

AI Innovation And Intellectual Property: Assessing The Impact Of European Patent Trends On International Trade Policies

Younes Touati

PhD candidate, Interntional trade, Zhongnan University of Economics and Law, China

Abstract

This paper examines the significant impact of technological breakthroughs in artificial intelligence (AI) and European patent legislation on global competitiveness and international business strategy. The findings indicate that trade liberalization, assessed using the government's AI readiness index, substantially facilitates trade growth, especially among high-income WTO member nations. Nonetheless, specific intellectual property restrictions, including the Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS), may serve as trade obstacles. The rise in AI-related patents prompts intricate enquiries on intellectual property protection and the divergences between inventive nations and those that utilize this technology. These changes may affect technology transfer norms and global intellectual property policies. Governments must persist in diminishing trade barriers through international and bilateral agreements, emphasizing tariff reductions. A future study should investigate the distinct effects of regional trade agreements, institutional reforms, and WTO membership on various economic sectors, while also examining the long-term consequences of price volatility on trade liberalization.

Keywords: WTO; European Patent Office; AI Technology; Government AI Readiness Index; WIPO.

Date of Submission: 27-02-2025

Date of Acceptance: 07-03-2025

I. Introduction

Technological advancements exert a significant influence on the evolution of international trade, with each industrial revolution bringing fundamental transformations in the fields of production, transportation, and the circulation of goods and services. For example, in the 18th century, the steam engine revolutionized global trade by increasing the efficiency of transportation and production systems. According to (Hobsbawm & Wrigley, 1999). At the dawn of the 21st century, we are faced with the profound consequences of the fourth industrial revolution, characterized by the advent of technologies such as artificial intelligence (AI), big data, and the Internet of Things. (IoT). These advancements have profoundly changed the sector, particularly regarding intellectual property protection, while raising new challenges and perspectives for international trade policies.

A crucial element of innovation in artificial intelligence lies in its interaction with intellectual property, particularly through patents. According to the report by the European Patent Office (EPO), patent applications related to artificial intelligence have seen a significant increase over the past ten years, and Europe has played a crucial role in the global landscape of artificial intelligence patents. The European Patent Office made this statement in 2020. This trend reflects the strategies implemented to preserve Europe's leadership in the field of artificial intelligence technology development, as well as its competitiveness within the global digital economy. However, patents not only serve as innovation tools but also establish ownership of cutting-edge technologies, grant rights for commercial and exclusive use, and influence market dynamics. According to the OECD (2019). This creates a delicate balance between promoting innovation and ensuring equitable access to technology.

Patents related to artificial intelligence in Europe have had a notable influence on global business strategies. With the rise of artificial intelligence integration in global supply chains and production processes, the preservation of intellectual property will become a key element of commercial competitiveness. European companies enjoy robust intellectual property protection and advanced artificial intelligence structures, allowing them to leverage these technological advancements to gain a competitive edge on the international stage. This also has a notable impact on trade policy, as

nations with stronger patent protection can exert a more significant influence on the development of international trade standards. According to (Fan, X, 2021) and (Raihan, 2024), (S.-H. Chang, 2020). For example, the implementation of a more rigorous patent regime could lead to the emergence of a monopoly in the field of essential technologies, which could pose trade barriers for countries that do not possess the required technological skills. According to (Mercurio, 2011).

The impact of artificial intelligence innovation on intellectual property is particularly important in the context of international trade. Artificial intelligence has contributed to improving logistics efficiency on a global scale, optimizing supply chain management, and reducing operational costs, resulting in an increase in productivity and competitiveness in the field of commerce. According to (Hasan & Ojala, 2024). However, the distribution of these benefits, despite their importance, is not equitable. Nations with advanced artificial intelligence skills, such as Europe, are preparing to lead the AI-related sectors, while developing countries may struggle to catch up. The inequality in the distribution of these artificial intelligence technologies is likely to exacerbate trade disparities, as nations lacking these advancements will find themselves at a disadvantage on the global stage.

Moreover, the growth in the number of patents in the field of artificial intelligence raises concerns about its long-term impact on the innovation process. Patents play a crucial role in protecting intellectual property; however, they can represent a barrier to entry for small businesses and countries with limited resources. The expansion of artificial intelligence technology in various fields, such as manufacturing, healthcare, and finance, raises concerns about the concentration of patents in this area, particularly among large companies, mainly in Europe. This concentration could potentially restrict the dissemination of this technology and hinder broader economic growth. According to WIPO data (2020).

The goal of this study is to examine how developments in European patents in the field of artificial intelligence affect global business strategies. By studying the relationship between patent filings in the field of artificial intelligence and the scale of international trade, we will examine how innovation in artificial intelligence stimulates global commercial competitiveness. More specifically, this research focusses on the impact of the government's artificial intelligence readiness index and the volume of patent applications in the field of artificial intelligence, based on cross-sectional data from 48 countries in 2023. The conclusions of this research shed light on the interaction between innovation in artificial intelligence, intellectual property rights, and trade policies. They emphasize the importance of a balanced regulatory framework in intellectual property, promoting innovation while ensuring equitable access to technology.

