

<https://doi.org/10.15407/scine22.04.064>

SHMATKOV, D. I. ^{1,2} (<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2952-4070>)

¹ Kharkiv National University of Internal Affairs,
27, L. Landau Ave., Kharkiv, 61080, Ukraine,
+380 57 252 3051, khnuvs@univd.edu.ua

² Research Institute of Providing Legal Framework for the Innovative Development,
National Academy of Legal Sciences of Ukraine,
80, Chernyshevska St., Kharkiv, 61002, Ukraine,
+380 57 700 0663, ndipzir@gmail.com

REBRANDING IN CRISIS: WARTIME CHANGES IN TRADEMARK CHARACTERISTICS IN UKRAINE

Introduction. The creation of intellectual property assets is frequently driven by innovation and is commonly associated with patents, industrial designs, trademarks (TMs), and copyright. At the same time, TMs have increasingly been recognized as valuable indicators of innovation implementation, commercialization, and business resilience, particularly under conditions of geopolitical crisis.

Problem Statement. Despite the growing recognition of TMs as indicators of innovation, commercialization, and industrial adaptation, empirical evidence on the effects of wartime conditions on trademark-related behavior, naming strategies, and the selection of goods and services in TM applications remains limited.

Purpose. To assess changes in the characteristics of TMs in Ukraine under wartime conditions and to determine which of the identified changes may be associated with the impact of the Russian–Ukrainian war.

Materials and Methods. The study covers the period from 2018 to 2025 and is based on a comparative analysis of TM applications filed before and during the war. Official data from the Ukrainian National Office for Intellectual Property and Innovations have been used. A total of 759 TMs have been analyzed within two representative samples to examine changes in naming practices, language use, and the goods and services covered by the applications, while testing three hypotheses concerning the direct, indirect, and adaptive effects of war on trademark activity.

Results. The analysis has demonstrated that wartime conditions in Ukraine have been associated with a decline in the number of TM registrations, the near disappearance of Russian-language and negatively connoted war-related symbols, the limited use of positively framed war-related symbols, and

Citation: Shmatkov, D. I. (2026). Rebranding in Crisis: Wartime Changes in Trademark Characteristics in Ukraine. *Sci. innov.*, 22(4), 64–76. <https://doi.org/10.15407/scine22.04.064>

© Publisher PH “Akademperiodyka” of the NAS of Ukraine, 2026. This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>)

a broader tendency toward shorter and simpler TMs. These findings have indicated that branding strategies have adapted primarily through simplification, resilience, and functional repositioning.

Conclusions. The study has highlighted the value of TM analysis for understanding the dynamics of innovation under crisis conditions. The findings have provided a foundation for further empirical research in the post-war period. The identified changes have made it possible to regard TMs as an effective instrument for capturing the adaptive responses of rights holders during periods of crisis.

Keywords: trademarks, Russo-Ukrainian war, statistics, intellectual property, adaptation, naming.

The development of innovation leads to the generation of intellectual property. When we speak of this, we primarily refer to inventions, industrial designs, trademarks, and copyright — approximately in that order. However, today, trademarks are emerging from the shadows:

- ◆ They have increased predictive value, as inventions often fail to capture so-called “soft” innovations — services, marketing, and business models [1, 2].
- ◆ Unlike patents, which primarily certify technological novelty without necessarily implying commercialization, trademarks more accurately reflect the actual implementation of innovations [1].
- ◆ They complement patents as indicators of innovation [2—5].
- ◆ They enhance the added value of innovations [6, 7].
- ◆ They help attract government support and investment [8].
- ◆ They are accessible to companies of all sizes and to firms with limited levels of innovativeness [2, 4, 7].

Innovation management involves not only the creation of new products and services, but also the systematic management of intangible assets such as trademarks. Strong trademark portfolios are often indicative of well-managed innovation processes, where firms systematically align branding with market differentiation and intellectual property protection. This alignment enables more efficient appropriation of innovation outcomes and enhances the firm’s ability to scale or pivot.

Mentioned studies have highlighted that companies which actively manage their intellectual property are more likely to engage in continuous

innovation. This is particularly relevant for SMEs, which may lack the capacity to maintain large patent portfolios but can effectively use trademarks to signal reliability, value, and market orientation.

Thus, the study of trademarks holds significant value in the context of innovation-driven development. However, various geopolitical phenomena can introduce new conditions for the registration and use of trademarks and may even serve as strategic tools for business recovery [9]. One such condition is, evidently, the Russo-Ukrainian war. This context has received limited attention in scholarly research, and the present article seeks to address this gap. Also, previous research [9] focused on green trademarks, whereas a broader context calls for further investigation.

Some commentators have suggested that intellectual property rights have become a form of “weapon” during the Russo-Ukrainian war [10, 11]. This may be especially true in the case of Russia, which refused to provide intellectual property protection to companies from “unfriendly countries” by invoking Article 73 of the TRIPS Agreement, which permits the temporary suspension of intellectual property rights for reasons of national security, including armed conflict [12].

