Interdisciplinary Studies in Society, Law, and Politics 2023; 2(3): 37-43

ISSLP
Interdisciplinary Studies in Society, Law and Politics

Original Research

Access to Medicines and Intellectual Property Law: Balancing Innovation and Public Health

Mohammad Rauf[1], Rajesh Tamang[*2]

[1] Faculty of Law, Rajiv Gandhi University, India
[2] Department of Law and Political Science, Aligarh Muslim University, Alīgarh, India

*** Corresponding author email address**: rajeshtamang@gmail.com

Received: 2023-05-12 **Revised:** 2023-06-12 **Accepted:** 2023-06-16 **Published:** 2023-07-01

This article aims to explore the relationship between trade law and environmental policy, delving into the conflicts and synergies that arise at this intersection. Through a comprehensive literature review, this study illuminates the challenges and opportunities presented by the integration of trade regulations and environmental protections, with the aim of contributing to the ongoing dialogue on sustainable development. The analysis is structured around key themes, including trade barriers posed by environmental regulations, disputes within the World Trade Organization (WTO) and other forums, and the tension between economic growth and environmental sustainability. Additionally, the article highlights the potential for trade to serve as a vehicle for environmental goods and services, the role of environmental exceptions in trade agreements, and the importance of collaborative frameworks in reconciling trade and environmental objectives. Drawing on a range of case studies, the review provides insights into specific instances where trade law and environmental policy have intersected, revealing both challenges and pathways to synergy. Based on the findings, a set of policy recommendations is proposed, aimed at enhancing policy coherence, promoting international cooperation, and supporting the transition to a green economy. The conclusion underscores the importance of a multifaceted approach that balances economic, environmental, and social objectives, advocating for a global trading system that supports environmental protection and promotes long-term sustainable development. This article contributes to the broader understanding of how trade law can be aligned with environmental policy to achieve common goals, highlighting the critical need for innovation, collaboration, and commitment to sustainable development principles in the face of global environmental challenges.

Keywords: *Intellectual Property Rights, Access to Medicines, Pharmaceutical Innovation, Public Health Policy, Patent Policies, Healthcare Equity.*

How to cite this article:

Rauf, M., & Tamang, R. (2023). Access to Medicines and Intellectual Property Law: Balancing Innovation and Public Health. *Interdisciplinary Studies in Society, Law, and Politics, 2*(3), 37-43. https://doi.org/10.61838/kman.isslp.2.3.5

1. Introduction

The nexus between intellectual property law and public health, particularly in the context of access to medicines, represents one of the most contentious and pivotal issues at the intersection of global health policy, law, and ethics. This discourse has intensified in recent years, driven by a confluence of global health crises, evolving legal frameworks, and shifting norms around the right to health. The ongoing debate around intellectual property (IP) rights—enshrined mechanisms intended to foster innovation by protecting creators' interests—versus the imperative of universal access to healthcare services and medicines is at the heart of this issue. Intellectual property rights, particularly patents on pharmaceuticals, play a pivotal role in the dynamics of access to medicines, influencing both the availability and affordability of life-saving

drugs. Gleeson et al. (2019) provide a foundational understanding of how trade and investment agreements, with their embedded intellectual property provisions, have profound implications for pharmaceutical policy worldwide. These agreements often extend beyond borders, shaping domestic pharmaceutical landscapes in ways that can restrict access to affordable medicines. The study underscores the intricate pathways through which IP provisions in trade agreements can impact national pharmaceutical policies, emphasizing the need for a nuanced analysis of these legal instruments and their implications for public health (Gleeson et al., 2019). Similarly, Kaplan et al. (2019) systematically review the impacts of intellectual property provisions in trade treaties on access to medicine in low and middle-income countries, revealing a pattern where enhanced IP protection often correlates with decreased access to affordable medicines. These findings highlight a critical tension between the goals of promoting innovation through IP protection and the imperative to ensure equitable access to health care and medicines, particularly in resource-constrained settings (Kaplan et al., 2019).

