World Patent Information 37 (2014) 74–80

Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

World Patent Information

journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/locate/worpatin

Literature listing

1. Books

1.1. Recent reports and other monographs

Intellectual Property Rights intensive industries: contribution to economic performance and employment in Europe, The European Patent Office (EPO) and the Office for Harmonization in the Internal Market (OHIM), 2013. http://www.epo.org/service-support/publications/studies/ip-intensive-industries.html.

Is Small Still Beautiful? – Literature Review of Recent Empirical Evidence on the Contribution of SMEs to Employment Creation, Jan de Kok, Claudia Deijl, Christi Veldhuis-Van Essen. Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ) GmbH, German Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development, International Labour Organisation, 2013. http://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/—ed_emp/—emp_ent/—ifp_seed/documents/publication/wcms_216909.pdf.

Supply Chain Perspectives and Issues: A Literature Review, Albert Park, Gaurav Nayyar, Patrick Low, World Trade Organization and Fung Global Institute, 2013. http://www.wto.org/english/res_e/booksp_e/aid4tradesupplychain13_e.pdf.

Supporting Investment in Knowledge Capital, Growth and Innovation, OECD, 2013. http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/9789264193307-en.

Brands – Reputation and Image in the Global Marketplace, World Intellectual Property Report, World Intellectual Property Organization, 2013. http://www.wipo.int/econ_stat/en/economics/wipr/.

Banking on IP? The role of intellectual property and intangible assets in facilitating business finance, Final report, Martin Brassell, Kelvin King, UK Intellectual Property Office, 2013. http://www.ipo.gov.uk/ipresearch-bankingip.pdf.

Enhancing Intellectual Property Management and Appropriation by Innovative SMEs, International Chamber of Commerce, 2013. http://www.iccwbo.org/Data/Documents/Intellectual-property/Enhancing-intellectual-property-management-and-appropriation-by-innovative-SMEs—English/.

1.2. Reviews are available as follows

Introduction to the Unified Patent and the Unified Patent Court, by Pieter Callens and Sam Granata, Wolters Kluwer, 2013 reviewed by Brook D. in European Intellectual Property Review, 2013, 35 (9), 561.

Intellectual Liberty: Natural Rights and Intellectual Property, Hugh Breakey, Ashgate, 2012 reviewed by Savirimuthu J. in Journal of Intellectual Property Law & Practice, 2013, 8 (11), 892–894.

Jefferson vs. the patent trolls: A populist vision of intellectual property rights, Matsuura J.H., 2012 reviewed by Schuster W.M. in NYU Journal of Law & Business, http://www.nyujlb.org/wp-content/uploads/JLBv5n1_8.pdf.

2. Journals

The listing in this issue includes entries found using SciVerse Scopus™, Elsevier's abstract and indexing database which gives access to almost 18,000 peer-reviewed titles from more than 5000 international publishers.

2.1. Search techniques, databases and analysis: classification: searcher certification

2.1.1. Search techniques, databases

A generalized framework for integrated professional search systems. Salampasis M., Hanbury A., Lecture Notes in Computer Science, 2013, 8201 LNCS, http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-41057-4_11, 99–110.

A method using two dimensions of the patent classification for measuring the technological proximity: an application in identifying a potential R&D partner in biotechnology. Angue K., Ayerbe C., Mitkova L., Journal of Technology Transfer, 2013, http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10961-013-9325-8, 1–32.

A multi-expert system for ranking patents: An approach based on fuzzy pay-off distributions and a TOPSIS-AHP framework. Collan M., Fedrizzi M., Luukka P., Expert Systems with Applications, 2013, 40 (12), 4749–4759.

A syntactic reordering model of Chinese special sentences for patent machine translation. Hu R.F., Zhu Y., Jin Y.H., Chen J.Y., Applied Mechanics and Materials, 2013, 411–414, http://dx.doi.org/10.4028/www.scientific.net/AMM.411-414.1923, 1923–1929.

Anticipating industry convergence: Semantic analyses vs IPC co-classification analyses of patents. Preschitschek N., Niemann H., Leker J., Moehrle M.G., Foresight, 2013, 15 (6), 446–464.

Biomedical Engineering in International Patent Classification. Alisova N.V., Biomedical Engineering, 2013, 47 (3), 164–167.

Concept extraction from patent images based on recursive hybrid classification. Moumtzidou A., Vrochidis S., Kompatsiaris I., Lecture Notes in Computer Science, 2013, 8201 LNCS, http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-41057-4_9, 83–86.

Cross-language patent matching via an international patent classification-based concept bridge. Chen Y.-L., Chiu Y.-T., Journal of Information Science, 2013, 39 (6), 737–753.

Domain adaptation of general natural language processing tools for a patent claim visualization system. Andersson L., Lupu M., Hanbury A., Lecture Notes in Computer Science, 2013, 8201 LNCS, http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-41057-4_8, 70–82.

Entity recognition in parallel multi-lingual biomedical corpora: The CLEF-ER laboratory overview. Rebholz-Schuhmann D. et al., Lecture Notes in Computer Science, 2013, 8138 LNCS, http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-40802-1_32, 353–367.