Ukraine, by contrast, has not invoked Article 73 of the TRIPS Agreement, despite calls to do so [13], likely as part of an effort to maintain its status as a fully functioning legal jurisdiction under conditions of wartime governance and institutional continuity. Nevertheless, the Ukrainian intellectual property system has faced several exceptional wartime challenges — such as the need to facilitate cooperation between applicants and the Intellectual Property Office under the now-

expired Law “On Protection of the Interests of Individuals in the Sphere of Intellectual Property under Martial Law Triggered by the Armed Aggression of the Russian Federation against Ukraine” (expired in 2025), as well as to resolve ethical concerns related to war symbols and other sensitive matters through administrative procedures [14].

Beyond systemic challenges, the war has also posed more practical and business-oriented tasks. The intensification of Ukraine’s international cooperation in the field of innovation development [15], particularly in war-related sectors [16], may have influenced the allocation of intellectual property rights — an issue of particular interest.

Moreover, since the onset of the war, Ukrainian participants in the e-commerce market have experienced negative consequences [17, 18]. At the same time, the global nature of e-commerce may open new opportunities, markets, and niches for Ukrainian entrepreneurs. Notably, many e-commerce platforms provide technical advantages to trademark holders; however, this has also led to a surge in registrations — including many “nonsense” marks [19]. Additionally, many marketplace systems do not accept purely figurative (textless) trademark applications, which means a decrease in such marks may reflect a strategic reorientation among businesses. These aspects merit empirical investigation.

Even during wartime, Ukrainian business life continues. The use of concise messaging [20, 21], adherence to fundamental branding principles [22], and alignment with broader naming and branding trends [23] likely remain relevant. Such questions can also be explored through trademark analysis [24].

Trademarks serve as indicators of origin and tools of market differentiation, as well as function as repositories of marketing innovation and adaptive strategies in response to systemic shocks. According to the World Intellectual Property Organization [25], trademarks play a critical role in documenting shifts in branding, naming conventions, and service orientation, especially in economies facing disruption. In the context of the Russian-Ukrainian war, trademark activity can thus be viewed not merely as

a legal formality but as a strategic response to geopolitical instability, enabling businesses to signal continuity, reposition products, and access new markets under changing conditions. While some studies provide valuable qualitative forecasts, the present research offers empirical confirmation of these dynamics based on quantitative analysis of trademark registrations during wartime.

Accordingly, this article aims to assess changes in trademark characteristics in Ukraine during wartime and to determine which observed shifts may be associated with the impact of the Russo-Ukrainian war. The article seeks to fill a gap in the academic literature, where this aspect has thus far received limited attention.

This study is guided by three hypotheses addressing the multifaceted impact of war on trademark registration in Ukraine.

To operationalize the hypotheses, a structured coding protocol was developed. All trademarks in both pre-war and wartime samples were analyzed manually using a pre-defined codebook, which categorized verbal, graphical, semantic, and symbolic features.

Image content in figurative or combined marks was classified using a typology of different thematic categories. Color analysis was performed to capture dominant hues. Coding reliability was ensured through iterative calibration rounds on subsamples, allowing refinement of criteria and reduction of subjective bias.

Data have been collected from the official, publicly accessible Ukrainian IP Office search system (<https://sis.nipo.gov.ua>), which provides full trademark records, including images, text, applicant nationality, filing date etc. This open-access source enables full replicability and transparency of results, aligning the study with best practices in empirical research.

Hypothesis H1. The war has a direct impact on the generation of trademarks:

- ◆ changes in the volume of registered intellectual property (trademarks);
- ◆ widespread use of positive wartime symbols in business;

- ◆ a decline in the use of negative wartime symbols;
- ◆ a reduced use of the Russian language
- ◆ a significant drop or increase in applications filed by foreign applicants;
- ◆ an increase in the number of trademarks in war-related Nice Classification classes.

Hypothesis H2. The war indirectly affects naming approaches through a shift toward international e-commerce:

- ◆ an increase in the number of English-language brand names;
- ◆ an increase in the number of fanciful trademarks;
- ◆ a decrease in the number of figurative (non-verbal) marks;

Hypothesis H3. Naming in Ukrainian business during wartime undergo natural transformation:

- ◆ change in the average number of classes designated per trademark application;
- ◆ changes in word length and formatting;
- ◆ changes in the use of logos in trademarks.

To test these hypotheses, trademark data were drawn from the official database of the Ukrainian National Office for Intellectual Property and Innovations. Descriptive statistical methods were applied. Data collection and processing were conducted in July 2025.

In the first phase, trademarks filed and registered during the war (from February 22, 2022, to July 18, 2025) were analyzed. The total population was 20,669, and a sample of 377 marks was drawn based on a 95% confidence level with a 5% margin of error.