As artificial intelligence continues to revolutionize global trade, policymakers and industry stakeholders must fully understand its impact on international trade policies. This study enriches the body of knowledge on innovation in artificial intelligence and intellectual property by empirically examining the developments in European patents and their influence on international trade. This study aims to analyze the influence of European patents in the field of artificial intelligence on the competitiveness of companies, to lay the groundwork for future research exploring the interactions between technology, intellectual property, and international trade.

II. Review Of Literature

Theoretical Framework

Artificial intelligence (AI) technology has emerged as a revolutionary influence, profoundly affecting conventional international trade theories. Adam Smith's (1776) theory of absolute advantage asserts that states ought to specialize in the production of things in which they possess an absolute advantage and engage in trade with other countries to acquire goods and services. AI technology is changing product innovation and diversity, as well as questioning the concept of mass production. Artificial intelligence can develop competitive advantages in multiple areas simultaneously, shifting the important factors in international trade from a natural resource-based advantage to a focus on technological innovation. (Smith, 1776). Countries that master AI-based technology can increase productivity, create new markets, and thus boost trade volume.

Furthermore, the interconnectivity of AI technology promotes international cooperation and challenges the traditional concept of relative autonomy in economic competition between countries. As countries increasingly rely on AI technologies to promote economic growth, they are becoming interdependent and exchanging knowledge, resources, and inventions. This interconnectivity can lead to more coherent supply chains while simultaneously increasing the efficiency of international trade, but it could also increase its complexity (Jones, 2023; OECD Trade Policy Papers, 2022; Ozturk, 2024).

According to David Ricardo's theory of comparative advantage (1817), even if a country has an absolute disadvantage in all goods, it can still benefit from trade if it focuses on goods with a relative advantage. AI has changed this dynamic by creating new industries that replace traditional ones. Artificial

intelligence automation of manufacturing has historically weakened the competitiveness of low-skilled, labor-intensive industries in many developing countries that once had a comparative advantage (Ricardo, 1817). Artificial intelligence encourages the emergence of new areas such as data processing and automation, which are changing trade paradigms such as digital commerce and service outsourcing (Agrawal et al., 2019).

(Heckscher et al., 1991) proposed the factor endowment theory, which emphasizes the differences in the relative degree of abundance of production factors, mainly labor and capital, as the basis for trade between nations. However, the emergence of artificial intelligence has added a new dimension to these production factors. Countries with a large technical workforce and strong research and development capabilities currently have a comparative advantage in artificial intelligence-driven industries. (Heckscher & Ohlin, 1920). With the intensification of international competition for artificial intelligence talent, countries with exceptional artificial intelligence capabilities are becoming more competitive in the global market (Ciuriak et al., 2020). Moreover, the integration of artificial intelligence has introduced new trade barriers in international commerce. In particular, this concerns data management. The cross-border flow of data using artificial intelligence is becoming increasingly important for trade, and some countries have implemented restrictions on data transfer and local data storage obligations in order to protect data sovereignty (Q. Chang, 2024), (Wei & Li, 2022).

Paul Krugman proposed the new trade theory in 1980, emphasizing the role of economies of scale and differences at the firm level in international trade. In this case, artificial intelligence technology allows multinational firms to more efficiently optimize production and resource distribution. By using artificial intelligence for automation and advanced analysis, companies can achieve economies of scale and improve their competitiveness in the international market (Krugman, 1980). However, artificial intelligence also poses a challenge to countries that have historically relied on low-wage labor to remain competitive on the global stage. With automation replacing manual labor, these countries could increasingly struggle to participate in international trade. Moreover, companies can achieve product differentiation more effectively and strengthen their competitiveness in the global market through the development of personalized products and AI-targeted marketing (Mustafa Ayobami Raji et al., 2024).

The influence of AI on global commerce is substantial

Artificial intelligence exerts both beneficial and detrimental effects on global commerce. From a production standpoint, AI has revolutionized the manufacturing process by automating procedures that were previously dependent on manual labor. Automated factories such as Tesla's Gigafactory and Foxconn's facilities exemplify the significant impact of AI on the manufacturing landscape (Hasan & Ojala, 2024; Menzies et al., 2024). These breakthroughs enhance production efficiency; yet, there are increasing apprehensions regarding job displacement and the consequent escalation of unemployment, especially in low-skilled sectors (Acypreste & Paraná, 2022; Capraro et al., 2023; Wang et al., 2024). Certain academics assert that AI can generate new job prospects by enhancing productivity and augmenting production (Igna & Venturini, 2023). The objective is to create an educational framework that cultivates exceptionally skilled individuals equipped to assume these emerging responsibilities (Etinosalgbinenikaro & Adefolake Olachi Adewusi, 2024; Rožman et al., 2023).

AI's impact extends beyond the industrial process, affecting international trade and e-commerce logistics. AI enhances supply chain efficiency and optimizes inventory management, allowing enterprises to save costs and expedite global transactions (Albayrak Ünal et al., 2023; Atwaniet al., 2022). AI-driven e-commerce platforms improve the consumer experience, facilitate transactions through tailored product suggestions, and provide prompt after-sales support (Tiutiu & Dabija, 2023). Nonetheless, apprehensions persist that AI may foster bias and discrimination. We must train AI systems to consider cultural diversity and prevent their reinforcement of prejudices (Akter et al., 2021; Dhablya et al., 2024).

