- Bouchoux, D. E., *Intellectual Property: The Law of Trademarks, Copyrights, Patents, and Trade Secrets* (5th edn, Cengage Learning 2019) 393.
- Cook, T., *A User's Guide to Patents* (6th edn, Bloomsbury 2020) 274–276.
- Cornish, W. R., Llewelyn, D., and Aplin, T., *Intellectual Property: Patents, Copyright, Trade Marks and Allied Rights* (9th edn, Sweet & Maxwell 2019) 241.
- Dutfield, G., *Intellectual Property Rights and the Life Science Industries: Past, Present and Future* (2nd edn, Routledge 2009) 229.
- Eisenberg, R. S., 'Why the Gene Patenting Controversy Persists' (2011) 89(1) *Academic Medicine* 66.
- European Patent Convention 2000, Art 53(c); cf. 35 USC §101 (US Patent Act).

- Gassmann, O., Reepmeyer, G., and von Zedtwitz, M., *Leading Pharmaceutical Innovation: Trends and Drivers for Growth in the Pharmaceutical Industry* (2nd edn, Springer 2008) 103.
- Grabowski, H. G., 'Patents and New Product Development in the Pharmaceutical and Biotechnology Industries' (2002) 56(2) *Science and Public Policy* 86.
- Grosse Ruse-Khan, H., *The Protection of Intellectual Property in International Law* (OUP 2016) 417–420.
- Helmers, C. and McDonagh, L., 'Patent Litigation in the UK: An Empirical Survey 2000–2008' (2013) 5(1) *Journal of Intellectual Property Law & Practice* 48.
- Kapczynski, A., 'The Cost of Price: Why and How to Get Beyond Intellectual Property Internalism' (2012) 59(4) *UCLA Law Review* 970.
- Kur, A. and Dreier, T., *European Intellectual Property Law: Text, Cases and Materials* (2nd edn, Edward Elgar 2021) 283.
- Nard, C. A., *The Law of Patents* (5th edn, Aspen Publishing 2022) 824–829.
- Oppenheim, J. and Taylor, M., *Patent Strategy for Researchers and Research Managers* (2nd edn, Wiley 2002) 109–112.
- Parchomovsky, G. and Wagner, R. P., 'Patent Portfolios' (2005) 154(1) *University of Pennsylvania Law Review* 1.
- Rai, A. K., 'Regulating Scientific Research: Intellectual Property Rights and the Norms of Science' (1999) 94(1) *Northwestern University Law Review* 77.
- Roin, B. N., 'Unpatentable Drugs and the Standards of Patentability' (2014) 87(3) *Texas Law Review* 503.
- Shapiro, C., 'Navigating the Patent Thicket: Cross Licenses, Patent Pools, and Standard Setting' (2001) 1 *Innovation Policy and the Economy* 119.
- Susskind, R., *Tomorrow's* Lawyers*: An Introduction to Your Future* (3rd edn, OUP 2021) 96–98.
- Thomas, J. R., 'Collusion and Collective Action in the Patent System: A Network Perspective' (2013) 36(1) *Harvard Journal of* Law & Technology 95.

- Torremans, P. L. C., *Holyoak and Torremans Intellectual Property Law* (9th edn, OUP 2019) 325.
- Vezzoso, S., 'Ethics, Algorithms and Patents: The Role of Transparency in Automated Decision-Making' (2021) 12(2) *European Journal of Risk Regulation* 350.
- Yamane, H., 'Freedom to Operate in the Japanese Patent System' (2016) 18(4) *Pacific Rim Law & Policy Journal* 675.