Subsequently, trademarks filed and registered during a comparable pre-war period (from September 26, 2018, to February 21, 2022) were analyzed. The total population was 64,011, and a sample of 382 marks was used based on the same confidence parameters.

The following system of quantitative and qualitative variables was established:

H1 (Direct wartime effects on intellectual property generation):

- ◆ number of trademark registrations during the period (based on applications submitted during the same period);

- ◆ number of trademarks using positive wartime textual symbols (e.g., “palyanytsia,” “Bayraktar,” etc.) (analyzed only for trademarks registered since the beginning of the war);
- ◆ number of trademarks incorporating graphic national symbols (e.g., national flag, map with 1991 borders, etc.);
- ◆ number of trademarks featuring negative wartime symbols — either textual or figurative marks — in which the letters “Z,” “O,” or “V” [26] are visually emphasized;
- ◆ number of trademarks using the Russian language;
- ◆ number of trademarks filed by foreign applicants;
- ◆ frequency distribution of Nice Classification classes.

H2 (Indirect wartime effects via e-commerce):

- ◆ number of trademarks using Latin script compared to those using Cyrillic;
- ◆ number of fanciful marks and word-length indicators;
- ◆ number of trademarks without textual elements.

H3 (Natural transformation of naming during wartime):

- ◆ average number of Nice Classification classes per trademark;
- ◆ textual presentation format: standard characters vs. stylized lettering;
- ◆ length and quantity of dominant and supplementary words on the mark;
- ◆ semantic category of core words and logos:
 - fanciful (nonexistent in language);
 - arbitrary (unrelated to goods/services);
 - suggestive (hinting at goods/services);
 - descriptive (explicitly describing a characteristic or function);
- ◆ colors used in fonts and logos;
- ◆ logo-text relation:
 - strong (logo follows full text);
 - medium (logo follows essential part of the text);
 - weak (logo repeats minor part of the text or is unrelated);
- ◆ image content categories:
 - human figures or body parts;

- animals or animal parts;
- natural objects (excluding humans/animals);
- IT symbols (e.g., chat icons, devices);
- standardized symbols (e.g., hearts, infinity symbol);
- prestige signs (e.g., stars, crowns);
- food and drink;
- household utensils;
- buildings (usually houses);
- tools and devices (e.g., clocks, gears, tools);
- means of transportation;
- clothing;
- sports equipment.

A comparison of trademarks registered before and during the war is presented in Tables 1 and 2, highlighting the top three increases and declines across Nice Classification classes.

Table 3 shows changes in relative difference in some areas that may be related to the war.

Class 4 includes products, which are vital for ensuring energy security and maintaining operational logistics during armed conflict. Class 5 reflecting increased needs for health protection, emergency care, and population resilience under war conditions. Class 9 covers electronic and optical

equipment, including components essential for communication, surveillance, and the development and operation of unmanned aerial vehicles (drones), which have become a key element in modern warfare. Class 12 underscoring the role of mobility, military transport, and the growing importance of drone delivery systems in both defense and civilian logistics. Class 13 directly reflecting defense production, procurement, and national security needs. Class 39 includes services, which are critical for maintaining supply chains, humanitarian aid distribution, and military operations in crisis conditions. Class 41 pertains services, which support capacity building, reskilling of displaced populations, and specialized military or technical instruction. Class 42 covers services, which enable innovation in areas such as defense technology, drone engineering, and cybersecurity.

The average number of classes per trademark application was 1.77 before the war and 2.11 during the war.

The frequency of references to goods in trademarks registered before the war was 44.85%, compared to 43.14% during the war; for services, the respective shares were 55.15% and 56.86% respectively.

Table 1. Top 3 Increases in Trademark Classes (Pre-War vs. Wartime)

Nice class	Description	Increase, %
<i>By absolute difference</i>		
35	Advertising; business management, organization and administration; office functions	2.69
28	Games, toys and playthings; video game apparatus; gymnastic and sporting articles; decorations for Christmas trees	1.84
6	Common metals and their alloys, ores; metal materials for building and construction; transportable buildings of metal; non-electric cables and wires of common metal; small items of metal hardware; metal containers for storage or transport; safes	1.73
<i>By relative difference</i>		
6	Common metals and their alloys, ores; metal materials for building and construction; transportable buildings of metal; non-electric cables and wires of common metal; small items of metal hardware; metal containers for storage or transport; safes	620.7
28	Games, toys and playthings; video game apparatus; gymnastic and sporting articles; decorations for Christmas trees	219.3
38	Telecommunications services	116.3

Table 2. Top 3 Declines in Trademark Classes (Pre-War vs. Wartime)