Artificial intelligence and global trade barriers

The impact of artificial intelligence technology on data management has particularly transformed commercial barriers. Since artificial intelligence systems heavily rely on data, managing and regulating cross-border data flows becomes crucial. Many countries have already adopted laws mandating local data storage from the perspective of privacy protection and data security, which could hinder market access for multinational companies (Tay, 2021). Furthermore, the emergence of artificial intelligence technology in the financial services sector has optimized cross-border payments, reduced trade barriers, and improved international trade (Maple et al.,

2023). However, the application of artificial intelligence in the financial system is raising concerns. Misuse of artificial intelligence-based tools can lead to illegal activities like money laundering (Chitimira & Ncube, 2021).

Despite these limitations, artificial intelligence continues to promote the potential for international cooperation. This is particularly true in the realm of research and development. The uneven distribution of artificial intelligence capabilities among major countries risks deepening existing commercial disparities and providing technologically advanced countries with a competitive edge over those that adopt AI more slowly (Goldfarb & Trefler, 2018). People are growing increasingly concerned about the monopolization of AI technology and the formation of new trade barriers due to the concentration of intellectual property rights in the field of artificial intelligence held by certain governments and companies (Parteka & Kordalska, 2023).

Overall, artificial intelligence technology has influenced production methods, trade barriers, and competitiveness, significantly changing international trade. Artificial intelligence brings significant advantages in improving efficiency and creating new businesses, but it also causes issues such as job displacement, inequality, and data management. This study complements the relevant literature by empirically examining the impact of artificial intelligence on international trade using the government's Artificial Intelligence Readiness Index and artificial intelligence-related patent application data. Therefore, we studied the complex relationship between artificial intelligence innovation and world trade.

III. Methodology

Model

This study employs cross-sectional data from 47 countries in 2023, sourced from the World Bank, the World Trade Organization, the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO), the European Patent Office, and the Oxford Insights Research Group. A review of previous literature reveals that scholars often use the number of AI-related patent applications in different countries as a proxy for measuring their AI capabilities. However, this approach has been frequently questioned. The main concern is that, without clear literature and data support on the impact of AI technology on specific economic factors, it's uncertain whether various aspects of AI-related technologies have a uniform effect on these factors. Our findings corroborate this skepticism, showing that different AI technology-related patent applications have varying impacts on international trade.

As a result, this paper adopts the Government AI Readiness Index as an alternative indicator to assess the AI level of each country. This index, based on six input indicators, provides a comprehensive estimate of a national government's preparedness to implement AI in public service delivery, offering a more holistic evaluation of a country's ability to apply AI technology.

However, in 2020, the calculation method of this index was modified, making it challenging to establish a panel database for building a multiple regression model. Since the original data and calculation methods are not publicly available, data prior to 2020 cannot be directly compared with data after 2020. Additionally, due to incomplete data for control variables in 2022 across countries, this study also excludes data from that year. For these reasons, we utilize cross-sectional data from 2023 to conduct our empirical research. The simple Ordinary Least Squares (OLS) method is employed for analysis, using STATA version 18.0 software. The basic regression model is as follows:

$$Y_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 ait_i + \beta_2 pt_i + \text{ControleVar}_i + \varepsilon_i \quad (1)$$

In this regression model, Y_i represents the dependent variable for country i . β_0 is the intercept term, and β_1 through β_2 are the coefficients for the independent variables. The independent variables include X_{1i} (for $i = 1, 2, 3, \dots, n$), which is the Government AI Readiness Index for country i , and X_{2i} (for $i = 1, 2, 3, \dots, n$), which denotes the total number of AI-related patent applications in country i . The control variables in this study are $GDP_{i,t}$, $LandArea_{i,t}$, and $Pop_{i,t}$ collectively referred to as accounting for the economic size, geographic size, and population of each country—standard factors that influence trade.

The purpose of this regression model is to evaluate how AI readiness and innovation, measured by European patent applications across various fields, impact international trade. By incorporating these control variables, the model aims to isolate the specific effects of AI-related factors from other country-specific

characteristics. To enhance the interpretability and statistical robustness of our regression model, we apply logarithmic transformation to certain variables. This approach helps to linearize relationships, reduce skewness, and stabilize variances, thereby improving the model's overall performance and goodness of fit.

Table 1 Variables Explanation

Variables	Description	Data Source
Dependent variables	$\ln Imp_i$	The logarithm of imports in country i
	$\ln Exp_i$	The logarithm of exports in country i. (USD)
	$\ln Trade_i$	The logarithm of total import and export volume in country i. (ln USD)
Independent Variables	ait_i	The Government AI readiness index Overall score in country i
	$ait2_i$	Score of the Technology Sector Pillar in country i
	$ait3_i$	Score of the Data and Infrastructure
	pt_i	The number of patents applications about AI in country i.
	pl_i	The number of patents applications about Electrical engineering
Independent Variables	$p2_i$	The number of patents applications about Instruments
	$p3_i$	The number of patents applications about Chemistry
	$p4_i$	The number of patents applications about Mechanical engineering
	$p5_i$	The number of patents applications about other fields (Furniture, games Other consumer goods Civil engineering)
	$p6_i$	The number of patents Applications about Unclassified
Control Variables	GDP_i	Accounting for the economic size each country
	$LandArea_i$	Geographic size each country
	Pop_i	Population of each country