Exploring manual and automatic query formulation in patent IR: Initial query construction and query generation process. Hansen

0172-2190/$ – see front matter
http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.wpi.2013.12.004

P., Jarvelin A., Jarvelin A., Journal of Documentation, 2013, 69 (6), 873–898.
Flowchart recognition for non-textual information retrieval in patent search. Rusinol M., de las Heras L.-P., Terrades O.R., Information Retrieval, 2013, http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10791-013-9234-3, 1–18.
Functional-based search for patent technology transfer. Russo D., Montecchi T., Ying L., Proceedings of the ASME Design Engineering Technical Conference, 2012, 2 (PARTS A and B), http://dx.doi.org/10.1115/DETC2012-70833, 529–539.
Image search in patents: A review. Bhatti N., Hanbury A., International Journal on Document Analysis and Recognition, 2013, 16 (4), 309–329.
Interactive patent classification based on multi-classifier fusion and active learning. Zhang X., Neurocomputing, 2014, 127, 200–205.
Landscaping: a practitioner view. Roberts G., Queen Mary Journal of Intellectual Property, 2013, 3 (4), 303–317.
Mining query logs of USPTO patent examiners. Tannebaum W., Rauber A., Lecture Notes in Computer Science, 2013, 8138 LNCS, http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-40802-1_17, 136–142.
Orbit reincarnated. Simmons E.S., Online Searcher, 2013, 37 (5), 10–15.
Overview of CLEF-IP 2013 lab: Information retrieval in the patent domain. Piroi F., Lupu M., Hanbury A., Lecture Notes in Computer Science, 2013, 8138 LNCS, http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-40802-1_25, 232–249.
Patent analysis based on information in XML documents. Wang Y., Lecture Notes in Electrical Engineering, 2013, 218 LNEE (VOL. 3), http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4471-4847-0_50, 399–406.
Post-ordering by parsing with ITG for Japanese-English statistical machine translation. Goto I., Utiyama M., Sumita E., ACM Transactions on Asian Language Information Processing, 2013, 12 (4), http://dx.doi.org/10.1145/2518100.
Recommending patents based on latent topics. Krestel R., Smyth P., RecSys 2013 - Proceedings of the 7th ACM Conference on Recommender Systems, 2013, http://dx.doi.org/10.1145/2507157.2507232, 395–398.
Search efforts, selective appropriation, and the usefulness of new knowledge: Evidence from a comparison across U.S. and non-U.S. patent applicants. Suzuki O., International Journal of Knowledge Management, 2013, 9 (1), 42–59.
Semiautomatic acquisition of translation templates from monolingual unannotated Chinese patent corpus. Yin D., Zhang D., Journal of Information and Computational Science, 2013, 10 (13), 4247–4255.
Studying machine translation technologies for large-data CLIR tasks: a patent prior-art search case study. Magdy W., Jones G.J.F., Information Retrieval, 2013, http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10791-013-9231-6, 1–28.
Syntax-based post-ordering for efficient Japanese-to-English translation. Sudoh K., Wu X., Duh K., Tsukada H., Nagata M., ACM Transactions on Asian Language Information Processing, 2013, 12 (3), http://dx.doi.org/10.1145/2499955.2499960.
The effect of citation analysis on query expansion for patent retrieval. Mahdabi P., Crestani F., Information Retrieval, 2013, http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10791-013-9232-5, 1–18.
The new Cooperative Patent Classification system: Improving patent searching. Gange D., Online Searcher, 2013, 37 (1), 27–30.
The study on the typical KPO service modes undertook by the scientific and technical information institutes based on SWOT model analysis. Zhang W., Li C., Chen S.J., Du Y., Li X., Applied Mechanics and Materials, 2013, 373–375, http://dx.doi.org/10.4028/www.scientific.net/AMM.373-375.2256, 2256–2261.
Using multiple query representations in patent prior-art search. Zhou D., Truran M., Liu J., Zhang S., Information Retrieval, 2013, http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10791-013-9236-1, 1–21.
Vacant technology forecasting using new Bayesian patent clustering. Choi S., Jun S., Technology Analysis and Strategic Management, 2013, http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09537325.2013.850477.
Wikipedia-based query phrase expansion in patent class search. Al-Shboul B., Myaeng S.-H., Information Retrieval, 2013, http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10791-013-9233-4, 1–22.