Nice class	Description	Decline, %
<i>By absolute difference</i>		
24	Textiles and substitutes for textiles; household linen; curtains of textile or plastic	3.34
45	Legal services; security services for the physical protection of tangible property and individuals; dating services, online social networking services; funerary services; baby-sitting	2.12
18	Leather and imitations of leather; animal skins and hides; luggage and carrying bags; umbrellas and parasols; walking sticks; whips, harness and saddlery; collars, leashes and clothing for animals	1.34
<i>By relative difference</i>		
22	Ropes and string; nets; tents and tarpaulins; awnings of textile or synthetic materials; sails; sacks for the transport and storage of materials in bulk; padding, cushioning and stuffing materials, except of paper, cardboard, rubber or plastics; raw fibrous textile materials and substitutes therefor	100.0
24	Textiles and substitutes for textiles; household linen; curtains of textile or plastic.	100.0
18	Leather and imitations of leather; animal skins and hides; luggage and carrying bags; umbrellas and parasols; walking sticks; whips, harness and saddlery; collars, leashes and clothing for animals	80.0

Table 3. Top Relative Percentage Changes in War-Affected Sectors

Nice class	Description	Changes, %
12	Vehicles; apparatus for locomotion by land, air or water	+20.5
39	Transport; packaging and storage of goods; travel arrangement	+20.3
5	Pharmaceuticals, medical and veterinary preparations etc.	+20.0
4	Industrial oils and greases, wax; lubricants; dust absorbing, wetting and binding compositions; fuels and illuminants etc.	+17.9
9	Scientific, research, navigation, surveying, photographic, cinematographic, audiovisual, optical, weighing, measuring, signalling, detecting, testing, inspecting, life-saving and teaching apparatus and instruments; apparatus and instruments for conducting, switching, transforming, accumulating, regulating or controlling the distribution or use of electricity; apparatus and instruments for recording, transmitting, reproducing or processing sound, images or data etc.	+9.3
13	Firearms; ammunition and projectiles; explosives; fireworks	+0.33 (from zero)
42	Scientific and technological services and research and design relating thereto; industrial analysis, industrial research and industrial design services; quality control and authentication services; design and development of computer hardware and software	-20.0
41	Education; providing of training etc.	-3.2

Table 4. Statistics of Verbal Elements in Trademarks

Parameters	Variables	Periods	Values
Lettering	Standard, %	Pre-War	48
		Wartime	52
	Stylized, %	Pre-War	52
		Wartime	48
Mean length of main textual elements	Number of symbols	Pre-War	9.05
		Wartime	8.59
Mean length of all textual elements	Number of symbols	Pre-War	12.66
		Wartime	11.83
	Number of words	Pre-War	2.26
		Wartime	1.98
Quality of main textual elements	Fanciful, %	Pre-War	21
		Wartime	23
	Arbitrary, %	Pre-War	36
		Wartime	35
	Suggestive, %	Pre-War	32
		Wartime	29
	Descriptive, %	Pre-War	11
		Wartime	12
The most popular colors	B/W, %	Pre-War	91
		Wartime	90
	Blue, %	Pre-War	7
		Wartime	3
	Green, %	Pre-War	3
		Wartime	3
The most popular scripts	Cyrillic (Ukrainian), %	Pre-War	25
		Wartime	33
	Cyrillic (Russian), %	Pre-War	6
		Wartime	1
	Latin, %	Pre-War	76
		Wartime	71
	Latin and Cyrillic, %	Pre-War	5
		Wartime	5
Highlighting negative symbols	Z, %	Pre-War	1
		Wartime	0
	O, %	Pre-War	2
		Wartime	4
	V, %	Pre-War	1
		Wartime	0

The share of foreign applicants declined from 11% before the war to 7% during the war.

Table 4 presents a summary of the statistics on the textual components of the trademarks.

In the absence of exactly Russian letters and words, we assumed that the text was written in Ukrainian.

The share of descriptive and suggestive additional (non the main) words in trademarks amounted to 78% before the war and 74% during the war.

It is also important to note that 3% of trademarks registered during the war were dedicated to positive wartime symbols (such as palyanytsia, Bayraktar, etc.).

Combined trademarks (Table 5) containing images accounted for 48% before the war and 44% during the war, with image-only marks representing just 3% in the pre-war period and 5% during the war.

The IT-related group accounted for 4% during the war and 2% before the war, and these figures can be viewed as complementary to the overall share of standardized symbols.

Before the war, an average of 1.49 themes were present per image, compared to 1.18 themes during the war.

The use of national symbols remained low in both periods, not exceeding 3%.

The total share of elements with low semantic value (abstractions and geometric shapes) — those that carry minimal meaning but distract consumer attention — was 58% before the war and 37% during the war.

The following section provides a structured assessment of the hypotheses.

Hypothesis H1. The war directly affects the generation of intellectual property (trademarks).

We observe a significant decline in trademark registrations during wartime. This could be divided into two sub-hypotheses: companies either perceive opportunities linked to the war or face increased barriers. Unfortunately, the current evidence leans more toward the latter explanation.

We did not identify a substantial number of registrations using positive wartime symbols as trademarks. This may be related to discussions within

professional communities regarding the ethical concerns surrounding the commercialization of such symbols, which were later addressed in public comments by the Intellectual Property Office [14].