IV. Results And Discussions

Descriptive Statistics and Correlations Results

Table 2 Description Statistics

	Mean	Max	Min	SD	Kurtosis	Skewness
$\ln imp_i$	25.614	28.974	19.895	1.954	3.509	-.812
$\ln exp_i$	25.636	28.888	19.134	2.034	3.99	-.982
$\ln Trade_i$	26.323	29.56	20.279	1.985	3.671	-.879
ait_i	65.258	84.796	43.262	9.842	2.506	-.493
pt_i	4150.936	48155	0.000	8806.966	15.207	3.323
$\ln GDP_i$	26.33	30.94	21.338	2.117	2.642	-.171
$\ln LandArea_i$	11.04	16.055	0.734	2.906	5.74	-1.173
$\ln Pop_i$	15.803	21.067	10.424	2.19	3.69	-.465

This table presents the descriptive statistics for several economic variables, including imports ($\ln imp$), exports ($\ln exp$), trade ($\ln Trade$), and others like ait_i (The Government AI readiness index), pt_i (The number of patent applications), GDP_i (Gross Domestic Product), $LandArea_i$ (Land area), and Pop_i (Population). When mentioned, variables are expressed in natural logarithms, taking into account central tendency (mean), variance (standard deviation) and distribution characteristics (skewness, kurtosis). Most of the variables have negative skewness, indicating a left-trending distribution, and high kurtosis, indicating that land area ($\ln LandArea$) and population ($\ln Population$) in particular are likely to be extreme. It should be noted that variables such as population and GDP have moderate standard deviations, reflecting the variability of the results observed. pt_i (number of patent applications) and other variables show considerable variability (mean 4150.936, standard deviation 8806.966), indicating large differences between data points for these economic indicators. This suggests the existence of the characteristics of the distribution suggest that there are potential asymmetries and outliers in the data set.

Table3Matrixofcorrelations

Variables	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
(1)lnimp _i	1.000							
(2)lnexp _i	0.996	1.000						
(3)lnTrade _i	0.999	0.999	1.000					
(4)ait _i	0.775	0.780	0.779	1.000				
(5)pt _i	0.560	0.531	0.547	0.529	1.000			
(6)lnGDP _i	0.968	0.959	0.965	0.771	0.646	1.000		
(7)lnLandArea _i	0.781	0.771	0.776	0.591	0.415	0.796	1.000	
(8)lnPop _i	0.921	0.902	0.912	0.593	0.572	0.940	0.856	1.000

The correlation matrix indicates a strong correlation between trade variables, including imports (lnimp), exports (lnexp), total trade (lnTrade), and GDP (lnGDP), with a correlation coefficient of approximately 0.95. This suggests that substantial economies generally encourage an increase in trade, which encompasses both imports and exports. The Government AI Readiness Index (aiti) exhibits a moderate correlation with these factors (about 0.77), suggesting that nations with reduced tariffs are inclined to engage in greater trade. The number of patent applications (pti) exhibits diminished correlations with trade variables, particularly imports, exports, and GDP (about 0.53-0.65), indicating its lesser significance in influencing trade volumes. The population and area have a modest correlation with GDP and trade, indicating that countries with greater geographical and demographic dimensions generally possess a higher GDP and trade volume. The matrix illustrates the correlation among economic magnitude, trade dynamics, and trade liberalization.

Regression Analysis Results

Table4RegressionwithImports,Exports,andTradeasDependentvariables

VARIABLES	(1) lnimp	(2) lnexp	(3) lnTrade
ait _i	0.0379** (0.0142)	0.0391** (0.0167)	0.0378** (0.0151)
pt _i	-2.60e-05** (1.01e-05)	-3.70e-05*** (1.18e-05)	-3.11e-05*** (1.07e-05)
lnGDP _i	0.585*** (0.156)	0.717*** (0.183)	0.658*** (0.166)
lnLandarea _i	-0.0665 (0.0480)	-0.0575 (0.0563)	-0.0614 (0.0510)
lnPop _i	0.324** (0.139)	0.232 (0.163)	0.269* (0.148)
Constant	3.450* (1.770)	1.314 (2.078)	3.078 (1.883)
Observations	47	47	47
R-squared	0.953	0.941	0.949

Standard errors in parentheses
 ***p<0.01, **p<0.05, *p<0.1

Table 4 presents the results of a regression with imports (lnimp), exports (lnexp), and total trade (lnTrade) as dependent variables. In regressions 1, 2, and 3, the coefficients of the aiti variable are all significant at 5% intervals, indicating that greater trade openness reduces tariffs and leads to an increase in imports, exports, and total trade. On the other hand, it is noteworthy that the number of patent applications (pti) shows negative and significant coefficients at the 1% and 5% levels, suggesting that an increase in the number of patent applications leads to a decrease in imports, exports, and overall trade. The logarithm of GDP (lnGDPi) exerts a positive and significant impact (p<0.01) on all dependent variables, indicating that nations with a higher GDP are characterized by higher levels of imports, exports, and commercial activities. The area of the territory (lnLandareai) is not significant, which suggests that geographical size does not play a decisive role in these models. At the 5% confidence level, the size of the population (lnPopi) has a positive and significant effect on imports. However, the impact is not significant for exports or overall trade. Finally, the high coefficient of determination (0.941 to 0.953) indicates that the model represents a significant portion of the variation in the dependent variable.