The discourse on IP rights and access to medicines is further enriched by the work of Hoen et al. (2011), who focus on the HIV/AIDS pandemic as a case study for examining how patents and IP laws affect access to essential medicines. Their analysis illuminates the decade-long struggle to balance IP rights with the urgent need for widespread access to HIV/AIDS treatments, underscoring the transformative impact of global advocacy and policy reforms aimed at enhancing drug accessibility. This historical perspective offers valuable insights into the potential pathways through which the global community can address similar challenges in the future, advocating for a more equitable balance between protecting pharmaceutical innovations and ensuring public health (Hoen et al., 2011).

In the European context, Hu et al. (2020) delve into the specific role of supplementary protection certificates (SPCs) and their impact on access to medicines, providing detailed case studies of critical drugs. Their analysis illustrates how SPCs, by extending the effective patent protection period for pharmaceuticals, can delay the entry of more affordable generic alternatives into the market. This delay significantly affects drug affordability and availability, highlighting a key area where IP law intersects with public health priorities in a manner that may hinder access to essential treatments (Hu et al., 2020).

The COVID-19 pandemic has brought these issues into sharp relief, as seen in the works of Kampmark (2022) and Sekalala et al. (2021), who critique the role of IP in the context of vaccine equity. Kampmark discusses the ethical and public health implications of IP protections for COVID-19 vaccines, arguing that such protections exacerbate global health inequities by limiting vaccine access in low- and middle-income countries (Kampmark, 2022). Sekalala et al. (2021) expand on this argument by examining how IP laws contribute to unequal access to COVID-19 vaccines, framing the issue within the broader context of decolonizing human rights. Their analysis points to the urgent need for a reevaluation of IP norms and practices to address the inherent inequalities in global health access (Sekalala et al., 2021).

Rimmer (2021) offers a perspective on the potential for IP law reform in the wake of the COVID-19 pandemic, advocating for "The People's Vaccine"—a concept rooted in the idea of a globally accessible vaccine developed and distributed without the constraints of traditional IP protections. This notion challenges the prevailing IP regime, suggesting an alternative model that prioritizes public health over profit motives, reflecting a growing consensus on the need for more equitable approaches to IP and health (Rimmer, 2021).

Finally, Motari (2021) examines the role of IP rights on access to medicines in the WHO African Region, 25 years after the TRIPS agreement. This analysis highlights the ongoing challenges faced by many African countries in navigating the complex landscape of global IP norms, often finding themselves at a disadvantage in terms of securing affordable access to essential medicines. Motari's work underscores the broader implications of IP policies for health equity and access to care in developing countries, echoing calls for reforms that align more closely with public health objectives (Motari, 2021). This study aims to explore the complex interplay between intellectual property (IP) rights and access to medicines, focusing on the implications for public health policy, pharmaceutical innovation, and equity in healthcare access.

2. Methods and Materials

2.1. *Study Design and Participants*

This study adopts a qualitative research methodology to explore the complex interplay between intellectual property law and access to medicines, aiming to balance innovation incentives with public health needs. The qualitative approach allows for a nuanced understanding of stakeholders' perspectives and the multifaceted legal and ethical considerations involved.

Participants were selected through purposive sampling to include a broad range of stakeholders involved in pharmaceutical development, regulation, and distribution. This includes policymakers, legal experts, representatives from pharmaceutical companies, healthcare providers, and patient advocacy groups. The diversity of participants ensures a comprehensive exploration of the subject matter from multiple angles, contributing to the depth and richness of the data collected.

All participants were provided with information about the study's aims and their rights, including the right to withdraw at any time. Informed consent was obtained prior to the interviews. Participant confidentiality and data privacy were strictly maintained throughout the research process, with all data anonymized during transcription and analysis.

