



## Literature listing

### 1. Books

#### 1.1. Recent reports and other monographs

European Court Issues Gene Patent Ruling Against Monsanto – A Myriad Connection? Genomics Law Report, Posted by John Conley on July 28, 2010, <http://www.genomicslawreport.com/index.php/2010/07/28/european-court-issues-gene-patent-ruling-against-monsanto-a-myrriad-connection/>.

#### 1.2. Reviews are available as follows:

Sebastian Haunss and Kenneth C. Shadlen, Politics of intellectual property: Contestation over the ownership, use and control of knowledge and information, Edward Elgar, Cheltenham, 2009 reviewed by Blakeney M. in European Intellectual Property Review, 2010, 32 (7), 367–368.

Spyros Maniatis, Trade Marks in Europe: A practical jurisprudence, 2nd edn, London, Sweet & Maxwell, 2009, reviewed by Torremans P.L.C. in European Intellectual Property Review, 2010, 32 (7), 368.

Trevor Cook, EU Intellectual Property Law, Oxford, OUP, 2010, reviewed by Burt R.J. in CIPA Journal, 2010, 39 (7), 449.

### 2. Journals

The listing in this issue includes entries found using Scopus™, Elsevier's abstract and indexing database which gives access to almost 18,000 peer-reviewed titles from more than 5,000 international publishers.

#### 2.1. Search techniques, databases and analysis: Classification: Searcher certification

##### 2.1.1. Search techniques, databases

A study on the application of data mining in the patent information analysis for company.

Huang L., Yuan Y., Zhao Z., 2nd International Workshop on Education Technology and Computer Science, ETCS 2010, 2010, 1, 5458763, 618–622.

Abstracts versus full texts and patents: A quantitative analysis of biomedical entities.

Muller B., Klinger R., Gurulingappa H., Mevissen H.-T., Hofmann-Apitius M., Fluck J., Friedrich C.M., Lecture Notes in Computer Science. 2010, 6107 LNCS, 152–165.

Advances in Multidisciplinary Retrieval – First Information Retrieval Facility Conference, IRFC 2010, Proceedings., Lecture Notes in Computer Science, 2010, 6107 LNCS.

Alerting companies through on-line patent trend analysis. Dereli T., Durmusoglu A., Cybernetics and Systems, 2010, 41 (5), 371–390.

An automatic system for summarization and information extraction of legal information. Chieze E., Farzindar A., Lapalme G., Lecture Notes in Computer Science, 2010, 6036 LNAI, 216–234.

An IPC-based vector space model for patent retrieval. Chen Y.-L., Chiu Y.-T., Information Processing and Management, 2010, DOI: 10.1016/j.ipm.2010.06.001.

Associating figures with descriptions for patent documents. Li L., Tan C.L., ACM International Conference Proceeding Series, 2010, 385–391.

Automatic extraction and resolution of bibliographical references in patent documents. Lopez P., Lecture Notes in Computer Science (including subseries Lecture Notes in Artificial Intelligence and Lecture Notes in Bioinformatics), 2010, 6107 LNCS, 120–135.

Clustering patents using non-exhaustive overlaps. Trappey C.V., Trappey A.J.C., Wu C.-Y., Journal of Systems Science and Systems Engineering, 2010, 19 (2), 162–181.

Designing graphical interfaces for design rationale search & retrieval. Liu Y., Liang Y., Lim S.C.J., Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems – Proceedings, 2010, 4087–4092.

Efficient logo retrieval through hashing shape context descriptors. Rusinol M., Lladós J., ACM International Conference Proceeding Series, 2010, 215–222.

Exploring contextual models in chemical patent search. Urbain J., Frieder O., Lecture Notes in Computer Science, 2010, 6107 LNCS, 60–69.

Exploring the feasibility and accuracy of Latent Semantic Analysis based text mining techniques to detect similarity between patent documents and scientific publications. Magerman T., van Looy B., Song X., Scientometrics, 2010, 82 (2), 289–306.