The overall results reveal general trends, such as the positive impacts of the government's Artificial Intelligence Readiness Index (aiti) and the logarithm of the Gross Domestic Product (GDPi), as well as the negative effects of the number of patent applications (pti). However, these indicators can mask significant country-to-country differences. For example, the positive effects of trade openness on trade may be greater in some countries than in others, due to various structural factors such as the level

of development, diversity of economic sectors or dependence on specific industries. Population differences only in imports and not found in exports or international trade indicate that larger countries can import more to meet domestic needs, without ensuring that there should be equity in the country. This highlights the importance of investigating the physiological processes underlying these relationships. The insignificance of the geographical dimension (lnLandarea) may indicate that the mentioned variable has no direct effect on the level of imports and exports. However, this may be the result of underlying factors related to regional conditions, such as access to waterways, infrastructure or software costs, which vary from country to country. The model includes 47 samples, among which are 2 non-WTO member countries. Subsequently, a regression is conducted to analyze the impact of WTO member states on the model.

Table 5 Regression of WTO Members Status on Model Regression

lnTrade	Coef.	St.Err.	t-value	p-value	[95% Conf	Interval]	Sig
aiti	.023	.012	1.93	.061	-.001	.048	*
pti	0	0	-2.66	.011	0	0	**
lnGDP	.836	.137	6.09	0	.558	1.113	***
lnLandarea	-.133	.043	-3.11	.003	-.22	-.047	***
lnPopulation	.112	.119	0.94	.352	-.129	.353	
Constant	2.672	1.522	1.76	.087	-.407	5.75	*
Mean dependent var		26.555			SD dependent var	1.673	
R-squared		0.957			Number of obs	45	
F-test		174.547		Prob >F		0.000	
Akaikecrit. (AIC)		43.184		Bayesiancrit. (BIC)		54.024	
***p<.01, **p<.05, *p<.1							

Regression 4 in Table 5 is the result of the regression when the sample includes only the WTO members (45 countries) of this study. Regression 5 is the result of the regression when the sample does not include WTO member states omitted due to limited observation (2 countries). The results of the regression analysis indicate that GDP (lnGDP) exerts the most pronounced and significant influence on total trade (lnTrade), with a coefficient of 0.836 and a significance level of 1%. This clearly demonstrates the heavy involvement of nations with a high GDP in commercial activities. The government AI readiness index (aiti) reveals a moderately significant positive effect (p = 0.061), indicating a moderate link between trade growth and increased trade openness. Conversely, the number of patent applications (pti) exhibits a significant negative effect of 5% (p = 0.011), implying that a tariff price distortion negatively impacts trade. The land area variable (lnLandarea) exhibits a significant negative effect of 1% (-0.133), suggesting a tendency for nations with vast geographical expanses to engage in fewer trade exchanges, potentially due to a self-sufficiency policy. Ultimately, this study revealed that the population variable (lnPopulation) does not have a significant correlation with the volume of trade exchanges. This model shows a satisfactory fit, with a coefficient of determination R² of 0.957, which means it explains 95.7% of the variation in total sales, and it is overall statistically significant (F-test = 174.547, p = 0.000).

To further study the impact of artificial intelligence on commerce, this document replaces the variable aiti with its components ait1, ait2, and ait3. In a similar manner, we replace the variable pti with its constituent variables p1, p2, ..., p6. The regression results can also be influenced by the income groups of this country. Therefore, in the following regression analysis, the countries are divided into two different samples (high-income group and middle-income group) based on their income group. Next, we perform a regression analysis once again. Due to the multicollinearity of the samples from middle-income countries, we did not analyze the regression results for these samples.

Table 6 Regression of Component variables of each core variable by income groups (Members and no members of WTO)

lnTrade	Coef.	St.Err.	t-value	p-value	[95% Conf	Interval]	Sig
ai1i	.062	.022	2.79	.009	.017	.108	***
ai2i	-.037	.018	-2.13	.04	-.073	-.002	**
ai3i	-.007	.024	-0.31	.76	-.055	.041	
p1i	0	0	-2.03	.05	0	0	*
p2i	0	0	0.20	.845	-.001	.001	
p3i	0	0	-0.07	.945	-.001	.001	
p4i	0	0	-1.15	.258	-.001	0	
p5i	.001	0	1.50	.142	0	.002	
p6i	-.002	.005	-0.34	.739	-.012	.009	

lnGDP _i	.782	.208	3.76	.001	.36	1.204	***
lnLandArea _i	-.056	.056	-1.00	.323	-.17	.058	
lnPop _i	.177	.187	0.94	.351	-.203	.557	
Constant	2.001	2.243	0.89	.379	-2.557	6.559	
Meandependentvar	26.323		SDdependentvar		1.985		
R-squared	0.959		Numberofobs		47		
F-test	65.972		Prob >F		0.000		
Akaikcrit. (AIC)	72.906		Bayesiancrit. (BIC)		96.958		
***p<.01, **p<.05, *p<.1							