The analysis has not revealed a statistically significant increase in the use of the yellow-and-blue color combination in trademarks.

Although the Russian language was not widely used in trademarks during either of the periods examined, its presence has now become almost negligible. A similar pattern has been observed with respect to negative wartime symbols, such as the deliberate highlighting of the letters “Z,” “O,” and “V” within trademark designs. However, the findings relating to these indicators fall within the margin of statistical error. It is also noteworthy that the letter “O” predominates among these three symbols. When used independently of “Z” and “V,” it may not evoke the same negative associations among Ukrainian consumers [26]. Furthermore, from a design perspective, the circular form of the letter provides a convenient space for the incorporation of graphic elements and stylistic enhancements.

The number of foreign applicants has also declined. Just like Ukrainian applicants, foreign entities might perceive either opportunities or barriers, especially in light of emerging foreign enterprises operating in Ukraine. However, the associated risks may still be too high. Again, these results remain within the bounds of statistical uncertainty.

We cannot exclude the psychological factor in business decision-making. In times of uncertainty, companies may deprioritize formal intellectual property protection in favor of survival strategies — leading to postponed or altogether abandoned trademark filings. However, there is also evidence that trademarks have a positive impact on business recovery [9]. In Ukraine, a persistent predominance of service-related classes has been observed, which may indicate a strategic shift toward more resilient and knowledge-intensive business models [27]. Such models are generally better positioned to mitigate operational risks and income volatility under conditions of external shocks and prolonged uncertainty.

The distribution of trademarks across the Nice Classification classes is of considerable analytical importance, as it provides insight into broader

Table 5. Statistics of Design Elements in Trademarks

Parameters	Variables, %	Periods	Values
Relation to textual content	High	Pre-War	22
		Wartime	23
Quality	Low	Pre-War	53
		Wartime	57
	Average	Pre-War	25
		Wartime	20
	Fanciful	Pre-War	23
		Wartime	16
	Arbitrary	Pre-War	39
		Wartime	47
	Suggestive	Pre-War	32
		Wartime	29
The most popular colors	Descriptive	Pre-War	5
		Wartime	9
	B/W	Pre-War	90
		Wartime	86
	Blue	Pre-War	12
		Wartime	11
	Green	Pre-War	9
		Wartime	8
	Red	Pre-War	8
		Wartime	8
Top thematic categories, excluding abstract and geometric elements	Nature	Pre-War	17
		Wartime	17
	Animals	Pre-War	17
		Wartime	13
	People	Pre-War	9
		Wartime	8
	Tools and devices	Pre-War	12
		Wartime	12
	Status symbol	Pre-War	9
		Wartime	2
	Building	Pre-War	4
		Wartime	7
	Standardized symbol	Pre-War	5
		Wartime	7

economic and social transformations [5, 28]. In the context of wartime conditions, registrations have increased across all product-related classes most directly associated with military needs (Classes 4—13). In contrast, several service classes have experienced a decline, most notably Class 42 that covers scientific and technological services, including R&D activities. At the same time, Class 39 that encompasses transportation and logistics services has recorded one of the largest increases, likely reflecting the growing importance of alternative transport solutions in the absence of regular air traffic.

Additional changes have been identified in other classes. Registrations in Class 6 (common metals and their alloys; metal building materials; ores) have increased, whereas Classes 22 (ropes and cords; nets; tents; tarpaulins and related goods) and 24 (textiles and textile substitutes) have shown a decline. However, these changes appear to be only indirectly related to the wartime factors considered in this study.

Overall, the findings have provided partial support for Hypothesis H1. The observed shifts in trademark registration patterns suggest that wartime conditions have influenced registration activity and altered the distribution of trademark applications across economic sectors.

Hypothesis H2. The war indirectly influences naming strategies through a shift toward international e-commerce.

A decline in the number of trademarks written in Latin script and a corresponding increase in Ukrainian-language brand names have been observed. These findings provide stronger support for Hypothesis H1 than for Hypothesis H2, suggesting a reduced orientation toward the expansion of trademarks into international markets. This result is consistent with and further extends the findings reported in previous studies [17, 18].

Each applicant, when investing money in registration, faces a dilemma: to increase the brand's distinctiveness — thereby improving the chances of registration — or to simplify the mark, risking refusal due to similarity with existing trademarks.

At the same time, overly differentiated brands carry the risk of short lifespans [29].

According to one commonly accepted classification, trademarks can be divided into the following types:

- ◆ Fanciful (e.g., *Nike* for sportswear) — a coined word that does not exist in nature or dictionaries; such marks are generally easier to register, but it is more difficult to convey the brand idea and message to consumers.
- ◆ Arbitrary (e.g., *Amazon* for e-commerce services) — a real word unrelated to the goods or services it represents.
- ◆ Suggestive (e.g., *Allo* for electronics) — a word that hints at the goods or services; such marks are harder to register.
- ◆ Descriptive (e.g., “Excellent Ukrainian pharmacy with low prices” for pharmaceuticals) — directly describes a characteristic, function, or quality of the goods or services. To prevent unfair advantages, such marks are generally not registrable in most jurisdictions, although exceptions still occur.