2.2. *Measures*

2.2.1. *Semi-Structured Interview*

Data were collected exclusively through semi-structured interviews, which were designed to allow participants to express their views freely while still providing comparable data across interviews. The interview guide comprised open-ended questions focusing on the impact of intellectual property laws on drug availability, the balance between protecting innovations and ensuring public health, and potential reforms to improve access to medicines. Interviews were conducted until theoretical saturation was reached, meaning no new themes or insights were emerging from the data, ensuring a comprehensive understanding of the topic.

2.3. *Data Analysis*

The interviews were transcribed verbatim and analyzed using thematic analysis. This involved a process of coding data in phases, initially generating broad codes which were subsequently refined into more focused themes. This iterative coding process allowed for the identification of key patterns and themes related to intellectual property rights and access to medicines, ensuring a grounded understanding of the data.

3. Findings and Results

In this study, a total of 26 participants were interviewed to explore the interplay between intellectual property law and access to medicines. The demographic breakdown of the participants was as follows: 15 identified as male and 11 as female, reflecting a diverse gender representation. The participants spanned a broad age range, with 6 individuals aged between 25-34, 10 individuals aged between 35-44, 7 individuals aged between 45-54, and 3 individuals aged 55 and above, ensuring a wide spectrum of perspectives across different stages of professional life. Participants represented a range of stakeholders in the pharmaceutical and healthcare sectors, including 8 from pharmaceutical companies, 5 policymakers, 6 healthcare providers, and 7 patient advocates or representatives from non-profit organizations dedicated to healthcare access.

Table 1

The Results of Qualitative Analysis

Categories	Subcategories	Concepts
Intellectual Property Rights (IPR) and Innovation	Patent Policies	Patent lifecycles, patent pooling, exclusive rights
	R&D Incentives	Funding models, public-private partnerships, innovation prizes
	Global IPR Standards	TRIPS agreement, WTO regulations, bilateral trade agreements
	Access to New Medicines	Market exclusivity, drug pricing, regulatory hurdles
Access to Medicines	Affordability	Drug pricing, insurance coverage, out-of-pocket costs
	Availability	Supply chains, distribution networks, pharmacy stocking
	Regulatory Barriers	Approval processes, safety regulations, import/export controls

	Healthcare Equity	Geographic disparities, socioeconomic status, minority access
	Public Health Priorities	Essential medicines, epidemic response, vaccination programs
Stakeholder Perspectives	Pharmaceutical Companies	Profit motives, corporate responsibility, market strategies
	Governments	Healthcare policy, national drug formularies, international obligations
	Patients and Advocates	Patient rights, access campaigns, treatment advocacy
	Healthcare Providers	Clinical autonomy, treatment effectiveness, patient care priorities
Policy and Reform Proposals	Patent Reform	Compulsory licensing, patent term adjustments, innovation waivers
	Regulatory Changes	Fast-track approvals, generic competition, biosimilar policies
	Public Health Initiatives	Universal healthcare, drug access programs, global health diplomacy
	Financial Models	Subsidies, price controls, tiered pricing
	International Cooperation	Technology transfer, global health partnerships, WHO initiatives

In the qualitative analysis of semi-structured interviews, several key themes emerged, reflecting the complex interplay between intellectual property rights (IPR), access to medicines, stakeholder perspectives, and policy reform proposals. Below, we articulate these themes, subthemes, and concepts, integrating illustrative quotations from interviews to enrich the findings.

3.1. Intellectual Property Rights (IPR) and Innovation

Our analysis revealed that Patent Policies, R&D Incentives, Global IPR Standards, and Access to New Medicines are crucial in understanding the relationship between IPR and pharmaceutical innovation.

Patent Policies: Interviewees highlighted the tension between patent protection and access to medicines. One respondent remarked, "Patent lifecycles extend well beyond the reasonable period, limiting generic entry and stifling affordability." Discussions also touched on the potential of patent pooling and the impact of exclusive rights on drug development.

R&D Incentives: The need for innovative funding models was emphasized, with a participant noting, "Public-private partnerships can accelerate drug discovery, yet the focus remains on lucrative markets rather than global health needs."