We carry out Regression 6 by substituting the variables a_{1i} and p_{1i} with their respective components. The regression study shows that the a_{1i} component's coefficient is statistically significant at the 1% level, indicating a positive effect on overall trade (lnTrade_i) (coefficient of 0.062, p=0.009). This implies that increased trade liberalization promotes commercial exchanges. Furthermore, a significant negative impact of a_{2i} is observed at the 5% level (coefficient -0.037, p=0.04). This implies that certain restrictions hinder trade. The a_{3i} component is not significant. Among the components of number of patent applications, only the variable p_{1i} showed a significant negative marginal effect (p = 0.05), leading to a decrease in the volume of exchanges. The natural logarithm of GDP (lnGDP_i) shows a significant positive impact, with a coefficient of 0.782 and a p-value of 0.001. These results demonstrate that nations with a higher GDP are more involved in trade exchanges, while neither geographical area (lnLandArea_i) nor population (lnPop_i) show statistical significance. This model explains 95.9% of the variations observed in the commercial data (R²=0.959) and shows overall statistical significance (F-test=65.972, p=0.000). To analyze in more detail the impact of the components of the a_i variable (a_{1i}, a_{2i}, and a_{3i}) and the components of the p_i variable (p_{1i}, p_{2i}, ..., p_{6i}) in the different pricing groups, regression 7 is performed for the samples of WTO member countries. Due to the limitations of the observations, we omit regression 8 for the samples from non-WTO member countries (2 Countries).

Table 7 Regression of component variables of each core variable of WTO Members by income groups

lnTrade	Coef.	St.Err.	t-value	p-value	[95% Conf	Interval]	Sig
a _{1i}	.045	.018	2.55	.016	.009	.082	**
a _{2i}	-.033	.015	-2.22	.034	-.063	-.003	**
a _{3i}	-.008	.019	-0.42	.68	-.046	.03	
p _{1i}	0	0	-1.51	.14	0	0	
p _{2i}	0	0	0.23	.818	-.001	.001	
p _{3i}	0	0	-0.17	.865	-.001	.001	
p _{4i}	0	0	-1.07	.294	0	0	
p _{5i}	.001	0	1.44	.158	0	.001	
p _{6i}	0	.004	-0.03	.974	-.008	.008	
lnGDP _i	.974	.177	5.50	0	.613	1.335	***
lnLandArea _i	-.125	.048	-2.61	.014	-.222	-.027	**
lnPop _i	.002	.153	0.02	.987	-.309	.314	
Constant	1.404	1.958	0.72	.478	-2.583	5.392	
Meandependentvar	26.555		SDdependentvar		1.673		
R-squared	0.965		Numberofobs		45		
F-test	73.785		Prob >F		0.000		
Akaikcrit. (AIC)	48.003		Bayesiancrit. (BIC)		71.489		
***p<.01, **p<.05, *p<.1							

Table 7 presents the results of regression 7. These regression results relate to the main components of the variables of WTO members classified by income group, revealing several important aspects. The a_{1i} component has a significant positive effect on overall trade (lnTrade) (coefficient 0.045, p = 0.016). This shows that trade liberalization is beneficial for trade. Conversely, a_{2i} has a significant negative effect (coefficient -0.033, p = 0.034), indicating that certain trade restrictions hinder exchanges. The a_{3i} component has no notable effect. Among the price and tariff variables (from p_{1i} to p_{6i}), none have a significant effect on trade. The GDP (lnGDP_i) has a strong positive and significant impact (coefficient 0.974, p=0.000). This shows that countries with a high GDP engage in more trade. Geographical size (lnLandArea_i) has a significant negative effect (coefficient -0.125, p = 0.014), indicating that countries with large geographical sizes have less trade. The population is not significantly affected. (lnPop_i). This model fits well, with an R² of 0.965, explaining 96.5% of the variations in transactions, and is statistically significant (F-test = 73.785, p = 0.000).

Table 8 Regression of component variables of each core variable of WTO Members in High Income

lnTrade	Coef.	St.Err.	t-value	p-value	[95% Conf	Interval]	Sig
ai1i	.058	.022	2.65	.013	.013	.102	**
ai2i	-.039	.016	-2.49	.019	-.072	-.007	**
ai3i	-.019	.024	-0.78	.443	-.069	.031	
p1i	0	0	-1.47	.152	0	0	
p2i	0	0	0.41	.682	-.001	.001	
p3i	0	0	-0.37	.714	-.001	.001	
p4i	0	0	-0.99	.331	0	0	
p5i	.001	0	1.40	.171	0	.001	
p6i	-.001	.004	-0.13	.895	-.009	.008	
lnGDPi	1.101	.205	5.37	0	.681	1.521	***
lnLandAreai	-.138	.051	-2.72	.011	-.241	-.034	**
lnPopi	-.079	.167	-0.47	.639	-.42	.262	
Constant	-.136	2.405	-0.06	.955	-5.054	4.783	
Meandependentvar	26.736		SDdependentvar		1.559		
R-squared			0.960	Numberofobs	42		
F-test	57.899		Prob >F		0.000		
Akaikecrit. (AIC)	46.359		Bayesiancrit. (BIC)		68.949		
***p<.01, **p<.05, *p<.1							