- Ground-truthed dataset of chemical structure images in Japanese published patent applications.  
Nakagawa K., Fujiyoshi A., Suzuki M., ACM International Conference Proceeding Series, 2010, 455–462.
- Improving retrievability of patents in prior-art search.  
Bashir S., Rauber A., Lecture Notes in Computer Science, 2010, 5993 LNCS, 457–470.
- Knowledge modeling in prior art search.  
Graf E., Frommholz I., Lalmas M., Van Rijsbergen K., Lecture Notes in Computer Science, 2010, 6107 LNCS, 31–46.
- Logic-based retrieval: Technology for content-oriented and analytical querying of patent data.  
Klampanos I.A., Wu H., Roelleke T., Azzam H., Lecture Notes in Computer Science, 2010, 6107 LNCS, 100–119.
- Measures for textual patent similarities: A guided way to select appropriate approaches.  
Moehrle M.G., Scientometrics, 2010, 85 (1), 95–109.
- Method to trigger design inspiration from heterogeneous product patents.  
Zhang H., Qiu Q.-Y., Feng P.-E., Wu J.-W., Jisuanji Jicheng Zhizao Xitong/Computer Integrated Manufacturing Systems, CIMS, 2010, 16 (3), 484–490.
- Patent databases: Fee required but value-added or free of charge?  
Birkner M., Information-Wissenschaft und Praxis, 2010, 61 (4), 245–258.
- Patent families: When do different definitions really matter?  
Martinez C., Scientometrics, 2010, DOI: 10.1007/s11192-010-0251-3, 1–25.
- Patent search decision support service.  
Segev A., Kantola J., ITNG2010 – 7th International Conference on Information Technology: New Generations, 2010, 5501670, 568–573.
- Patents under the microscope: Teaching patent searching to graduate and undergraduate students in the life sciences.  
MacMillan D., Thuna M., Reference Services Review, 2010, 38 (3), 417–430.
- PRES: A score metric for evaluating recall-oriented information retrieval applications.  
Magdy W., Jones G.J.F., SIGIR 2010 Proceedings – 33rd Annual International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval, 2010, 611–618.
- Pruning training samples using a supervised clustering algorithm.  
Huang M., Zhao H., Lu B.-L., Lecture Notes in Computer Science, 2010, 6064 LNCS (PART 2), 250–257.
- Scaling up high-value retrieval to medium-volume data.  
Cunningham H., Hanbury A., Ruger S., Lecture Notes in Computer Science, 2010, 6107 LNCS, 1–5.
- Search system requirements of patent analysts.  
Azzopardi L., Vanderbauwhede W., Joho H., SIGIR 2010 Proceedings – 33rd Annual International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval, 2010, 775–776.
- When do applicants search for prior art?  
Sampat B.N., Journal of Law and Economics, 2010, 53 (2), 399–416.
- 2.1.2. Analysis and statistics*  
A comparative study of research performance in nanotechnology for China's inventor-authors and their non-inventing peers.  
Guan J., Wang G., Scientometrics, 2010, 84 (2), 331–343.
- A compared R&D-based and patent-based cross impact analysis for identifying relationships between technologies.  
Thorleuchter D., den Poel D.V., Prinzie A., Technological Forecasting and Social Change, 2010, 77 (7), 1037–1050.
- An analysis on the relationship between R&D input and patent output in Chinese software firms.  
Ye T., Qing Z., Key Engineering Materials, 2010, 439–440, 788–793.
- An empirical enquiry into co-patent networks and their stars: The case of cardiac pacemaker technology.  
Goetze C., Technovation, 2010, 30 (07/08/10), 436–446.
- Analysis of patent numbers in OECD countries.  
Gerami M., 2010 The 2nd International Conference on Computer and Automation Engineering, ICCAE 2010, 2010, 3, 5451378, 402–405.
- Bibliometrics analysis of patent indicators' application in Taiwan.  
Liang C.-C., Yuan M.-S., Journal of Educational Media and Library Science, 2010, 47 (1), 19–53.
- Business, market and intellectual property analysis of polymer solar cells.  
Nielsen T.D., Cruickshank C., Foged S., Thorsen J., Krebs F.C., Solar Energy Materials and Solar Cells, 2010, 94 (10), 1553–1571.
- Capacity for innovation of the Madrid Community based on patents approved between 1996 and 2007.  
Luisa Lascrain M., Jesus Madera-Jaramillo M., Ortoll E., Casado E.S., Revista Espanola de Documentacion Cientifica, 2010, 33 (3), 458–479.
- Comparative study on innovation resource in pharmaceutical fields: An entropy measure over patent data in China.  
Chen X.-D., Cao L.-L., International Journal of Learning and Intellectual Capital, 2010, 7 (03/04/10), 284–294.
- Discovery of factors influencing patent value based on machine learning in patents in the field of nanotechnology.  
Bass S.D., Kurgan L.A., Scientometrics, 2010, 82 (2), 217–241.
- Evaluation frame of technological developing trend based on patent information.  
Huang L.-C., Li Y., UKSim2010 – UKSim 12th International Conference on Computer Modelling and Simulation, 2010, 5481202, 299–304.
- Extracting the commercialization gap between science and technology – Case study of a solar cell.  
Shibata N., Kajikawa Y., Sakata I., Technological Forecasting and Social Change, 2010, 77 (7), 1147–1155.
- Forecasting unmanned vehicle technologies: Use of patent map.  
Shiue Y.-C., Chang C.-C., 2nd International Conference on Computer Research and Development, ICCRD 2010, 2010, 5489507, 752–755.