2.1.2. Analysis and statistics

A social network analysis of leading semiconductor companies' knowledge flow network. Ho Y., Chiu H., Asia Pacific Journal of Management, 2013, 30 (4), 1265–1283.
A study of the method using search traffic to analyze new technology adoption. Jun S.-P., Yeom J., Son J.-K., Technological Forecasting and Social Change, 2014, 81 (1), 82–95.
A surname-based patent-related indicator: The contribution of Jewish inventors to US patents. Kissin I., Bradley Jr. E.L., Scientometrics, 2013, 97 (2), 357–368.
A technology opportunities analysis model: applied to dye-sensitised solar cells for China. Ma T., Porter A.L., Guo Y., Ready J., Xu C., Gao L., Technology Analysis and Strategic Management, 2013, http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09537325.2013.850155.
Analysis of Chinese CNC machine tool industry based on patent intelligence. Huang X.L., Zheng J., Wang Y., Advanced Materials Research, 2013, 774–776, http://dx.doi.org/10.4028/www.scientific.net/AMR.774-776.1975, 1975–1978.
Analysis of technology development trend of the wind power generation-based on patent map cluster analysis system and method. Chao K., Liu J., Advanced Materials Research, 2013, 748, http://dx.doi.org/10.4028/www.scientific.net/AMR.748.490, 490–492.
Analysis of technology trends based on big data. Segev A., Jung C., Jung S., Proceedings – 2013 IEEE International Congress on Big Data, http://dx.doi.org/10.1109/BigData.Congress.2013.65, 419–420.
Analyzing interdisciplinarity of technology fusion using knowledge flows of patents. Ko N., Yoon J., Seo W., Expert Systems with Applications, 2014, 41 (4 PART 2), 1955–1963.
Appropriating innovation's technical value: Examining the influence of exploration. Meyer J., Subramaniam M., Journal of Business Research, 2014, 67 (1), 2860–2866.
Constraints of Internally and Externally Derived Knowledge and the Innovativeness of Technological Output: The Case of the United States. Rosenzweig S., Mazursky D., Journal of Product Innovation Management, 2013, http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/jpim.12092.
Construction patents and university-industry research interaction: An analysis of Nordic region data. Brochner J., Construction Innovation, 2013, 13 (4), http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/CI-02-2012-0012, 410–423.
Continuous sic fibre-reinforced SiC matrix composites: An analysis based on patents. Huang X.G., Li Y.Q., Zhao N., Shi H., Yao X., Han Y.S., Applied Mechanics and Materials, 2013, 377, http://dx.doi.org/10.4028/www.scientific.net/AMM.377.28, 28–32.
Determinants of national patent ownership by public research organisations and universities. Azagra-Caro J.M., Journal of Technology Transfer, 2013, http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10961-013-9322-y, 1–17.
Diversity of fields in patent citations: synchronic and diachronic changes. Yoshikane F., Suzuki T., Scientometrics, 2013, http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11192-013-1165-7, 1–19.
Do co-publications with industry lead to higher levels of university technology commercialization activity? Wong P.K., Singh A., Scientometrics, 2013, 97 (2), 245–265.
Do Foreign-owned Subsidiaries in China Follow a Distinctive Pattern of Technological Knowledge Sourcing. Cantwell J.A., Zhang F., Management and Organization Review, 2013, 9 (3), 489–512.

Does the composition of regional knowledge bases influence extra-regional collaboration for innovation? Ebersberger B., Herstad S.J., Koller C., Applied Economics Letters, 2014, 21 (3), 201–204.
Exploratory analysis of inventor networks: The impact of collaboration on the value of Canadian nanotechnology patents. Barirani A., Beaudry C., Agard B., Journal Europeen des Systemes Automatises, 2012, 46 (8), 855–875.
Four dimensional Science and Technology planning: A new approach based on bibliometrics and technology roadmapping. Huang L., Zhang Y., Guo Y., Zhu D., Porter A.L., Technological Forecasting and Social Change, 2014, 81 (1), 39–48.
Getting patents and economic data to speak to each other: An 'Algorithmic Links with Probabilities' approach for joint analyses of patenting and economic activity. Lybbert T.J., Zolas N.J., Research Policy, 2013, http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2013.09.001.
Identification and evaluation of corporations for merger and acquisition strategies using patent information and text mining. Park H., Yoon J., Kim K., Scientometrics, 2013, 97 (3), 883–909.
Innovation source and performance: A firm-level analysis of high-tech sector in China. Li Z., Millman C., Chi R., Global Business and Economics Review, 2013, 15 (4), 327–349.
Innovation, international R&D spillovers and the sectoral heterogeneity of knowledge flows. Malerba F., Mancusi M.L., Montobbio F., Review of World Economics, 2013, 149 (4), 697–722.
Innovator network structure and cluster evolution: An exploration study of world patent data in nanotechnology. Wang G., Yu C., WIT Transactions on Information and Communication Technologies, 2014, 46 Volume 1, http://dx.doi.org/10.2495/ISME20130411, 311–318.
International collaboration in nanotechnology from 1991 to 2010 based on patent analysis. Zheng J., Cui W., Advanced Materials Research, 2013, 771, http://dx.doi.org/10.4028/www.scientific.net/AMR.771.119, 119–124.
Inventors and impostors: An analysis of patent examination with self-selection of firms into R&D. Schuett F., Journal of Industrial Economics, 2013, 61 (3), 660–699.
Inventorship and authorship as attribution rights: An enquiry into the economics of scientific credit. Lissoni F., Montobbio F., Zirulia L., Journal of Economic Behavior and Organization, 2013, 95, 49–69.
Leading trends of the information society technology development - Case study of IBM. Okon-Horodynska E., Wisla R., Sierotowicz T., Transformations in Business and Economics, 2013, 12 (2 B), 421–430.
Mapping innovation growth in the sports industry through patent data mining. Dulakakhoria S., Jana T., Journal of Intellectual Property Rights, 2013, 18 (5), 410–418.
Patent analysis with innovative patent map system. Chen R., Chen C.-C., Yau B.-B., Telkomnika, 2014, 12 (2), 917–923.
Patenting, licensing, trade, foreign direct investment and economic growth: A panel data analysis of middle and low income countries. Sattar A., Mehmood T., Malik W.S., Subhan Q.A., Journal of Intellectual Property Rights, 2013, 18 (5), 475–484.
Research on the analysis method of the technology roadmap supporting enterprise technology decision based on patent text mining. Liu S., Wang X.G., Geng Y.S., Applied Mechanics and Materials, 2013, 411–414, http://dx.doi.org/10.4028/www.scientific.net/AMM.411-414.2617, 2617–2621.
Research on the patent analysis of national protection textile industry. Wang Y., Wang J., Advanced Materials Research, 2013, 821–822, http://dx.doi.org/10.4028/www.scientific.net/AMR.821-822.419, 419–425.
Science, technology and innovation in the Brazilian State of São Paulo: The need for public policies for region-based development. Torres-Freire C., Abdal A., Callil V., International Journal of Technological Learning, Innovation and Development, 2013, 6 (3), 225–243.
Selection bias in innovation studies: A simple test. De Rassenfosse G., Schoen A., Wastyn A., Technological Forecasting and Social Change, 2014, 81 (1), 287–299.
Semantic compared cross impact analysis. Thorleuchter D., Van den Poel D., Expert Systems with Applications, 2013, http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.eswa.2013.10.051.
Social network analysis of trade secrets and patents as social relations. Opderbeck D.W., AIPLA Quarterly, 2013, 41 (3), 355–422.
Studies of layout of world machine tools industry based on patent analysis. Zhang T., Zhang X., Li Z., Zhao Y., Zhou L., High Technology Letters, 2013, 19 (3), 246–253.
Technological positioning and development strategy planning of Personal Fall-Arrest equipment based on patent information. Wu C.-M., Yu W.-D., Cheng S.-T., Lai Y.-H., Lin C.-C., Journal of the Chinese Institute of Civil and Hydraulic Engineering, 2013, 25 (1), 87–96.
The concentration of knowledge activities in Italy: An analysis at local level. Morettini L., Perani G., Sirilli G., Foresight Russia, 2013, 7 (2), 28–39.
The dynamic effect of knowledge capitals in the public research institute: insights from patenting analysis of ITRI (Taiwan) and ETRI (Korea). Shiu J.-W., Wong C.-Y., Hu M.-C., Scientometrics, 2013, http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11192-013-1158-6, 1–18.
The effects of R&D investment and industrial agglomeration on regional innovation of Zhejiang. Liu S.A., Wang J., WIT Transactions on Information and Communication Technologies, 2014, 46 Volume 2, http://dx.doi.org/10.2495/ISME20132102, 1621–1627.
The nexus between labor diversity and firm's innovation. Parrotta P., Pozzoli D., Pytlikova M., Journal of Population Economics, 2013, http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s00148-013-0491-7, 1–62.