Table 8 presents the results of the regression of the component variables of each main variable of the high-income WTO Members. Due to limited observations, we have excluded the results of the regression of the component variables of each main variable for WTO members with intermediate income (3 observations). The results of the regression analysis for these high-income WTO members show that several factors have a significant impact on overall trade (lnTrade). The ai1 component has a significant positive effect (coefficient 0.058, p=0.013), indicating that trade liberalization stimulates trade in high-income countries. On the other hand, ai2i has a significant negative effect (coefficient -0.039, p = 0.019). This shows that there are certain restrictions that hinder trade in these countries. ai3i has no notable effect. The variables related to prices and tariffs (p1i to p6i) do not have a significant effect on trade. GDP (lnGDPi) has a strong positive impact and shows a significant influence (coefficient 1.101, p = 0.000). This shows that countries with high GDP engage in more trade. The geographical area (lnLandAreai) has a significant negative effect (coefficient -0.138, p=0.011). This shows that large countries have a lower trade volume, and that there is no significant effect on the population (lnPopi). This model explains 96% of the commercial variations ($R^2 = 0.960$) and is globally significant (F-test = 57.899, p = 0.000).

V. Conclusions

Technological advancements in artificial intelligence (AI) are critical for global competitiveness, and legislative developments regarding patents in Europe directly impact international business strategies. The strengthening of patent protections related to AI consolidates Europe's strategic position on the global stage. Regression analysis shows that trade liberalization, measured by the average tariff index (aiti), significantly influences trade expansion, especially among high-income countries that are members of the World Trade Organization (WTO). Conversely, certain tariff restrictions, such as those imposed by the Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS), can act as trade barriers. Gross Domestic Product (GDP) has a significant and positive effect on trade, emphasizing that larger and wealthier economies are more actively engaged in international commerce. Additionally, the geographical size of a country has a negative impact on trade, suggesting that larger nations may be less dependent on international trade. The analyzed model indicates that population size does not significantly affect trade.

However, the surge in AI-related patents raises complex issues concerning intellectual property (IP) protection and highlights disparities between nations that innovate and those that utilize these technologies. The increase in patent filings may enhance the protection of innovation and influence the standards governing technology transfer and IP transactions.

Considering these findings, it is recommended that government authorities continue to promote the reduction of trade barriers through multilateral or bilateral agreements. It is crucial for WTO member states to commit to reducing tariffs to maximize economic benefits. Developing countries should implement economic policies aimed at stimulating GDP growth. Additionally, accession to the WTO can offer significant trade advantages to countries that are not yet members. This research has certain limitations. The analysis focuses on global variables such as GDP, population, and geographical size, without considering institutional or political factors that could affect trade exchanges. Moreover, the study's

ability to observe dynamic developments in trade policies is limited due to the lack of consideration for the temporal variability of data and study periods. Access to more detailed data would allow for a better understanding of the influence of specific factors like price variables.

Future studies could examine the impact of specific regional trade agreements and institutional reforms on international trade. It would also be pertinent to analyze the effect of WTO membership on various economic sectors, particularly those oriented towards exports. A comparative analysis between WTO member and non-member countries, considering income and development levels, would provide deeper insights into the benefits associated with membership. Furthermore, a comprehensive examination of the repercussions of price fluctuations could offer valuable insights into the long-term consequences of trade liberalization.