- Growth behavior of publications and patents: A comparative study on selected Asian economies.  
Wong C.-Y., Goh K.-L., *Journal of Informetrics*, 2010, DOI: 10.1016/j.joi.2010.04.002.
- Inventing together: Exploring the nature of international knowledge spillovers in Latin America.  
Montobbio F., Sterzi V., *Journal of Evolutionary Economics*, 2010, DOI: 10.1007/s00191-010-0181-5, 1–37.
- Inventors on the move: Tracing inventors' mobility and its spatial distribution.  
Migueluez E., Moreno R., Surinach J., *Papers in Regional Science*, 2010, 89 (2), 251–274.
- Knowledge spillovers in US patents: A dynamic patent intensity model with secret common innovation factors.  
Blazsek S., Escribano A., *Journal of Econometrics*, 2010, DOI: 10.1016/j.jeconom.2010.04.004.
- Latin American technological production of greatest international visibility: 1996–2007. A case study: Brasil.  
Perez M.D., Amador S.R., de Moya-Anegón F., *Revista Española de Documentación Científica*, 2010, 33 (1), 34–62.
- Male and female involvement in patenting activity in Spain.  
Mauleon E., Bordons M., *Scientometrics*, 2010, 83 (3), 605–621.
- Mapping growth of an emerging technology – A case study of flexible electronics.  
Poranki S., Nagarur N., Srihari K., *Proceedings of the ASME Inter-Pack Conference 2009, IPACK2009*, 2010, 1, 301–307.
- Modeling economic growth fuelled by science and technology.  
Ribeiro L.C., Ruiz R.M., Bernardes A.T., Albuquerque E.M., *Estudios Economicos*, 2010, 40 (2), 319–340.
- Patent activity on water pollution and treatment in China – a scientometric perspective.  
Yuan J.P., Yue W.P., Su C., Wu Z., Ma Z., Pan Y.T., Ma N., Hu Z.Y., Shi F., Yu Z.L., Wu Y.S., *Scientometrics*, 2010, 83 (3), 639–651.
- Patent analysis for promoting technology transfer in multi-technology industries: The Korean aerospace industry case.  
Park Y., Lee S., Lee S., *Journal of Technology Transfer*, 2010, DOI: 10.1007/s10961-010-9181-8, 1–20.
- Patent and publishing activity sequence over a technology's life cycle.  
Jarvenpää H.M., Mäkinen S.J., Seppänen M., *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 2010, DOI: 10.1016/j.techfore.2010.06.020.
- Patent indicators for monitoring convergence – Examples from NFF and ICT.  
Curran C.-S., Leker J., *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 2010, DOI: 10.1016/j.techfore.2010.06.021.
- Publication activity, citation impact and bi-directional links between publications and patents in biotechnology.  
Glanzel W., Zhou P., *Scientometrics*, 2010, DOI: 10.1007/s11192-010-0269-6, 1–21.
- Research on technology trend based on patent information.  
Huang L.C., Li Y., 5th IEEE International Conference on Management of Innovation and Technology, ICMIT2010, 2010, 5492922, 209–213.
- Samsung's catch-up with Sony: An analysis using US patent data.  
Joo S.H., Lee K., *Journal of the Asia Pacific Economy*, 2010, 15 (3), 271–287.
- Spatial patterns of inventors' mobility: Evidence on US urban areas.  
Breschi S., Lenzi C., *Papers in Regional Science*, 2010, 89 (2), 235–250.
- The breadth and intensity of supercritical particle formation research with an emphasis on publication and patent disclosures.  
Yesil-Celiktas O., Senyay D., *Industrial and Engineering Chemistry Research*, 2010, 49 (15), 7017–7026.
- The internationalization of inventive activity: A gravity model using patent data.  
Picci L., *Research Policy*, 2010, 39 (8), 1070–1081.
- The technological origins of radical inventions.  
Schoenmakers W., Duysters G., *Research Policy*, 2010, 39 (8), 1051–1059.
- Trends in worldwide nanotechnology patent applications: 1991 to 2008.  
Dang Y., Zhang Y., Fan L., Chen H., Roco M.C., *Journal of Nanoparticle Research*, 2010, 12 (3), 687–706.
- University patenting activities and their link to the quantity and quality of scientific publications.  
Wong P.K., Singh A., *Scientometrics*, 2010, 83 (1), 271–294.
- Unveiling the core technology structure for companies through patent information.  
Wu H.-C., Chen H.-Y., Lee K.-Y., *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 2010, 77 (7), 1167–1178.
- Using patent data for technology forecasting: China RFID patent analysis.  
Trappey C.V., Wu H.-Y., Taghaboni-Dutta F., Trappey A.J.C., *Advanced Engineering Informatics*, 2010, DOI: 10.1016/j.aei.2010.05.007.
- Utilizing patent analysis to explore the cooperative competition relationship of the two LED companies: Nichia and Osram.  
Chen Y.-S., Chen B.-Y., *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 2010, DOI: 10.1016/j.techfore.2010.06.017.
- Visualizing perspectives and trends in robotics based on patent mining.  
Ruffaldi E., Sani E., Bergamasco M., *Proceedings – IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation*, 2010, 5509648, 4340–4347.
- What determines how long an innovative spell will last?  
Jang S.-L., Chen J.H., *Scientometrics*, 2010, DOI: 10.1007/s11192-010-0247-z, 1–12.

## 2.2. Patents

### 2.2.1. Relating to life sciences and pharmaceuticals

- ACLU takes on patent office & myriad genetics.  
Powell S., Elman G., *Genetic Engineering and Biotechnology News*, 2010, 30 (5).

- Court ruling could lengthen patent term.  
Brinckerhoff C., *Genetic Engineering and Biotechnology News*, 2010, 30 (3).

