

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Rethinking Intellectual Property Rights in the Era of Open Science

Nishant Kumar^{1*} ¹ Faculty of Law, Aligarh Muslim University, Aligarh, India


* Corresponding author email address: nishantkumar@amu.ac.in

Received: 2023-03-23

Revised: 2023-04-22


Accepted: 2023-04-25

Published: 2023-07-01

EDITOR:Yuyu Zheng 


School of International Relations, University of St Andrews, St Andrews, London, United Kingdom

yuyuzheng@gmail.com

REVIEWER 1:Nabeel Bani-Hani 

Faculty of Education Specialization, Wasit University, Wasit, Iraq

nabeelhani@uowasit.edu.iq

REVIEWER 2:Kaushalya Korlage 

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

korlage@iouc.cmb.ac.lk

1. Round 1

1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

The paper should more explicitly define the research question or the specific aspect of intellectual property rights (IPR) it aims to address within the open science context. This will help narrow the focus and provide clearer direction for the analysis.

Incorporating case studies or examples of open science initiatives could illustrate the tensions between IPR and open science, making the argument more concrete and relatable.

A detailed analysis of different stakeholders in the IPR ecosystem (e.g., researchers, universities, private companies) and their interests or challenges in the context of open science would add depth to the discussion.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the document.

1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

More specific recommendations for policymakers on how to balance IPR with the goals of open science would be valuable. This could include suggestions for new models of IP management or examples of successful policy interventions.

Exploring the role of technology transfer offices in universities and research institutions in managing IP within open science frameworks can provide insights into practical challenges and solutions.

The paper could benefit from a discussion on how IPR issues in open science manifest differently across countries, especially between developed and developing nations.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the document.

2. Revised

Editor's decision: Accepted.

Editor in Chief's decision: Accepted.