References

- [1] Acypreste, R. D., & Parana, E. (2022). Artificial Intelligence And Employment: A Systematic Review. *Brazilian Journal Of Political Economy*, 42(4), 1014–1032. <https://doi.org/10.1590/0101-31572022-3320>
- [2] Agrawal, A., Gans, J., Goldfarb, A., & National Bureau Of Economic Research (Eds.). (2019). *The Economics Of Artificial Intelligence: An Agenda*. NBER Conference On The Economics Of Artificial Intelligence, Chicago London. The University Of Chicago Press.
- [3] Akter, S., Dwivedi, Y. K., Biswas, K., Michael, K., Bandara, R. J., & Sajib, S. (2021). Addressing Algorithmic Bias In AI-Driven Customer Management: *Journal Of Global Information Management*, 29(6), 1–27. <https://doi.org/10.4018/JGIM.20211101.Oa3>
- [4] Albayrak Ünal, Ö., Erkayman, B., & Usanmaz, B. (2023). Applications Of Artificial Intelligence In Inventory Management: A Systematic Review Of The Literature. *Archives Of Computational Methods In Engineering*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/S11831-022-09879-5>
- [5] Atwani, M., Hlyal, M., & Elalami, J. (2022). A Review Of Artificial Intelligence Applications In Supply Chain. *ITM Web Of Conferences*, 46, 03001. <https://doi.org/10.1051/itmconf/20224603001>
- [6] Capraro, V., Lentsch, A., Acemoglu, D., Akgun, S., Akhmedova, A., Bilancini, E., Bonnefon, J.-F., Branas-Garza, P., Butera, L., Douglas, K., Everett, J. A. C., Gigerenzer, G., Greenhow, C., Lunstad, J., Jetten, J., Johnson, S., Kunz, W., Longoni, C., & Viale, R. (2023). The Impact Of Generative Artificial Intelligence On Socioeconomic Inequalities And Policy Making. <https://doi.org/10.31234/osf.io/6fd2y>
- [7] Chang, Q. (2024). The Legal And Regulatory Issues Of AI Technology In Cross-Border Data Flow In International Trade. *Transactions On Economics, Business And Management Research*, 8, 111–117. <https://doi.org/10.62051/Cyw9y102>
- [8] Chang, S.-H. (2020). Technical Trends Of Artificial Intelligence In Standard-Essential Patents. *Data Technologies And Applications*, 55(1), 97–117. <https://doi.org/10.1108/DTA-10-2019-0178>
- [9] Chitimira, H., & Ncube, P. (2021). The Regulation And Use Of Artificial Intelligence And 5G Technology To Combat Cybercrime And Financial Crime In South African Banks. *Potchefstroom Electronic Law Journal*, 24, 1–33. <https://doi.org/10.17159/1727-3781/2021/V24i0a10742>
- [10] Dhabliya, D., Dari, S. S., Dhabliya, A., Akhila, N., Kachhoria, R., & Khetani, V. (2024). Addressing Bias In Machine Learning Algorithms: Promoting Fairness And Ethical Design. *E3S Web Of Conferences*, 491, 02040. <https://doi.org/10.1051/E3Sconf/202449102040>
- [11] Etinosa Igbinenikaro & Adefolake Olachi Adewusi. (2024). NAVIGATING THE LEGAL COMPLEXITIES OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE IN GLOBAL TRADE AGREEMENTS. *International Journal Of Applied Research In Social Sciences*, 6(4), 488–505. <https://doi.org/10.51594/ijarss.V6i4.987>
- [12] European Patent Office. (2020). *Patents And The Fourth Industrial Revolution: The Inventions Behind Digital Transformation*. Access Through: <https://www.epo.org>
- [13] Fan, X. (2021). Digital Economy Development, International Trade Efficiency And Trade Uncertainty. *China Finance And Economic Review*, 10(3), 89–110. <https://doi.org/10.1515/Cfer-2021-0018>
- [14] Goldfarb, A., & Trefler, Daniel. (2018). *AI And International Trade* (January 2018). NBER Working Paper No. W24254, Available At SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=3112041>
- [15] Hasan, R., & Ojala, A. (2024). Managing Artificial Intelligence In International Business: Toward A Research Agenda On Sustainable Production And Consumption. *Thunderbird International Business Review*, 66(2), 151–170. <https://doi.org/10.1002/Tie.22369>
- [16] Heckscher, E. F., Ohlin, B., Flam, H., & Flanders, M. J. (1991). *Heckscher-Ohlin Trade Theory*. MIT Press.
- [17] Hobsbawm, E. J., & Wrigley, C. (1999). *Industry And Empire: From 1750 To The Present Day* ([New] Ed). Distributed By W. W. Norton.
- [18] Igna, I., & Venturini, F. (2023). The Determinants Of AI Innovation Across European Firms. *Research Policy*, 52(2), 104661. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2022.104661>
- [19] Jones, E. (2023). Digital Disruption: Artificial Intelligence And International Trade Policy. *Oxford Review Of Economic Policy*, 39(1), 70–84. <https://doi.org/10.1093/Oxrep/Grac049>
- [20] Krugman, P. (1980). Scale Economies, Product Differentiation, And The Pattern Of Trade. *American Economic Review*, 70(5), 950–959.
- [21] Liu, Y., & Zhao, H. (2021). Artificial Intelligence And Patent Protection: Implications For Global Trade. *Journal Of World Trade*, 55(3), 491–510.
- [22] Maple, C., Szpruch, L., Epiphaniou, G., Staykova, K., Singh, S., Penwarden, W., Wen, Y., Wang, Z., Hariharan, J., & Avramovic, P. (2023). *The AI Revolution: Opportunities And Challenges For The Finance Sector* (Version 1). Arxiv. <https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.2308.16538>
- [23] Menzies, J., Sabert, B., Hassan, R., & Mensah, P. K. (2024). Artificial Intelligence For International Business: Its Use, Challenges, And Suggestions For Future Research And Practice. *Thunderbird International Business Review*, 66(2), 185–200. <https://doi.org/10.1002/Tie.22370>
- [24] Mercurio, B. (2011). Intellectual Property Rights, Trade, And Economic Development. In Y.-S. Lee, G. Horlick, W.-M. Choi, & T. Broude (Eds.), *Law And Development Perspective On International Trade Law* (1st Ed., Pp. 49–80). Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511994715.005>
- [25] Mustafa Ayobami Raji, Hameedat Bukola Olodo, Timothy Tolulope Oke, Wilhelmina Afua Addy, Onyeka Chrisanctus Ofodile,

- &Adedoyin Tolulope Oyewole. (2024). E-Commerce And Consumer Behavior: A Review Of AI-Powered Personalization And Market Trends. *GSC Advanced Research And Reviews*, 18(3), 066–077. <https://doi.org/10.30574/Gscarr.2024.18.3.0090>
- [28] OECD Trade Policy Papers. (2022). Artificial Intelligence And International Trade: Some Preliminary Implications (OECD Trade Policy Papers 260; OECD Trade Policy Papers, Vol. 260). <https://doi.org/10.1787/13212d3e-en>
- [29] OECD. (2019). *Artificial Intelligence In Society*. OECD Publishing, Paris, Access Through: <https://doi.org/10.1787/eedfee77-en>
- [30] Ozturk, O. (2024). The Impact Of AI On International Trade: Opportunities And Challenges. <https://doi.org/10.20944/Preprints202409.2123.V1>