Some scholars have suggested that the expansion of e-commerce stimulates the registration of increasingly fanciful and, in some cases, semantically arbitrary trademarks [19]. A similar tendency has been observed in the growing reliance on textual elements within trademark compositions. This development may reflect a preference among business owners for the practical advantages that digital platforms provide to trademark holders, rather than for substantial investments in comprehensive branding strategies beginning at the naming stage. Moreover, as noted above, purely figurative trademarks have limited functionality in digital marketplaces.

The analysis has identified only a modest increase in fanciful trademarks, together with a reduction in text length and the continued use of non-verbal logos. As a result, the evidence does not support the existence of a pronounced shift toward greater integration with international e-commerce channels.

At the same time, the wartime context has required businesses to adapt their operational prac-

tices, communication approaches, and market priorities. This adaptation has manifested itself in the evolution of trademark characteristics, particularly through the simplification of brand elements and the growing use of functional and emotionally meaningful identifiers. However, these changes do not provide sufficient grounds for confirming Hypothesis H2 as originally formulated.

Hypothesis H3. Naming in Ukrainian business undergo a natural transformation during wartime.

The results have shown only a marginal increase in the average number of classes per trademark. At the same time, trademarks have become shorter, have contained fewer words, and have exhibited a modest shift toward standard-character formats rather than stylized lettering. A slight reduction in the descriptiveness and suggestiveness of secondary textual elements has indicated a more efficient use of trademark space, while the quality of wording and its semantic relationship with logo elements have remained largely stable. The analysis has also revealed a modest decline in the use of black, white, and grey color schemes and in the semantic density of logos. These changes are consistent with broader minimalist tendencies in post-digital design culture, which emphasize clarity, functionality, and rapid recognition under conditions of information overload and digital-interface constraints.

Before the war, a logo contained an average of 1.49 visual themes; during the wartime period, this figure has decreased to 1.18. The share of low-information design elements — features that contribute little semantic content while potentially distracting viewers — has declined from 58% to 37%. A noticeable reduction has also been observed in the use of declarative symbols associated with prestige or quality.

Since consumers typically form an impression of a brand within approximately 60 milliseconds, trademarks function as powerful cognitive anchors, particularly in visually saturated environments [22]. The findings have indicated that Ukrainian trademark applicants have increasingly favored simplicity in brand presentation. This tendency constitutes the principal evidence support-

ing Hypothesis H3. Although some individual changes have not reached statistical significance and others have remained stable, the overall pattern has been either neutral or moderately positive.

The wartime context has also provided a unique opportunity to examine trademarks as cultural artifacts that reflect collective experience, emotional resilience, and adaptive identity formation.

Under conditions of geopolitical instability, innovation management has emerged as an important mechanism for ensuring business resilience and continuity. Trademarks have served not only as instruments of market differentiation but also as means of preserving identity, facilitating rapid rebranding, and rebuilding reputation in times of crisis. Consequently, innovation strategy and trademark protection have remained closely interconnected components of business continuity, even in a wartime economy.

Overall, this study has reinforced the value of trademark analysis for understanding broader processes of economic development, innovation, and branding transformation. The research has demonstrated how open-access data can be effectively employed for empirical investigation in contexts of geopolitical disruption. By combining official trademark databases with a systematic coding framework, the study has enabled a robust analysis of branding trends, linguistic shifts, and symbolic adaptation during wartime.

Although the findings are constrained by the geographical scope of the study and the limited observation period, the proposed methodology has offered a replicable framework for future research in other jurisdictions and crisis settings. Ultimately, trademarks have proven to be cultural artifacts that respond to the pressures of war, market adaptation, and the redefinition of identities.

Future research may focus on the collection of more granular empirical data, although the present study adheres to the commonly accepted standard of a 95% confidence level and a 5% margin of error. A more comprehensive assessment of the identified trends may become possible once wartime conditions have ended.