- Developmental states, civil society, and public health: Patent regulation for HIV/AIDS pharmaceuticals in India and Brazil.  
Eimer T., Lutz S., *Regulation and Governance*, 2010, 4 (2), 135–153.
- ECJ case law on holders' rights to acquire information on the use of farm-saved seed.  
Millett T., *Journal of Intellectual Property Law & Practice*, 2010, 5 (6), 424–428.
- Gene patent considered by English Court of Appeal.  
Webber P., *Journal of Commercial Biotechnology*, 2010, 16 (3), 275–276.
- How a 510(k) submission can affect your patent.  
Regitz M., *Medical Device and Diagnostic Industry*, 2010, 32 (6).
- Biopatents and the problem/promise of genetic leaks: Farming canola in Canada.  
Van Dooren T., *Capitalism, Nature, Socialism*, 2010, 21 (2), 43–63.
- Human induced pluripotent stem cells: A review of the US patent landscape.  
Georgieva B.P., Love J.M., *Regenerative Medicine*, 2010, 5 (4), 581–591.
- Intellectual property, state sovereignty, and biotechnology.  
Brody B.A., *Kennedy Institute of Ethics Journal*, 2010, 20 (1), 51–73.
- Intellectual property, technology transfer and manufacture of low-cost HPV vaccines in India.  
Padmanabhan S., Amin T., Sampat B., Cook-Deegan R., Chandrasekharan S., *Nature Biotechnology*, 2010, 28 (7), 671–678.
- IP position critical to biotech investment.  
Haile L.A., *Genetic Engineering and Biotechnology News*, 2010, 30 (7).
- Market competition in aid of humanitarian concern: Reconsidering pharmaceutical drug patents.  
Ilg M., *Journal of Intellectual Property*, 2010, 9 (2), 149–178.
- Patent Eligibility for Personalized Medicine.  
Dowd S.O., Yu S., *Medical Device and Diagnostic Industry*, 2010, 32 (5).
- Patent law and bioprospecting in Antarctica.  
Tvedt M.W., *Polar Record*, 2010, DOI: 10.1017/S0032247410000045, 1–10.
- Patent policy for human embryonic stem cell research in Taiwan.  
Hsiao J.I.-H., *The Journal of World Intellectual Property*, 2010, 13 (4), 540–555.
- Patents and pharmaceutical R&D: Consolidating private-public partnership approach to global public health crises.  
Oguamanam C., *The Journal of World Intellectual Property*, 2010, 13 (4), 556–580.
- Patents to “treat me”, no patents to “test me”: An analysis of the 2009 Senate inquiry into gene patents.  
Triffett D., *Journal of law and medicine*, 2010, 17 (5), 800–806.
- Patents without exclusivity: IP rights granted, but not protected.  
Harachand S., *Contract Pharma*, 2010, (3).
- Patents, innovation, and the welfare effects of Medicare Part D.  
Gailey A., Lakdawalla D., Sood N., *Advances in health economics and health services research*, 2010, 22, 317–344.
- Product patent, the problem of availability of patented drugs and parallel trade: A theoretical approach.  
Mazumdar M., Rajeev M., *The Journal of World Intellectual Property*, 2010, 13 (4), 581–604.
- Pluripotent patents make prime time: An analysis of the emerging landscape.  
Simon B.M., Murdoch C.E., Scott C.T., *Nature Biotechnology*, 2010, 28 (6), 557–559.
- Price and prejudice: Examining the Glivec glitch.  
Subramanian D., *Journal of Intellectual Property Law & Practice*, 2010, 5 (9), 644–649.
- Purpose-bound protection for DNA sequences: In through the back door?  
Kock M.A., *Journal of Intellectual Property Law & Practice*, 2010, 5 (7), 495–513.
- Recent patent applications in high-throughput drug screening.  
*Nature biotechnology*, 2010, 28 (4), 329.
- Regulatory diversity as key to the “myth” of drug patenting in sub-Saharan Africa.  
Adusei P., *Journal of African Law*, 2010, 54 (1), 26–50.
- Sequencing firms vie for diagnostics market, tiptoe round patents.  
Eisenstein M., *Nature Biotechnology*, 2010, 28 (7), 635–636.
- Setting the threshold for industrial application: The UK diverges from Europe.  
Fitt R., Nodder E., *Journal of Intellectual Property Law & Practice*, 2010, 5 (8), 560–565.
- The determinants of international patenting for nine agricultural biotechnology firms.  
Chan H.P., *Journal of Industrial Economics*, 2010, 58 (2), 247–278.
- Unfettered consumer access to affordable therapies in the post-TRIPS era: A dead-end journey for patients? Kenya and India case studies.  
Mey B.P., *The Journal of World Intellectual Property*, 2010, 13 (3), 403–473.
- What Myriad means for gene patenting.  
Gollin M., Fischer R., *Managing Intellectual Property*, 2010, (201), 58–60.
- Who invents life: Intelligent designers, blind watchmakers, or genetic engineers?  
Dutfield G., *Journal of Intellectual Property Law & Practice*, 2010, 5 (7), 531–540.
- Patent Incentives, Technology Markets, and Public-Private Bio-Medical Innovation Networks in Brazil.  
Ryan M.P., *World Development*, 2010, 38 (8), 1082–1093.
- Bilski v. Kappos*: The US Supreme Court broadens patent subject-matter eligibility.  
Simmons W.J., *Nature Biotechnology*, 2010, 28 (8), 801–805.

### 2.2.2. Relating to software

Business Method Patents And US Financial Services.

Hunt R., *Contemporary Economic Policy*, 2010, 28 (3), 322–352.

A review of the EPO Enlarged Board of Appeal Opinion G03/08 (The software reference).

Kennington A., *CIPA Journal*, 2010, 39 (6), 350–354.

Carving up the Commons: How Software Patents Are Impacting Our Digital Composition Environments.

Vee A., *Computers and Composition*, 2010, 27 (3), 179–192.

Economic analysis of e-business method patent.

Luo S., Zhao H., IC4E 2010 – 2010 International Conference on e-Education, e-Business, e-Management and e-Learning, 2010, 5432486, 397–400.

Navigating the software and business method maze.

Collins J., *Intellectual Asset Management*, 2010, (43), 72–76.

OK computer?

Roberts G., Fennell G., *Managing Intellectual Property*, 2010, (201), 20–23.

Patentability of computer programs: EPO referral held by Enlarged Board to be inadmissible.

Sant D., Beckett N., Davies I., *World Intellectual Property Report*, 2010, 24 (7), 30–34.

Patenting tomorrow's newspaper.

Campbell D., *European Intellectual Property Review*, 2010, 32 (8), 369–371.

Protecting innovation in cloud computing.

Palermo C.J., *CIPA Journal*, 2010, 39 (5), 293–295.

