


OPEN PEER REVIEW

Legal Mechanisms for Protecting Indigenous Knowledge

Patrika Handique^{1*} , Amit Dubey¹ 


¹ Patent Information Centre, Intellectual Property Facilitation Centre, Chhattisgarh Council of Science & Technology, Raipur, Chhattisgarh, India

* Corresponding author email address: Patriandique@gmail.com

Received: 2022-05-02**Revised:** 2022-05-22**Accepted:** 2022-05-29**Published:** 2022-07-01**EDITOR:**Vanessa Indama 


Public Administration Department, Basilan State College, Isabela City, Basilan, Philippines

vanesindama@gmail.com

REVIEWER 1:Kaushalya Korlage 

Assistant Lecturer in Sociology at University of Colombo, Colombo, Sri Lanka

korlage@iouc.cmb.ac.lk

REVIEWER 2:Sandeep Kotwal 

Knowledge Management Division, National Health Systems Resource Centre, Ministry of Health and Family Welfare, New Delhi, India

sandkotwal@gmail.com

1. Round 1

1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

The inclusion of case studies from Australia, Canada, and South Africa is commendable. However, a deeper exploration of how these legal frameworks have been practically applied and their direct impact on indigenous communities would enrich the discussion. Specific examples of successful legal interventions or notable failures could provide more actionable insights.

The manuscript briefly touches upon the potential role of technology in documenting and protecting IK. Given the increasing relevance of digital platforms and blockchain technology in safeguarding intellectual property, a more detailed exploration of these technological solutions, including their limitations and ethical considerations, would be beneficial.

While the analysis of legal and policy frameworks is thorough, it would benefit from a clearer delineation between international and national mechanisms. A comparative analysis highlighting the synergies and conflicts between different levels of legal protection could offer a more nuanced understanding of the current landscape.

The manuscript would benefit from an update to include any recent developments or landmark cases in the protection of IK since its submission. This could involve changes in international treaties, national laws, or significant case law that has emerged, providing a more current perspective on the topic.

The conclusion effectively summarizes the manuscript's main arguments but could be strengthened by explicitly stating clear, actionable recommendations for future legal and policy initiatives. This could involve suggesting specific changes to existing laws, proposing new international collaborations, or identifying priority areas for research and advocacy.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the document.

1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

While the manuscript is strong in its theoretical framework, incorporating more empirical evidence to support the arguments could enhance its impact. This could include statistics on the outcomes of existing legal protections for IK, interviews with indigenous leaders, or surveys of legal experts in the field.

The manuscript could benefit from a more explicit discussion on how interdisciplinary approaches—combining legal, anthropological, environmental, and technological perspectives—can enhance the protection of IK. This could involve examples of successful interdisciplinary collaborations or recommendations for integrating diverse expertise in legal reform efforts.

The ethical considerations surrounding the protection of IK are crucial. This section could be expanded to discuss more deeply the challenges of balancing respect for indigenous cultures with the demands of global intellectual property laws, including potential ethical frameworks or principles that could guide this balancing act.

The role of international cooperation in protecting IK is touched upon but could be elaborated further. Specific recommendations for improving international treaties and collaborations, as well as examples of successful international initiatives, would provide a clearer path forward.

The recommendations made in the manuscript are valuable but could be made more specific and actionable. For each proposed direction, outlining the steps required to achieve these outcomes, potential stakeholders involved, and anticipated challenges would provide readers with a clearer understanding of how to move forward.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the document.

2. Revised

Editor's decision: Accepted.

Editor in Chief's decision: Accepted.