REFERENCES

1. Block, J., Lambrecht, D., Willeke, T., Cucculelli, M., Meloni, D. (2025). Green patents and green trademarks as indicators of green innovation. *Research Policy*, 54(1), 105138. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2024.105138>
2. Flikkema, M. J., De Man, A. P., Castaldi, C. (2021). Are trademark counts a valid indicator of innovation? Results of an in-depth study of new benelux trademarks filed by SMEs. In: *Trademarks and Their Role in Innovation, Entrepreneurship and Industrial Organization*. Routledge.
3. Castaldi, C., Mendonça, S. (2022). Regions and trademarks: Research opportunities and policy insights from leveraging trademarks in regional innovation studies. *Regional Studies*, 56(2), 177—189. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00343404.2021.2003767>
4. Morales, P., Flikkema, M., Castaldi, C., de Man, A. P. (2024). When do trademarks improve the measurement of innovation? An analysis of innovations from Dutch SMEs. *Science and Public Policy*, 51(5), 923—938. <https://doi.org/10.1093/scipol/scae035>
5. Ribeiro, L. C., Dos Santos, U. P., Muzaka, V. (2022). Trademarks as an indicator of innovation: Towards a fuller picture. *Scientometrics*, 127(1), 481—508. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-021-04197-2>
6. Faurel, L., Li, Q., Shanthikumar, D., Teoh, S. H. (2024). Bringing innovation to fruition: Insights from new trademarks. *Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis*, 59(2), 474—520. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022109022001260>
7. Shmatkov, D. (2025). The role of trademark legal protection in supporting environmentally oriented brands. *Law & Innovations*, 2(50), 122—127 [in Ukrainian]. [https://doi.org/10.37772/2518-1718-2025-2\(50\)-18](https://doi.org/10.37772/2518-1718-2025-2(50)-18)
8. Gumus, S. (2024). The importance of branding within the scope of government supports: Turquality example. *International Journal of Arts and Social Studies*, 7(13), 232—257.
9. Todorova, S. (2024). Green trademarks and sustainability. *Strategies for Policy in Science and Education*, 32(1s), 87—97. <https://doi.org/10.53656/str2024-1s-6-gre>.
10. Tasev, A. (2024). The future of intellectual property as a weapon of war. *Pace International Law Review*, 36(1), 123—147. <https://doi.org/10.58948/2331-3536.1432>
11. Upadhyay, A. (2024). The unseen arsenal: IPRs as a weapon in armed conflicts. *Journal of Intellectual Property Rights*, 29(2), 88—95. <https://doi.org/10.56042/jipr.v29i2.2655>
12. Klutke, G. (2024). Rights in conflict: Examining investment treaty arbitration and intellectual property rights in the wake of Russia's invasion of Ukraine. *Journal of Business, Entrepreneurship and Law*, 17(1), 220—254.
13. Gurgula, O. (2022). Saving Ukrainian lives during the Russian war: Ukraine must waive IP rights under Article 73 TRIPS to provide access to essential medicines. *GRUR International*, 71(8), 719—730. <https://doi.org/10.1093/grurint/ikac067>
14. Ukrpatent. (2023, March 27). *The official position of the IP office on the registration of trademarks using symbols of war*. URL: <https://www.ukrpatent.org/uk/news/main/ofitsiina-pozytsiia-ip-ofisu-shchodo-reiestratsii-tm-z-symvolamy-viiny-27032023> (Last accessed: 28.03.2026).
15. Miroshnychenko, O., O'Brien, J., Wainwright, T. (2024). *Innovation and Knowledge Management Through On-line Collaboration: Generating Innovative Solutions in Times of War*. SAGE Publications, Inc. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781071966839>.
16. Mészáros, A. Á. (2024). Innovation in the Defence Industry from the End of the Cold War to the War in Ukraine. *Journal of Regional Security*, 19(1), 97—118. <https://doi.org/10.5937/jrs19-42865>
17. Maksymenko, I., Akimov, A., Bikulov, D. (2024). Development of the e-commerce market in ukraine in the context of modern challenges. *Baltic journal of economic studies*, 10(2), 177—186. <https://doi.org/10.30525/2256-0742/2024-10-2-177-186>
18. Novikova, N., Fedun, I., Diachenko, O., Honcharenko, O., Stetsko, M., Shnyrkov, O. (2023, May). Trends in the Development of E-Commerce in Ukraine. In *International Conference on Business and Technology* (pp. 91—100). Cham: Springer Nature Switzerland. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-54019-6_8
19. McLaughlin, G. (2021). Fanciful Failures: Keeping Nonsense Marks off the Trademark Register. *Harvard Law Review*, 134. URL: <https://harvardlawreview.org/2021/03/fanciful-failures-keeping-nonsense-marks-off-the-trademark-register/> (Last accessed: 28.03.2026).