Protecting intellectual property.

Goldmann A., *Journal of Internet Banking and Commerce*, 2010, 15 (1).

Supreme Court confirms that business methods are patent eligible when not purely abstract ideas – *Bilski v Kappos*.

Palermo C.J., *CIPA Journal*, 2010, 39 (7), 418–421.

The patentability of computer programs in Europe: An improved interpretation of Articles 52(2) and (3) of the European Patent Convention.

Sterckx S., Cockbain J., *The Journal of World Intellectual Property*, 2010, 13 (3), 366–402.

The private value of software patents.

Hall B.H., MacGarvie M., *Research Policy*, 2010, 39 (7), 994–1009.

### 2.2.3. Policy and strategic issues

Addressing the green patent global deadlock through Bayh-Dole reform.

Ouellette L.L., *Yale Law Journal*, 2010, 119 (7), 1727–1738.

An academic landscape of patent & innovation research for policy reform.

Sakata I., Sasaki H., Kajikawa Y., Hashimoto M., Morita A., 5th IEEE International Conference on Management of Innovation and Technology, ICMIT2010, 2010, 5492854, 754–759.

Does India need to harmonize the law of patent exhaustion and parallel imports?

Rai R.K., *Information and Communications Technology Law*, 2010, 19 (2), 115–146.

Does intellectual property protection mean pursuit of patent perpetuity?

Cooper C.C., *Technology and Culture*, 2010, 51 (2), 486–489.

Dynamic Effects of Patent Policy on Sequential Innovation.

Koo B., Wright B.D., *Journal of Economics and Management Strategy*, 2010, 19 (2), 489–512.

Optimal patent length and breadth in an economy with creative destruction and non-diversifiable risk.

Palokangas T., *Journal of Economics/ Zeitschrift fur Nationalokonomie*, 2010, DOI: 10.1007/s00712-010-0161-0, 1–27.

Patent office in innovation policy: Nobody's perfect.

Caillaud B., Duchene A., *International Journal of Industrial Organization*, 2010, DOI: 10.1016/j.ijindorg.2010.06.002.

R&D Teams competencies, innovation, and growth with knowledge information flow.

Ozkaya A., *IEEE Transactions on Engineering Management*, 2010, 57 (3), 5401031, 416–429.

Runner-up patents: Is monopoly inevitable.

Henry E., *Scandinavian Journal of Economics*, 2010, 112 (2), 417–440.

The curious persistence of inventor's moral right.

Dutfield G., *CIPA Journal*, 2010, 39 (7), 415–418.

The Elusive Quest for the Definition of Obviousness-Patent Law's Holy Grail.

Deepak J.S., *IIC International Review of Intellectual Property and Competition Law*, 2010, 41 (4), 410–427.

The EU patent: Cui bono et quo vadit?

Jaeger T., *Common Market Law Review*, 2010, 47 (1), 63–115.

The evolution of China's IPR system and its impact on the patenting behaviours and strategies of multinationals in China.

Liang Z., Xue L., *International Journal of Technology Management*, 2010, 51 (02/04/10), 469–496.

The London Agreement and the cost of patenting in Europe.

van Pottelsberghe de la Potterie B., Mejer M., *European Journal of Law and Economics*, 2010, 29 (2), 211–237.

A comprehensive analysis of the approach to patentable subject matter in the UK and EPO.

Feros A., *Journal of Intellectual Property Law & Practice*, 2010, 5 (8), 577–594.

### 2.2.4. Other patent topics

A longitudinal study of the impact of R&D, patents, and product innovation on firm performance.

Artz K.W., Norman P.M., Hatfield D.E., Cardinal L.B., *Journal of Product Innovation Management*, 2010, 27 (5), 725–740.

A rough set based approach to patent development with the consideration of resource allocation.

Huang C.-C., Liang W.-Y., Shian-Hua Lin, Tseng T.-L.(B.), Chiang H.-Y., *Expert Systems with Applications*, 2010, DOI: 10.1016/j.eswa.2010.07.132.