2.2. Patents

2.2.1. Relating to life sciences and pharmaceuticals

A comparative look at Bowman v. Monsanto in the European context. Germinario C., World Intellectual Property Report, 2013, 27 (7), 39–41.
Alternative incentive models delinking R&D costs from pharmaceutical product price. Agitha T.G., Journal of Intellectual Property Rights, 2013, 18 (5), 491–498.
Association for Molecular Pathology v. Myriad Genetics: Sieving the gene pool. Stern R.H., European Intellectual Property Review, 2013, 35 (11), 685–689.
Consequences of the US Supreme Court decision on gene patenting. Kurts A., European Intellectual Property Review, 2013, 35 (11), 629–636.
DREAMing of a patent-free human genome for clinical sequencing. McKernan K.J., Spangler J., Helbert Y., Zhang L., Tadigotla V., Nature Biotechnology, 2013, 31 (10), 884–887.
Evolving standards for patent infringement. Warren W.L., Cline J.L., Genetic Engineering and Biotechnology News, 2013, 33 (19).
Has the commodore steered the fleet onto the rocks? Biotechnology and the requirement for industrial applicability. Odell-West A., Intellectual Property Quarterly, 2013, (4), 279–302.
Intellectual property protection for bioinformatics and computational intelligence. Fernandez D., Maninang A., Kobayashi S., Proceedings of the IEEE Symposium on Computational Intelligence in Bioinformatics and Computational Biology, SSCI 2013, http://dx.doi.org/10.1109/CIBCB.2013.6595385, 31–35.
Intellectual property rights and rent appropriation: Open conflict regarding royalties on RR Soy in Argentina. Rauchecker M., Journal fur Entwicklungspolitik, 2013, 29 (2), 69–86.
Investments in pharmaceuticals before and after TRIPS. Kyle M.K., McGahan A.M., Review of Economics and Statistics, 2012, 94 (4), 1157–1172.

Learning from Novartis: India in the quid pro quo world. Tiku D.K., Singh T.J., Managing Intellectual Property, 2013, (232), 22–24.
Lessons from the Federal Circuit: avoiding unpatentability for life science. Zuniga B., Journal of the Patent and Trademark Office Society, 2013, 95 (2), 223–237.
License to infringe on research tool patents. Coggio B.D., Genetic Engineering and Biotechnology News, 2013, 33 (17), 10–11.
Mayo V. Prometheus: Reorganizing the toolbox for patent eligible subject matter and uses of natural laws. Wisecup B., University of Cincinnati Law Review, 2013, 81 (4), 1651–1675.
Novatis v Myriad: The Indian and US Supreme Courts on patents and public health. Sunder M., European Intellectual Property Review, 2013, 35 (12), 711–714.
Obviousness: A trap for the unwary? Regeneron & Bayer v Genentech. Lancaster D., Gilbert P., European Intellectual Property Review, 2013, 35 (9), 542–545.
Patent Act of 1952 – Patent exhaustion doctrine - Bowman v. Monsanto Co. Harvard Law Review, 2013, 127 (1), 378–387.
Patent Act of 1952 – Patentable subject matter – Ass'n for molecular pathology v. Myriad Genetics, Inc. Harvard Law Review, 2013, 127 (1), 388–397.
Patenting of agriculture biotechnology and food security: Options and challenges. Srivastava S.P., International Journal of Public Law and Policy, 2012, 2 (1), 35–65.
Patents against people: How drug companies price patients out of survival. Chen M., Dissent, 2013, 60 (4), 71–77.
Patents and China's research and development in agricultural biotechnology. Hu R., Wang X., Huang J., Cai J., Nature Biotechnology, 2013, 31 (11), 986–988.
Patents for diagnostic tools: An economic analysis. Booton D., Intellectual Property Quarterly, 2013, (3), 187–213.
Pharmaceutical patent controversy arises with Senator Bernard Sanders's proposed bill. Gloglo M.F., European Intellectual Property Review, 2013, 35 (9), 527–532.
Societal monetary benefits of pharmaceutical innovation: The case of ramipril in Canada. Thanh N.X., Chuck A.W., Ohinmaa A., Jacobs P., Journal of Pharmaceutical Health Services Research, 2013, 4 (4), 195–201.
Supplementary protection certificates in Europe – Transitional regime. Batakliev D., IIC International Review of Intellectual Property and Competition Law, 2013, 44 (7), 750–764.
The genes you can't patent. Kevles D.J., New York Review of Books, 2013, 60 (14).
The skilled person: an evolving concept. Cohen L., Davies C., Pharmaceutical Patent Analyst, 2013, 2 (6), 725–735.
The Unpatentable Human Being. Torrance A.W., Hastings Center Report, 2013, 43 (5), 10–11.
Writing a good patent application. Meenakshi K., Pharmaceutical Patent Analyst, 2013, 2 (6), 689–692.