20. Shmatkov, D., Zagalaz-Sánchez, M. L., Cachón-Zagalaz, J. (2021). Analysis of posters for informing the population via social media during covid-19: Ukrainian network. *Psycholinguistics*, 30(1), 249—273. <https://doi.org/10.31470/2309-1797-2021-30-1-249-273>
21. Snodgrass, J. G., Vanderwart, M. (1980). A standardized set of 260 pictures: Norms for name agreement, image agreement, familiarity, and visual complexity. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Learning and Memory*, 6(2), 174—215. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0278-7393.6.2.174>
22. Tushnet, R. (2007). Gone in sixty milliseconds: Trademark law and cognitive science. *Texas Law Review*, 86, 507—568. URL: <https://scholarship.law.georgetown.edu/facpub/792> (Last accessed: 28.03.2026).
23. Toniatti, C. de A., Guerreiro, M., Viana, C., Pereira, L. N. (2023). Emerging Branding Trends in the Post-COVID World. *Journal of Tourism, Sustainability and Well-Being*, 11(2), 100—115. <https://doi.org/10.34623/qstn-4p54>
24. Bas, J., Sáiz, P., Zofío, J. L. (2025). What doesn't kill you makes you stronger: On the determinants of trademark survivability over the long term. *Journal of Product & Brand Management*, 34(6), 862—877. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JPBM-04-2024-5097>
25. WIPO. (2025). *Pathfinders: Exploring the role of trademarks in innovation and development*. World Intellectual Property Organization.
26. Gessen, M. (2022, March 7). “Z” is the symbol of the new Russian politics of aggression. *The New Yorker*. URL: <https://www.newyorker.com/news/our-columnists/z-is-the-symbol-of-the-new-russian-politics-of-aggression> (Last accessed: 28.03.2026).
27. Hudson, K., Morgan, R. E. (2025). Intellectual property protection and firm risk: How service transition and knowledge intensity mitigate the loss of strategic resources. *Journal of Business Research*, 188, 115118. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2024.115118>
28. Shmatkov, D., Gorokhovatskyi, O., Vnukova, N. (2023). Elaborative trademark similarity evaluation using goods and services automated comparison. *Proceedings of the 7th International Conference on Computational Linguistics and Intelligent Systems (COLINS 2023) (April 20—21, 2023, Kharkiv, Ukraine)*, 3403. CEUR Workshop Proceedings.
29. Pfeifer, L. M., Schreiner, T. F., Sattler, H. (2025). The role of consumer-based brand equity on the prolongation of trademarks. *Journal of Brand Management*, 32(2), 94—108. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41262-024-00370-z>

Received 27.07.2025

Revised 08.01.2026

Accepted 03.02.2026

Д.І. Шматков^{1,2} (<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2952-4070>)

¹ Харківський національний університет внутрішніх справ,
просп. Л. Ландау, 27, Харків, 61080, Україна,
+380 57 252 3051, khnuvs@univd.edu.ua

² Науково-дослідний інститут правового забезпечення інноваційного розвитку
Національної академії правових наук України,
вул. Чернишевська, 80, Харків, 61002, Україна,
+380 57 700 0663, ndipzir@gmail.com

РЕБРЕНДИНГ ПІД ЧАС КРИЗИ: ЗМІНИ ХАРАКТЕРИСТИК ТОРГОВЕЛЬНИХ МАРОК В УКРАЇНІ У ЧАС ВІЙНИ

Вступ. Генерування об'єктів інтелектуальної власності часто зумовлюється інноваціями, які зазвичай пов'язують із патентами, промисловими зразками, торговельними марками (ТМ) та авторським правом. Водночас ТМ дедалі частіше визнаються цінними індикаторами впровадження інновацій, комерціалізації та стійкості бізнесу, особливо в умовах геополітичної кризи.

Проблематика. Незважаючи на зростаюче визнання ТМ як індикаторів інновацій, комерціалізації та адаптації промисловості, емпіричні дані про те як воєнні умови впливають на поведінку у сфері ТМ, тактики неймінгу та вибір товарів і послуг у заявках на ТМ залишаються обмеженими.

Мета. Оцінити зміни характеристик ТМ в Україні в умовах воєнного часу та визначити, які з виявлених змін можуть бути пов'язані з впливом російсько-української війни.

Матеріали й методи. Дослідження охоплює період з 2018 по 2025 рік і ґрунтується на порівнянні заявок на ТМ, поданих до війни та під час війни. Використано офіційні дані Українського національного офісу інтелектуальної власності та інновацій, проаналізовано 759 ТМ у межах двох репрезентативних вибірок з метою дослідження змін в неймінгу, використанні мови, а також у товарах і послугах, охоплених заявками, перевіряючи три гіпотези щодо прямого, опосередкованого та адаптивного впливу війни на активність у сфері ТМ.

Результати. Показано, що воєнні умови в Україні були пов'язані зі зменшенням кількості реєстрацій ТМ, майже повним зникненням російськомовних і негативних воєнних символів, обмеженим використанням позитивних воєнних символів, а також із ширшою тенденцією до коротших і простіших ТМ, що дає підстави ідентифікувати адаптацію стратегій насамперед через спрощення, стійкість і функціональне перепозиціонування.

Висновки. Підкреслено цінність аналізу ТМ для розуміння динаміки інновацій у кризових умовах. Результати є базисом для подальших емпіричних досліджень після завершення війни. Виявлені зміни дають змогу розглядати ТМ як інструмент фіксації адаптаційних реакцій правовласників у кризовий період.

Ключові слова: торговельні марки, російсько-українська війна, статистика, інтелектуальна власність, адаптація, неймінг.