- A study of designing around patents based on Function Trimming. Yao B., Jiang P., Zhang T., Ma Q., 5th IEEE International Conference on Management of Innovation and Technology, ICMIT2010, 2010, 5492926, 214–219.
- A super fast track to the grant of patents in Singapore and the USA. Sadasivam A., *Journal of Intellectual Property Law & Practice*, 2010, 5 (6), 459–464.
- Academic inventors as brokers. Lissoni F., *Research Policy*, 2010, 39 (7), 843–857.
- Accounting for IP? Ghafele R., *Journal of Intellectual Property Law & Practice*, 2010, 5 (7), 521–530.
- An empirical analysis of pricing in patent licensing contracts. Sakakibara M., *Industrial and Corporate Change*, 2010, 19 (3), dtq036, 927–945.
- Analysis of the influence of network effect on patent pools. Mei K., Du X.-J., Geng Y.-X., *Dongbei Daxue Xuebao/Journal of Northeastern University*, 2010, 31 (7), 1058–1060.
- Appropriate support for claims by description in the Japanese patent system. Kadota K., *Journal of Intellectual Property Law & Practice*, 2010, 5 (9), 631–643.
- Being aware of details in preparing a patent disclosure. Mouallem R., *IEEE Instrumentation and Measurement Magazine*, 2010, 13 (3), 5475162, 18–21.
- Bilski and the case for IP audits. Van Gieson E., *Intellectual Asset Management*, 2010, (43), 64–70.
- Can entitlement to priority be transferred, shared or divided? Cordina K., Stephen R., *CIPA Journal*, 2010, 39 (7), 408–411.
- China's amended legal regime on patents for inventions and utility models. Ganea P., *Journal of Intellectual Property Law & Practice*, 2010, 5 (9), 650–662.
- China's new patent regime. Clark D., Lin G., Xia A., *China Business Review*, 2010, 37 (3).
- Collateral damage for R and D manufacturers: How patent sharks operate in markets for technology. Reitzig M., Henke J., Schneidery F., *Industrial and Corporate Change*, 2010, 19 (3), dtq037, 947–967.
- Contributing to the wrong: The indirect infringement of patents. Johnson P., *Journal of Intellectual Property Law & Practice*, 2010, 5 (7), 514–520.
- Do stronger patent rights raise high-tech exports to the developing world? Ivus O., *Journal of International Economics*, 2010, 81 (1), 38–47.
- Empowering young inventors: An experimental course on IP and patent application drafting at Auburn University. Swamidass P., Gokcek A.J., *Journal of Technology Transfer*, 2010, 35 (4), 424–431.
- German employee inventors' compensation records: A window into the returns to patented inventions. Giummo J., *Research Policy*, 2010, 39 (7), 969–984.
- How IPR policies of telecommunication standard-setting organizations can effectively address the patent ambush problem. Zhang L., *IIC International Review of Intellectual Property and Competition Law*, 2010, 41 (4), 380–410.
- Innovation cycles and learning at the patent office: Does the early patent get the delay? Regibeau P., Rockett K., *Journal of Industrial Economics*, 2010, 58 (2), 222–246.
- Inside the world of public auctions. Ewing T., *Intellectual Asset Management*, 2010, (42), 63–70.
- International patent strategies of small and large firms: An empirical study of nanotechnology. Fernandez-Ribas A., *Review of Policy Research*, 2010, 27 (4), 457–473.
- Inventing and patenting activities of scientists: In the expectation of money or reputation? Goktepe-Hulten D., Mahagaonkar P., *Journal of Technology Transfer*, 2010, 35 (4), 401–423.
- Is patenting of technical inventions in university sectors impeding the flow of scientific knowledge to the public? A case study of South Africa. Lubango L.M., Pouris A., *Technology in Society*, 2010, DOI: 10.1016/j.techsoc.2010.07.003.
- Lightening the load: Whether the burden of proof for overcoming a patent's presumption of validity should be lowered. Dietly K., *Fordham Law Review*, 2010, 78 (5), 2615–2658.
- Market behavior of patent infringement litigations. Wang Y.-H., Shih K.-H., Chuang Y.-H., *African Journal of Business Management*, 2010, 4 (4), 390–395.
- Measuring technological diversification: Identifying the effects of patent scale and patent scope. Chen J.H., Jang S.-L., Wen S.H., *Scientometrics*, 2010, 84 (1), 265–275.
- Network structure of innovation: Can brokerage or closure predict patent quality? Wang J.-C., Chiang C.-H., Lin S.-W., *Scientometrics*, 2010, 84 (3), 735–748.
- Objectively reckless standards of commerce: Unanswered questions on wilful infringement. Masurovsky L.P., Schroeder J.A., *Journal of Intellectual Property Law & Practice*, 2010, 5 (6), 435–440.
- Patent knowledge aided module innovation in modular product design. Chen M., Hou L., Wang H., 2010 International Conference on Mechanic Automation and Control Engineering, MACE2010, 2010, 5536199, 5876–5879.
- Patent pools and cross-licensing in the shadow of patent litigation. Choi J.P., *International Economic Review*, 2010, 51 (2), 441–460.