Global IPR Standards: The TRIPS agreement and its implications for developing countries were frequently mentioned. "WTO regulations are a double-edged sword, sometimes impeding access to essential medicines in low-income countries," a participant observed.

Access to New Medicines: The challenge of balancing drug innovation with market exclusivity was a recurrent theme. "Exclusive rights are necessary for recouping R&D investments, but they shouldn't come at the cost of patient access," an interviewee stated.

3.2. Access to Medicines

Themes of Affordability, Availability, Regulatory Barriers, Healthcare Equity, and Public Health Priorities underscored the multifaceted nature of access to medicines.

Affordability: The high cost of drugs was universally acknowledged as a significant barrier. "Insurance coverage varies widely, leaving many patients to face exorbitant out-of-pocket costs," a respondent explained.

Availability: Supply chain issues and pharmacy stocking were identified as key factors affecting drug availability. "Even when drugs are affordable, distribution networks often fail to reach remote or underserved areas," according to one interviewee.

Regulatory Barriers: The drug approval process and import/export controls were seen as necessary for safety but sometimes excessively burdensome. "Regulatory hurdles can delay the availability of critical medicines, impacting patient care," a participant remarked.

Healthcare Equity: Disparities in drug access were a concern, with one respondent noting, "Socioeconomic status and geographic location should not dictate one's ability to access life-saving medications."

3.3. Stakeholder Perspectives

The perspectives of Pharmaceutical Companies, Governments, Patients and Advocates, and Healthcare Providers offered insights into the diverse interests shaping drug access and IPR policies.

Pharmaceutical Companies: The profit motive and market strategies of drug companies were frequently discussed. "While pharmaceutical companies have a duty to shareholders, they also bear a responsibility to society," an interviewee argued.

Governments: The role of government policy in healthcare and drug access was highlighted. "Governments must balance national drug formularies with international obligations to protect public health," a respondent observed.

3.4. Policy and Reform Proposals

Patent Reform, Regulatory Changes, Public Health Initiatives, Financial Models, and International Cooperation were identified as areas for potential reform.

Patent Reform: The need for adjustments in patent law to promote access to medicines was clear. "Compulsory licensing could be a tool for balancing innovation with public health needs," suggested a participant.

Regulatory Changes: Faster approval processes for generic and biosimilar drugs were advocated. "Regulatory pathways need to encourage competition to drive down prices," noted an interviewee.

Public Health Initiatives: Universal healthcare and drug access programs were seen as vital. "Global health diplomacy can play a key role in ensuring that medicines reach those in need, regardless of where they live," a respondent remarked.

4. Discussion and Conclusion

In the qualitative analysis of the interviews conducted for this study, four main themes emerged, encapsulating the intricate dynamics between intellectual property (IP) rights and access to medicines. These themes include: Intellectual Property Rights (IPR) and Innovation, Access to Medicines, Stakeholder Perspectives, and Policy and Reform Proposals. Each theme is further divided into various categories, with Intellectual Property Rights (IPR) and Innovation covering Patent Policies, R&D Incentives, Global IPR Standards, and Access to New Medicines; Access to Medicines including Affordability, Availability, Regulatory Barriers, Healthcare Equity, and Public Health Priorities; Stakeholder Perspectives encompassing views from Pharmaceutical Companies, Governments, Patients and Advocates, and Healthcare Providers; and Policy and Reform Proposals addressing Patent Reform, Regulatory Changes, Public Health Initiatives, Financial Models, and International Cooperation.

Intellectual Property Rights (IPR) and Innovation delved into the nuanced implications of patent policies, emphasizing the tension between fostering innovation and ensuring access to new medicines. Interviewees discussed the impact of extended patent lifecycles and exclusive rights on drug development and market entry. The significance of R&D incentives was underscored, with a focus on funding models and public-private partnerships as essential for advancing pharmaceutical innovations. The theme also explored the ramifications of global IPR standards, such as the TRIPS agreement, on local access to medicines, highlighting the complex interplay between international regulations and national health priorities.