2.2.2. Relating to software

Commercial success criterion in business method patent's nonobviousness judgment. Luo S., Zhao H., WIT Transactions on Information and Communication Technologies, 2014, 46 Volume 2, http://dx.doi.org/10.2495/ISME20132122, 1637–1642.
Competitive regulation of mobile software systems: Promoting innovation through reform of antitrust and patent laws. Baskin J., Hastings Law Journal, 2013, 64 (6), 1727–1758.
From wall street to wheat fields: Using the business method patent's "first inventor defense" as a model for genetically engineered seed protection. Dawson C.W., George Washington Law Review, 2012, 80 (4), 1174–1208.
Positioning and shifting of technology focus for integrated device manufacturers by patent perspectives. Li Y.-T., Huang M.-H., Chen D.-Z., Technological Forecasting and Social Change, 2014, 81 (1), 363–375.
Software patents and the return of functional claiming. Lemley M.A., Wisconsin Law Review, 2013, 2013 (4), 905–964.

2.2.3. Policy and strategic issues

Les patent trolls, des parasites de innovation. Breese P., Documentaliste: Sciences de l'Information, 2013, 50 (2), 18–19.
Patent hold-up and the limits of competition law: A trans-atlantic perspective. PetrovcIc U., Common Market Law Review, 2013, 50 (5), 1363–1386.
Patent rights: When patent protection may either encourage or discourage innovation. Allred B.B., Advances in International Marketing, 2012, 23, 223–240.
Patents, R&D investments and post-IPO strategies. Vismara S., Review of Managerial Science, 2013, http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11846-013-0113-5, 1–17.
The optimal time path of clean energy R&D policy when patents have finite lifetime. Gerlagh R., Kverndokk S., Rosendahl K.E., Journal of Environmental Economics and Management, 2013, http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jeem.2013.09.005.
The risks of patent infringement damages for global businesses: Businesses with a global reach will always face the threat of patent infringement lawsuits in the United States, but companies can manage the risk of high damages. Donahey T.I., China Business Review, 2013, (September).
When to commit more to a technological entry: Evidence of the follow-up patenting action of bearings manufacturers. Wu H.-L., Lee C.-Y., Lin J.-C., Journal of Engineering and Technology Management - JET-M, 2014, 31 (1), 1–20.

2.2.4. Other patent topics

"Undetected, unsuspected, and unknown": Should we anticipate problems for scientific innovation following Scheming Corp. v. Geneva Pharmaceuticals? Coleman J., Fordham Law Review, 2013, 82 (1), 165–204.
"Unitary patent" and court system – The "sub-sub-suboptimal compromise" of the EU Parliament. Stjerna I.B., CIPA Journal, 2013, 42 (9), 512–517.
20 years in the making – New Zealand's new patent legislation. Balance J., CIPA Journal, 2013, 42 (9), 510–511.
3D printing – the breakthrough technology that could change the world. Mujamdar D., Intellectual Asset Management Magazine, 2013, (62), 99–105.
A critical analysis of a legislative black swan in an age of preconceived notions. Miller C.E., Journal of the Patent and Trademark Office Society, 2013, 95 (2), 124–164.
A patently public concern: Using public nuisance law to fix the false patent marking statute after the Leahy-Smith America invents act. Crudo R.A., George Washington Law Review, 2012, 80 (2), 568–601.
A reply to Etzkowitz' comments to Leydesdorff and Martin (2010): Technology transfer and the end of the Bayh-Dole effect. Leydesdorff L., Meyer M., Scientometrics, 2013, 97 (3), 927–934.
Adjustment of patent law and the independent innovation. Zhang Q.-L., Ju X.-F., International Conference on Management Science and Engineering – Annual Conference Proceedings, 2013, http://dx.doi.org/10.1109/ICMSE.2013.6586518, 1854–1860.
An engineering design support tool based on TRIZ. Ang M.C., Ng K.W., Ahmad S.A., Wahab A.N.A., Lecture Notes in Computer Science, 2013, 8237 LNCS, http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-02958-0_11, 115–127.
Bargaining and delay in patent licensing. Mauleon A., Vannetelbosch V., Vergari C., International Journal of Economic Theory, 2013, 9 (4), 279–302.