- Patent pools as a solution to efficient licensing of complementary patents? Some experimental evidence.  
Santore R., McKee M., Bjornstad D., *Journal of Law and Economics*, 2010, 53 (1), 167–183.
- Patent power.  
Pluvinau V., *Intellectual Asset Management*, 2010, (42), 31–45.
- Patent strategy in Chinese universities: A comparative perspective.  
Luan C., Zhou C., Liu A., *Scientometrics*, 2010, 84 (1), 53–63.
- Patent thickets, licensing and innovative performance.  
Cockburn I.M., MacGarvie M.J., Muller E., *Industrial and Corporate Change*, 2010, 19 (3), dtq035, 899–925.
- Patents and economic development in South Africa: Managing intellectual property rights.  
Pouris A., Pouris A., 5th IEEE International Conference on Management of Innovation and Technology, ICMIT2010, 2010, 5492924, 232–237.
- Patents and standards – A comment on the German federal supreme court decision orange book standard.  
Ullrich H., *IIC International Review of Intellectual Property and Competition Law*, 2010, 41 (3), 337–351.
- Propensity to patent, competition and China's foreign patenting surge.  
Hu A.G., *Research Policy*, 2010, 39 (7), 985–993.
- Rational antitrust policy and reverse payment settlements in Hatch-Waxman patent litigation.  
Opderbeck D.W., *Georgetown Law Journal*, 2010, 98 (5), 1303–1348.
- Refusal to license intellectual property rights under article 82 E in light of standardization context.  
Zhang L., *European Intellectual Property Review*, 2010, 32 (8), 402–411.
- Research on dynamic IPR management in colleges and universities of Henan province.  
Wang L., 2010 Chinese Control and Decision Conference, CCDC 2010, 2010, 5498684, 1870–1874.
- The compatibility of patent law and the internet.  
Fromer J.C., *Fordham Law Review*, 2010, 78 (6), 2783–2797.
- The complaint of a citizen (Alexander Leonidovich ) about violation of his constitutional rights by several provisions of Section 29 of the Patents Act of the Russian Federation.  
Haworth L., *European Intellectual Property Review*, 2010, 32 (7), 362–366.
- The decline of university patenting and the end of the Bayh-Dole effect.  
Leydesdorff L., Meyer M., *Scientometrics*, 2010, 83 (2), 355–362.
- The research exemption from a nanotechnology perspective.  
Helweggen W., *European Intellectual Property Review*, 2010, 32 (7), 341–351.
- The threat of patent-infringement in IT-business operations.  
Kaiser L., 5th IEEE International Conference on Management of Innovation and Technology, ICMIT2010, 2010, 5492923, 226–231.
- Understanding patenting decisions: A classroom exercise.  
Bernard J.C., Yiannaka A., *Journal of Economic Education*, 2010, 41 (3), 235–251.
- Who is my partner and how do we dance? technological collaboration and patenting speed in US biotechnology.  
Al-Laham A., Amburgey T.L., Baden-Fuller C., *British Journal of Management*, 2010, 21 (3), 789–807.
- Who Makes the Patent Calls?  
Teska K., *Mechanical Engineering*, 2010, 132 (4).
- Why buy what you can get for free? The effect of foreign direct investment on state patent rates.  
Ford T.C., Rork J.C., *Journal of Urban Economics*, 2010, 68 (1), 72–81.
- Why defining patentable inventions is an economic question.  
Ren L., *Managing Intellectual Property*, 2010, (201), 97–100.
- ### 2.3. Trademarks and domain names
- #### 2.3.1. Trademarks
- “Genuine use in the Community” – What does the CTMR require?  
Morcom C., *European Intellectual Property Review*, 2010, 32 (7), 359–362.
- Analysis of trademark management efficiency by means of indices of development level and dominance power (light industry enterprises case study).  
Shcherbak V.G., Bykhova O.M., *Actual Problems of Economics*, 2010, (5), 159–165.
- Applying liability rules to metatag cases and other instances of trademark infringement on the internet: How to get to “no harm, no foul”.  
Devoe D., *Boston University Law Review*, 2010, 90 (3), 1221–1259.
- Bad faith and honest practices: Is it black and white?  
Smith J., Newton H., Patterson R., *Journal of Intellectual Property Law & Practice*, 2010, 5 (4), 260–267.
- Geographical indications of origin as a tool of product differentiation: The case of coffee.  
Teuber R., *Journal of International Food and Agribusiness Marketing*, 2010, 22 (3), 277–298.
- Harnessing the development potential of geographical indications for traditional knowledge-based agricultural products.  
Dagne T.W., *Journal of Intellectual Property Law & Practice*, 2010, 5 (6), 441–458.
- Protecting famous trademarks: Comparative analysis of US and EU diverging approaches – The battle between legislatures and the judiciary who is the ultimate judge?  
Malliaris S., *Journal of Intellectual Property*, 2010, 9 (2), 45–59.
- Re-registration of UK rights in British Overseas Territories and Crown Dependencies.  
Chinnery M.R., *ITMA Review*, 2010, (373), 31–33.
- Recent developments of dilution in the United States and United Kingdom.  
Naser M.A., *European Intellectual Property Review*, 2010, 32 (7), 332–340.

Significant 2009 case law on the Community Trade Mark from the Court of Justice of the European Union and the General Court. Folliard-Monguiral A., Rogers D., *Journal of Intellectual Property Law & Practice*, 2010, 5 (5), 306–326.

The application of cultural information resources in trademark translation.

Xu X., Wang X., 2nd International Workshop on Education Technology and Computer Science, ETCS 2010, 2010, 2, 5460370, 281–283.

The saga of Vikings and trade marks.

Wallberg K., *Journal of Intellectual Property Law & Practice*, 2010, 5 (9), 663–667.

To key or not to key? The judgment of the European Court of Justice in the Google AdWords cases.

Cornthwaite J., *European Intellectual Property Review*, 2010, 32 (7), 352–359.

Trade marks in Tanzania: The prima facie case and interim relief. Makulilo A.B., *Journal of Intellectual Property Law & Practice*, 2010, 5 (8), 566–576.

Trademarks as a system of signs: A semiotic look at trademark law. Garrett M.L., *International Journal for the Semiotics of Law*, 2010, 23 (1), 61–75.

### 2.3.2. Domain names

.com v trade marks: Who will win?

Greenberg D., Speres J., *Journal of Intellectual Property Law & Practice*, 2010, 5 (4), 268–281.

New gTLDs – Pandora's box is open.

Alramahi M., *International Review of Law, Computers and Technology*, 2010, 24 (2), 183–192.

Phonewords, trade marks, and domain names: A complex matrix of rights.

Gyngel J., *Journal of Intellectual Property Law & Practice*, 2010, 5 (4), 223–231.

### 2.4. Designs

A study on Design Patent Knowledge Base System.

Chen R., Chang E., Lee Y.-J., Chen C.-Y., Lin C.-Y., Yau B.-B., 3CA 2010 – 2010 International Symposium on Computer, Communication, Control and Automation, 2010, 1, 5533830, 283–286.

International harmonisation of designs law: The case for diversity. Akaster P., *European Intellectual Property Review*, 2010, 32 (8), 372–381.

### 2.5. Other IP; general IP issues

#### 2.5.1. Policy and strategic issues

An integrated Intellectual Property code: The second step.

Ris T., *Intellectual Property Quarterly*, 2010, (2), 143–152.