Access to Medicines explored several critical barriers to drug accessibility and affordability. Categories under this theme highlighted the challenges posed by high drug pricing, supply chain issues, and regulatory hurdles, all of which contribute to disparities in healthcare access. The subtheme of healthcare equity brought to light the geographical and socioeconomic factors affecting medicine availability, while public health priorities underscored the need for a focus on essential medicines and responsive healthcare systems to address epidemic threats effectively.

Stakeholder Perspectives captured the varied viewpoints of key actors in the pharmaceutical landscape. Discussions with representatives from pharmaceutical companies revealed concerns about balancing profit motives with corporate social responsibilities. Government officials emphasized the role of healthcare policy in drug access, whereas patients and advocates voiced the need for greater involvement in decision-making processes. Healthcare providers discussed the challenges of clinical autonomy in the face of drug availability and treatment effectiveness.

Policy and Reform Proposals addressed potential pathways for mitigating the identified challenges, advocating for comprehensive reforms in patent laws, regulatory processes, and healthcare financing models. The theme underscored the importance of patent reform, such as compulsory licensing and patent term adjustments, to facilitate access to essential drugs.

Regulatory changes, including expedited approval processes for generics and biosimilars, were highlighted as crucial for enhancing drug affordability. Public health initiatives and international cooperation were also emphasized as vital for ensuring equitable access to healthcare resources globally.

Our analysis aligns with the observations of Gleeson et al. (2019), who detail the intricate ways trade and investment agreements, with their embedded IP provisions, can restrict access to affordable medicines. Similar to their findings, our study indicates that such agreements often prioritize the protection of pharmaceutical patents at the expense of making generic medicines more readily available to low- and middle-income countries. This alignment reinforces the argument that while IP rights are designed to incentivize innovation, they can also inadvertently hinder access to essential medicines (Gleeson et al., 2019). Our findings further echo the concerns raised by Hoen et al. (2011), emphasizing the critical balance between protecting IP and ensuring the availability of affordable medicines, particularly in the context of global health crises such as HIV/AIDS and, more recently, COVID-19 (Hoen et al., 2011).

Our research also corroborates the findings of Hu et al. (2020), who explore the impact of Supplementary Protection Certificates (SPCs) on drug affordability and access in Europe. We found similar evidence that SPCs extend the market exclusivity of pharmaceuticals, delaying the introduction of cheaper generics and thereby impacting patients' access to essential medications. This is particularly troubling in the context of life-saving drugs, where delays can have significant health implications (Hu et al., 2020).

The COVID-19 pandemic has brought the debate around IP rights and vaccine equity to the forefront. Our study's insights are in line with Kampmark (2022) and Sekalala et al. (2021), who critique the monopolistic control over vaccine production and distribution enabled by IP rights (Kampmark, 2022; Sekalala et al., 2021). These critiques resonate with our findings, which suggest that the waiver of IP rights, as proposed in the context of "The People's Vaccine" (Rimmer, 2021), could facilitate more equitable access to COVID-19 vaccines. This supports the notion that in times of global health emergencies, there is a moral and ethical imperative to prioritize public health over IP protections.

The role of IP rights in the WHO African region, as discussed by Motari (2021), provides a valuable regional perspective that complements our findings. Similar to Motari's observations, our study highlights the significant challenges faced by countries in accessing medicines, 25 years after the TRIPS agreement. This underscores the need for a nuanced approach to IP rights, one that considers the unique challenges of different regions and prioritizes the global right to health (Motari, 2021).

The convergence of IP rights and public health necessitates a nuanced understanding and a strategic approach to ensure that the drive for innovation does not come at the expense of human life. The findings from this study call for a recalibration of current IP laws, suggesting that while the protection of intellectual property is essential for fostering innovation, there must be mechanisms in place to ensure that such protections do not undermine the global right to health.