Economics at the FTC: Physician Acquisitions, Standard Essential Patents, and Accuracy of Credit Reporting. Carlson J.A., Dafny L.S., Freeborn B.A., Ippolito P.M., Wendling B.W., Review of Industrial Organization, 2013, http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11151-013-9411-y, 1–24.
Evaluating TRIZ as a Provider of Provocative Stimuli. Arlitt R., Nix A., Stone R., ASME International Mechanical Engineering Congress and Exposition, Proceedings (IMECE), 2012, 3 (Parts A, B and C).
Examining sources of resistance to the implementation of a patent management system in a developing country: Evidence from a case study of the Brazilian patent office. Do Canto Cavalheiro G.M., Joia L.A., Lecture Notes in Computer Science, 2013, 8074 LNCS, http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-40358-3-22, 262–273.
Federal Circuit boosts patent owners on claim construction. Carlson S., Dubai U., Managing Intellectual Property, 2013, (234), 30–32.
Government-sponsored university-industry collaboration and the production of nanotechnology patents in US universities. Ponomariov B., Journal of Technology Transfer, 2013, 38 (6), 749–767.
Have Chinese universities embraced their third mission? New insight from a business perspective. Wang Y., Huang J., Chen Y., Pan X., Chen J., Scientometrics, 2013, 97 (2), 207–222.
How to forecast cross-border patent infringement? – The case of U.S. international trade. Lee P.-C., Su H.-N., Technological Forecasting and Social Change, 2013, http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2013.10.024.
Improving patent quality through pre-grant opposition in Thailand. Puasiri W., Journal of International Commercial Law and Technology, 2013, 8 (4), 219–253.
In search of a technical effect. Pearce D., CIPA Journal, 2013, 42 (10), 580–582.
Incidence and growth of patent thickets: The impact of technological opportunities and complexity. Von Graevenitz G., Wagner S., Harhoff D., Journal of Industrial Economics, 2013, 61 (3), 521–563.
Innovative problem solving for social applications: A structured approach. Souchkov V., Proceedings of the IADIS International Conference Web Based Communities and Social Media 2013, Proceedings of the IADIS International Conference Collaborative Technologies 2013, 2013, 3–10.
Inventive productivity and patent quality: Evidence from Italian inventors. Schettino F., Sterlacchini A., Venturini F., Journal of Policy Modeling, 2013, 35 (6), 1043–1056.
Lessons for patent owners from the first year of inter partes review. Alter S., Linder W., O'Loughlin R., Managing Intellectual Property, 2013, (234), 22–24.
Local context, academic entrepreneurship and open science: Publication secrecy and commercial activity among Japanese and US scientists. Walsh J.P., Huang H., Research Policy, 2013, http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2013.10.003.
No longer guilty if proved innocent [Supreme Court; EPO decision]. Evans H., Hidaka S., Managing Intellectual Property, 2013, (232), 18–21.
Non-Practical Entities: Business Method Patents and the Digitization of Culture. Morris J.W., Critical Studies in Media Communication, 2013, http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/15295036.2013.833341.
Patent assertion entities: Do they impede innovation and technology commercialisation? Hemphill T.A., Technology Analysis and Strategic Management, 2013, http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09537325.2013.850478.
Patent pledge evaluation model construction based on the AHP. Yan Y., Li J., Applied Mechanics and Materials, 2013, 380–384, http://dx.doi.org/10.4028/www.scientific.net/AMM.380-384.4700, 4700–4704.
Patent pools and dynamic R&D incentives. Dequiedt V., Versaevel B., International Review of Law and Economics, 2013, 36, 59–69.
Patent pools: Licensing strategies in the absence of regulation. Lampe R., Moser P., Advances in Strategic Management, 2012, 29, 69–86.
Patent portfolios as securities. Risch M., Duke Law Journal, 2013, 63 (1), 89–154.
Patent storage research of cooperation between S&T-oriented small-micro enterprise and university in triple helix innovation based on EPQ model. Ye L.F., Su S.B., Applied Mechanics and Materials, 2013, 411–414, http://dx.doi.org/10.4028/www.scientific.net/AMM.411-414.2317, 2317–2321.
Patent trolls turn friendly. Hatch D., Managing Intellectual Property, 2013, (233), 30–35.
Patents and the university. Lee P., Duke Law Journal, 2013, 63 (1), 1–88.
Patents as signals for startup financing. Conti A., Thursby J., Thursby M., Journal of Industrial Economics, 2013, 61 (3), 592–622.
Patents in the university: Priming the pump and crowding out. Scotchmer S., Journal of Industrial Economics, 2013, 61 (3), 817–844.
Playing favourites: A proposal for the selective acceleration of patent applications examination. Whallen D., Intellectual Property Journal, 2013, 25 (2), 111–147.
Priority date assessment under EPC: part II. Lawrence M., CIPA Journal, 2013, 42 (8), 443–450.
Prizes, publicity and patents: Non-Monetary awards as a mechanism to encourage innovation. Moser P., Nicholas T., Journal of Industrial Economics, 2013, 61 (3), 763–788.
Reasonable royalties and the calculation of patent damages: Reflections and recommendations for a fair and adequate calculating basis of reasonable royalties in terms of harmonization of China-Taiwan regional patent laws. Shen C.-L., Journal of Intellectual Property, 2013, 12 (1).
Reverse causality in the R&D-patents relationship: an interpretation of the innovation persistence. Baraldi A.L., Cantabene C., Perani G., Economics of Innovation and New Technology, 2013, http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10438599.2013.848059.
Review of toxic priority. Lawrence M., CIPA Journal, 2013, 42 (9), 518–527.
Reviving the paper patent doctrine. Duffy J.F., Cornell Law Review, 2013, 98 (6), 1359–1398.
Rush to judgment? Trial length and outcomes in patent cases. Lemley M.A., Kendall J., Martin C., AIPLA Quarterly, 2013, 41 (2), 169–204.
Section 8 requirements of the Indian Patent Act: neither a mere formality nor a groundless threat. Banerjee S., Journal of Intellectual Property Law & Practice, 2013, 8 (12), 939–945.
Shopping for reversals: How accuracy differs across patent litigation forums. Lii T., Journal of Intellectual Property, 2013, 12 (1), 1–21.
Small Firms, Big Patents? Estimating Patent Value Using Data on Israeli Start-ups' Financing Rounds. Greenberg G., European Management Review, 2013, http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/emre.12015.
Specific and general information sharing among competing academic researchers. Haeussler C., Jiang L., Thursby J., Thursby M., Research Policy, 2013, http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2013.08.017.
Stable bargaining outcomes in patent licensing: A cooperative game approach without side payments. Kishimoto S., Mathematical Social Sciences, 2013, 66 (3), 183–195.
Taboo, the game: Patent office edition-the new preissuance submissions under the America invents act. Trzeciak A.R., Duke Law Journal, 2013, 63 (1), 245–279.
Technology variation vs. R&D uncertainty: What matters most for energy patent success? Popp D., Santen N., Fisher-Vanden K., Webster M., Resource and Energy Economics, 2013, 35 (4), 505–533.

