

**From:** [Mason, James](#)  
**To:** [aipartnership](#)  
**Subject:** Inventorship  
**Date:** Thursday, August 29, 2019 7:41:11 AM

---

The inventorship issue in the context of AI is not really new. Computer modeling for drug compounds has been known for years. Lead compounds are presented in the minds of the inventors by human intervention of the computer programmer. Similarly, my understanding is that AI requires a person to present data to the AI computer; thus, a result of the inventors human intervention/conception. *Olusegun Falana v. Kent State University* and *Alexander J. Seed*, 669 F.3d 1349 (Fed. Cir. 2012) address substantial contributors in the making of the invention that didn't necessary conceive the claimed invention. It's not really for the patent office to decide these issues on a hypothetical basis. It's for courts to decide. I see no need to add entities as inventors. These opinions are my own opinions, and I am not writing on behalf of nor do they reflect the opinions of my employer.

**James C Mason, MS, JD**

Patent Counsel

Emory University - Office of Technology Transfer, Emory Patent Group  
1599 Clifton Road NE, 4th Floor, Atlanta, GA 30322  
404-727-5259 (phone) • [james.mason@emory.edu](mailto:james.mason@emory.edu)

Find us on our [website](#), [Facebook](#), [Twitter](#), [LinkedIn](#) & our [Blog!](#)

Subscribe. Discover. License. Our latest techs direct to you via [TechFeed](#)

---

This e-mail message (including any attachments) is for the sole use of the intended recipient(s) and may contain confidential and privileged information. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this message (including any attachments) is strictly prohibited.

If you have received this message in error, please contact the sender by reply e-mail message and destroy all copies of the original message (including attachments).