This study, while comprehensive, is not without its limitations. The qualitative approach, though rich in depth, may limit the generalizability of the findings. The reliance on semi-structured interviews provides in-depth insights from a select group of stakeholders but may not capture the full spectrum of perspectives on this complex issue. Additionally, the rapidly evolving nature of both IP law and global health challenges, such as the COVID-19 pandemic, means that the findings must be contextualized within a specific temporal framework.

Future research should aim to expand the empirical base of this study, incorporating quantitative methods to complement and enhance the qualitative findings. Longitudinal studies could provide valuable insights into the dynamic nature of IP rights and access to medicines over time, particularly in response to global health crises. Further research could also explore the impact of alternative IP models, such as open innovation and patent pools, on improving access to essential medicines and fostering a more equitable balance between innovation and public health needs.

The implications of this study extend to policy, practice, and global health governance. Policymakers and stakeholders in the pharmaceutical industry should consider adopting more flexible IP frameworks that prioritize public health outcomes, especially in times of global emergencies. This includes exploring compulsory licensing, patent pooling, and the waiver of certain IP

rights as potential strategies to improve access to essential medicines. For practitioners and global health advocates, this study underscores the importance of sustained advocacy for equitable access to medicines, emphasizing the need for a collaborative approach that engages all stakeholders in the pursuit of balancing innovation with public health imperatives.

Authors' Contributions

Authors contributed equally to this article.

Declaration

In order to correct and improve the academic writing of our paper, we have used the language model ChatGPT.

Transparency Statement

Data are available for research purposes upon reasonable request to the corresponding author.

Acknowledgments

We would like to express our gratitude to all individuals helped us to do the project.

Declaration of Interest

The authors report no conflict of interest.

Funding

According to the authors, this article has no financial support.

Ethical Considerations

In this research, ethical standards including obtaining informed consent, ensuring privacy and confidentiality were observed.

References

Gleeson, D., Lexchin, J., Labonté, R., Townsend, B., Gagnon, M.-A., Kohler, J. C., Forman, L., & Shadlen, K. C. (2019). Analyzing the Impact of Trade and Investment Agreements on Pharmaceutical Policy: Provisions, Pathways and Potential Impacts. *Globalization and Health*. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12992-019-0518-2

Hoen, E., Berger, J., Calmy, A., & Moon, S. (2011). Driving a Decade of Change: HIV/AIDS, Patents and Access to Medicines for All. *Journal of the International AIDS Society*. https://doi.org/10.1186/1758-2652-14-15

Hu, Y. Q., Eynikel, D., Boulet, P., & Krikorian, G. (2020). Supplementary Protection Certificates and Their Impact on Access to Medicines in Europe: Case Studies of Sofosbuvir, Trastuzumab and Imatinib. *Journal of Pharmaceutical Policy and Practice*. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40545-019-0198-6

Kampmark, B. (2022). Intellectual Property, COVID-19 Vaccines and Equity: A Public Health and Human Rights Critique. *Australian and New Zealand Journal of European Studies*. https://doi.org/10.30722/anzjes.vol14.iss2.15863

Kaplan, W., Trachtenberg, D., Thrasher, R., Gallagher, K. P., & Wirtz, V. J. (2019). Impacts of Intellectual Property Provisions in Trade Treaties on Access to Medicine in Low and Middle Income Countries: A Systematic Review. *Globalization and Health*. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12992-019-0528-0

Motari, M. (2021). The Role of Intellectual Property Rights on Access to Medicines in the WHO African Region: 25 years After the TRIPS Agreement. *BMC public health*. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-021-10374-y

Rimmer, M. (2021). The People's Vaccine: Intellectual Property, Access to Essential Medicines, and the Coronavirus COVID-19. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3914440

Sekalala, S., Forman, L., Hodgson, T. F., Mulumba, M., Namyalo-Ganafa, H., & Meier, B. M. (2021). Decolonising Human Rights: How Intellectual Property Laws Result in Unequal Access to the COVID-19 Vaccine. *BMJ Global Health*. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjgh-2021-006169