The domestic context to Chinese overseas patent applications. Duke T., CIPA Journal, 2013, 42 (8), 450–453.
The ebb and flow of patent law. Klee M.M., IEEE Pulse, 2013, 4 (5), http://dx.doi.org/10.1109/MPUL.2013.2271418, 52–68.
The end of the "Golden Orange-Book-Standard". Verhauwen A., Journal of Intellectual Property Law & Practice, 2013, 8 (11), 879–886.
The impact of university research on corporate patenting: evidence from UK universities. Helmers C., Rogers M., Journal of Technology Transfer, 2013, http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10961-013-9320-0, 1–24.
The ontological function of the patent document. Chin A., University of Pittsburgh Law Review, 2012, 74 (2), 263–332.
The Patent policy trilemma. Shadlen K.C., Journal fur Entwicklungspolitik, 2013, 29 (2), 87–105.
The real problem is patent quality, not NPEs. Milone C., Intellectual Asset Management Magazine, 2013, (61), 11–16.
The right not to use in property and patent law. Liivak O., Penalver E.M., Cornell Law Review, 2013, 98 (6), 1437–1494.
The spatial distribution of innovation: Evidence on the role of academic quality for seven European countries. Malva A.D., Carree M., Economics of Innovation and New Technology, 2013, 22 (6), 601–618.
The TRIPs agreement and technological innovation. Di Vita G., Journal of Policy Modeling, 2013, 35 (6), 964–977.
The UK research and 'Bolar' exemptions: broadening the scope for innovation? Cohen L., Peirson L., Journal of Intellectual Property Law & Practice, 2013, 8 (11), 837–845.
There will be exports and licensing: The effects of patent rights and innovation on firm sales. Briggs K., Park W.G., Journal of International Trade and Economic Development, 2013, http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09638199.2013.843199.
Third-party submissions for patent applications pending before the USPTO. Wagner J.J.D., Wu B., Journal of Intellectual Property Law & Practice, 2013, 8 (11), 828–832.
Threat of litigation and patent value. Tekic Z., Kukolj D., Research Technology Management, 2013, 56 (2), 18–25.
Venture capitalists and the patenting of innovations. Fabrizi S., Lippert S., Norback P.-J., Persson L., Journal of Industrial Economics, 2013, 61 (3), 623–659.

