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Peer search pilot overview

- Paired (lead and secondary) examiners each independently searched an application to share results and strategies
- Pilot ran for two quarters (October to April, 2019) and had participants from every utility technology center
- Total of 130 applications (out of a possible 240 applications)
- Investment of seven hours of other time per application
  - Three hours for secondary examiner to search
  - Two hours for each examiner for surveys and meetings
Evaluations conducted

• Previously presented results:
  – Surveys of lead and secondary examiner participants
  – Focus sessions with participants

• Updated results:
  – OPQA reviews of pilot and pre-pilot cases
  – Monitoring of pilot cases through prosecution
Quality review showed statistically significant increase in prior art citations:

Average # references cited Pre-Pilot = 6.5
Average # references cited Pilot = 8.2
Selected survey results

Would you recommend periodic search collaboration as a regular part of examination procedure?

- 47%: Yes, depending on search complexity
- 40%: Yes, depending on the art
- 9%: Yes, other reason
- 4%: No

Reasons lead examiners selected cases for pilot

- 36%: Help w/Limitation
- 56%: Help w/Invention
- 8%: 2nd Opinion

Would you recommend periodic search collaboration as a regular part of examination procedure?

- Yes, depending on search complexity: 47%
- Yes, depending on the art: 40%
- Yes, other reason: 9%
- No: 4%

Reasons lead examiners selected cases for pilot

- Help w/Limitation: 36%
- Help w/Invention: 56%
- 2nd Opinion: 8%
OPQA review of non-finals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall correctness</th>
<th>Pre-pilot</th>
<th>Pilot</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>102 Compliance Rate</td>
<td>80.6%</td>
<td>81.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103 Compliance Rate</td>
<td>86.6%</td>
<td>80.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Modified review process to capture additional information on search
- No statistical significant differences between pre-pilot and pilot cases for 102 or 103 correctness
- Clarity metrics
  - 102 equal or non-significant increases
  - 103 equal or non-significant increases
  - Small sample sizes for most of the clarity metrics
Prosecution outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>App type</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Abandoned</th>
<th>Allowance</th>
<th>Terminal disposal</th>
<th>Rejection</th>
<th>RCE count</th>
<th>% Allowance rate</th>
<th>% Terminal disposal rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>30 (37.9%)</td>
<td>25.3%</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pilot</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>40 (37.7%)</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
<td>39.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>+4.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Slight increase in allowances and terminal disposals in pilot (pre-RCE)
- Not statistically significant
Next steps

• Positive survey data indicates support among examiners

• No statistically significant differences identified in statutory compliance, clarity, or compact prosecution
  – Limitations due to small sample sizes for some metrics

• Proceeding with further piloting
  – Considering use cases with potential value
  – Larger data sets to increase statistical confidence
  – Evaluate processes that are more cost effective
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