No international organization is an Island. the WTO's relationship with the WIPO: A model for the governance of trade linkage areas? Hrbata V., *Journal of World Trade*, 2010, 44 (1), 1–47.

On the meaning of "National treatment" in art. 2(1) of the Paris Convention for the Protection of Industrial Property.

Yang Y.-K., *European Intellectual Property Review*, 2010, 32 (8), 396–401.

The development of free trade agreements and international protection of intellectual property rights in the WTO Era-new bilateralism and its future.

He H., *IIC International Review of Intellectual Property and Competition Law*, 2010, 41 (3), 253–283.

The role of intellectual property management education in a technology management curriculum.

Fishman E.A., *Journal of Technology Transfer*, 2010, 35 (4), 432–444.

#### 2.5.2. Other IP issues

Applicable law to intellectual property infringements in Japan: Alternative lex loci protectionis principle.

Jurcys P., *International Review of Law, Computers and Technology*, 2010, 24 (2), 193–203.

Aspects of intellectual property in the knowledge society.

Gross V., *Information-Wissenschaft und Praxis*, 2010, 61 (4), 237–244.

Does institutional reform of intellectual property rights lead to more inbound FDI? Evidence from Latin America and the Caribbean. Khoury T.A., Peng M.W., *Journal of World Business*, 2010, DOI: 10.1016/j.jwb.2010.07.015.

Enforcing intellectual property rights in weak appropriability regimes: The case of de facto protection strategies in China.

Keupp M.M., Beckenbauer A., Gassmann O., *Management International Review*, 2010, 50 (1), 109–130.

Entrepreneurial experiences and intellectual property: A student perspective.

Cook K., Reimer D., Abro S., ASEE Annual Conference and Exposition, Conference Proceedings, 2010.

Exploring the impacts of intellectual property on intellectual capital and company performance: The case of Iranian computer and electronic organizations.

Namvar M., Fathian M., Akhavan P., Gholamian M.R., *Management Decision*, 2010, 48 (5), 676–697.

Industrial-design-centered intellectual property strategy of the company.

Xia H., 2010 International Conference on Networking and Digital Society, ICNDS 2010, 2010, 1, 5479141, 261–263.

Integration of intellectual property strategy with innovation strategy.

Germeraad P., *Research Technology Management*, 2010, 53 (3), 10–19.

Intellectual property clearinghouses: The effects of reduced transaction costs in licensing.

Aoki R., Schiff A., *Information Economics and Policy*, 2010, 22 (3), 218–227.

Intellectual property in inter-organisational relationships – Findings from an interview study.

Luoma T., Paasi J., Valkokari K., *International Journal of Innovation Management*, 2010, 14 (3), 399–414.



Intellectual property issues in the process of response to global climate change.

Li W., Xu Z., Bi L., 2010 International Conference on Mechanic Automation and Control Engineering, MACE2010, 2010, 5536159, 4955–4958.

Intellectual property law and the sumptuary code.

Beebe B., Harvard Law Review, 2010, 123 (4), 809–889.

Intellectual property policy for universities and research institutes and economic Development – The Egyptian case.

Gadallah Y.M., IIC International Review of Intellectual Property and Competition Law, 2010, 41 (4), 450–467.

Intellectual property rights and entry into a foreign market: FDI versus joint ventures.

Leahy D., Naghavi A., Review of International Economics, 2010, 18 (4), 633–649.

Intellectual property rights protection and the surge in FDI in China.

Awokuse T.O., Yin H., Journal of Comparative Economics, 2010, 38 (2), 217–224.

Interdisciplinary experiential education of intellectual property concepts in an engineering context.

Henry R.M., Richey S.M., 2010 IEEE Transforming Engineering Education: Creating Interdisciplinary Skills for Complex Global Environments, 2010, 5508884.

Introduction to the symposium on intellectual property and innovation.

Legros P., Journal of Industrial Economics, 2010, 58 (2), 215–221.

Principle of necessity in China – Intellectual property rights.

Sato N.R., Journal of International Trade Law and Policy, 2010, 9 (2), 108–129.

Retrospective valuations of intellectual property.

Wilson B.S., Journal of Technology Transfer, 2010, DOI: 10.1007/s10961-010-9172-9, 1–10.

The upside of intellectual property's downside.

Cotropia C.A., Gibson J., UCLA Law Review, 2010, 57 (4), 921–982.

## 2.6. Historical

Early twentieth-century Canadian medical patent law in practice: James Bertram Collip and the discovery of Emmenin.

Marier V., Piper T., University of Toronto Law Journal, 2010, 60 (3), 855–892.

Origin and background of the invention of the electron microscope: Commentary and expanded notes on memoir of Reinhold Rüdtenberg.

Gunther Rudenberg H., Rudenberg P.G., Advances in Imaging and Electron Physics, 2010, 160 (C), 207–271.

Path dependency and change in international relations: Institutional dynamics in the field of intellectual property rights.

Marx J., Historical Social Research, 2010, 35 (3), 175–199.

Roberto Piontelli: “Grand seigneur” of electrochemical science.

Cavallotti P.L., Transactions of the Institute of Metal Finishing, 2010, 88 (4), 178.

The role of independent invention in US technological development, 1880–1930.

Nicholas T., Journal of Economic History, 2010, 70 (1), 57–82.

David Newton

Associate Editor

*Crooked Thatch*

*East End*

*Hook Norton*

*Banbury OX15 5LG*

*United Kingdom*

*E-mail address: dnewton@hotmail.co.uk*