2.3. Trademarks and domain names

2.3.1. Trademarks

European Commission proposes reform of the European Trade Mark system. Fields D., Sheraton H., European Intellectual Property Review, 2013, 35 (10), 563–566.
Getting to functional: Limiting the applicability of the trademark aesthetic functionality doctrine. Midei A., AIPLA Quarterly, 2013, 41 (3), 467–510.
How are unregistered trademarks protected in china? Feng S., IIC International Review of Intellectual Property and Competition Law, 2013, 44 (7), 815–830.
How can I protect geographic indications? Managing Intellectual Property, 2013, (233), 46–55.
How trade mark defendants are winning from Medimmune. Ghajar B., Toto C., Managing Intellectual Property, 2013, (233), 36–39.
Logo recognition based on the Dempster-Shafer fusion of multiple classifiers. Bagheri M.A., Gao Q., Escalera S., Lecture Notes in Computer Science, 2013, 7884 LNAI, http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-38457-8_1, 1–12.
Lost in the semiotic maze: Empirical approaches to proof of blurring in trademark dilution law. Bunker M.D., Bissell K., Communication Law and Policy, 2013, 18 (4), 375–393.
Marketing of geographical indications in India: An analysis. Singh H., Aggarwal R., European Intellectual Property Review, 2013, 35 (11), 667–673.
Not prior in time, but superior in right - how trademark registrations can be affected by third-party interests in a sign. Kur A., IIC International Review of Intellectual Property and Competition Law, 2013, 44 (7), 790–814.
Pharmaceutical trademark examination and its implications for self-medication: Parameters and examples in Brazil. Bucasio R.P., da Silva E.F., Fierro I.M., Peralta P.P., Journal of Intellectual Property Rights, 2013, 18 (5), 439–447.
Protecting religious identity with American trademark law. Olsen S.J., Journal of Intellectual Property, 2013, 12 (1), 1–23.
Revisiting trade marks. Vivant M., Queen Mary Journal of Intellectual Property, 2013, 3 (4), 307–312.
Schumpeterian competition and efficiency among commercial banks. Duygun M., Sena V., Shaban M., Journal of Banking and Finance, 2013, 37 (12), 5176–5185.
Studying factors causing wordmark confusions to improve brand identity. Chen R., Cheng T., International Journal of Information and Management Sciences, 2013, 24 (3), 265–277.
The confusion trap: Rethinking parody in trademark law. Simon D.A., Washington Law Review, 2013, 88 (3), 1021–1101.
The dawning of non-traditional trade marks in Japan. Tessensohn J.A., European Intellectual Property Review, 2013, 35 (10), 612–615.
The USPTO trademark case files dataset: Descriptions, lessons, and insights. Graham S.J.H., Hancock G., Marco A.C., Myers A.F., Journal of Economics and Management Strategy, 2013, 22 (4), 669–705.
Trade mark functions and protection for marks with a reputation. Bailey A., Journal of Intellectual Property Law & Practice, 2013, 8 (11), 868–875.
Trademark recognition based on Hu modified invariant moments. Huang M., Ma Y.Q., Shu H.Z., Gong Q.P., Applied Mechanics and Materials, 2013, 397–400, http://dx.doi.org/10.4028/www.scientific.net/AMM.397-400.2313, 2313–2317.
Trademarks and venture capital valuation. Block J.H., De Vries G., Schumann J.H., Sandner P., Journal of Business Venturing, 2013, http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusvent.2013.07.006.

2.3.2. Domain names

ICANN'T help myself: beneficial adjustments to the new generic top-level domain. Marsh B., Journal of the Patent and Trademark Office Society, 2013, 95 (2), 195–222.

2.4. Designs

Apple v Samsung: the Hoge Raad legacy. Folliard-Monguiral A. and Miniotas M., Journal of Intellectual Property Law & Practice, 2013, 8 (12), 924–931.
Community design law: further guidance from the General Court of the European Union. Hartwig H., Journal of Intellectual Property Law & Practice, 2013, 8 (11), 862–867.
Similarity scope of design patent rights. Chen R., Kuo H.-T., Journal of Industrial and Production Engineering, 2013, 30 (4), 211–219.
BMW v Roound & Metal: First UK decision on he Community Design "Repair Clause". Cornwell J., European Intellectual Property Review, 2013, 35 (9), 548–554.

2.5. Other IP; general IP issues

2.5.1. Policy and strategic issues

Co-ownership of intellectual property: Exploring the value-appropriation and value-creation implications of co-patenting with different partners. Belderbos R., Cassiman B., Faems D., Leten

B., Van Looy B., Research Policy, 2013, http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2013.08.013.
Creating value through external intellectual property commercialization: A desorptive capacity view. Ziegler N., Ruether F., Bader M.A., Gassmann O., Journal of Technology Transfer, 2013, 38 (6), 930–949.

2.5.2. Other IP issues

A case study of the collaborative approaches to sustain open source business models. Coughlan S., Noda T., Tansho T., Proceedings of the 9th International Symposium on Open Collaboration, WikiSym + OpenSym 2013, http://dx.doi.org/10.1145/2491055.2491072.
Intellectual property issues in college-industry partnerships. Lori Glover J.D., Keiller T.S., ASEE Annual Conference and Exposition, Conference Proceedings, 2013.
Protecting layout designs on printed circuit boards in China and some key industrial countries - New regulatory regime from a law and economics perspective. Shen W., Journal of Intellectual Property Rights, 2013, 18 (5), 419–438.
Research on coupling intellectual property and open business model. Huan G., Zhang W.-S., International Conference on Management Science and Engineering – Annual Conference Proceedings, 2013, http://dx.doi.org/10.1109/ICMSE.2013.6586379, 864–869.
Research on the barriers and strategies of IPRs for LCT transfer. Ma J.J., Chen X.F., Hong S.Z., Advanced Materials Research, 2013, 734–737, http://dx.doi.org/10.4028/www.scientific.net/AMR.734-737.1842, 1842–1847.
Revision of the European union regime on customs enforcement of intellectual property rights. Cook T., Journal of Intellectual Property Rights, 2013, 18 (5), 485–490.
Russia's new IP Court – a great leap forward. Aylan D., Rawal B., CIPA Journal, 2013, 42 (10), 573–577.
Stage-dependent intellectual property rights. Chu A.C., Cozzi G., Galli S., Journal of Development Economics, 2014, 106, 239–249.
The Invisible Meets the Intangible: Culture's Impact on Intellectual Property Protection. Budde-Sung A., Journal of Business Ethics, 2013, 117 (2), 345–359.

2.6. Historical

Chaim Selig Slonimski and his adding devices. Monnier V., Szrek W., Zalewski J., IEEE Annals of the History of Computing, 2013, 35 (3), http://dx.doi.org/10.1109/MAHC.2013.13, 42–53.

David Newton
Crooked Thatch, East End, Hook Norton, Banbury OX15 5LG, United Kingdom
E-mail address: dnewton@hotmail.co.uk.