

MRF Overview

Sections included in ad hoc review. Check all that apply.

- None
 - Search
 - 35 U.S.C. 112(f) Analysis
 - Allowable Subject Matter
 - Interview
 - Restriction/Election of Species
 - Reply to Applicant
 - Finality
 - Reply to After-Final Response
 - Other Issues / Accolades / Additional Comments
-

Rejections made in Office action. Check all that apply.

- None
 - 35 U.S.C. 102
 - 35 U.S.C. 103
 - 35 U.S.C. 112(a) – Written Description
 - 35 U.S.C. 112(a) – Enablement
 - 35 U.S.C. 112(b) – Vague and Indefinite Claim Language
 - 35 U.S.C. 112(a)/(b) – 112(f) Related
 - 35 U.S.C. 101 (Eligibility)
 - 35 U.S.C. 101 (Utility)
 - Double Patenting (Statutory)
 - Double Patenting (Nonstatutory)
 - Other Rejection(s)
-

Were there any omitted rejections? Check all that apply.

- None
- 35 U.S.C. 102
- 35 U.S.C. 103
- 35 U.S.C. 112(a) – Written Description
- 35 U.S.C. 112(a) – Enablement
- 35 U.S.C. 112(b) – Vague and Indefinite Claim Language
- 35 U.S.C. 112(a)/(b) – 112(f) Related
- 35 U.S.C. 101 (Eligibility)
- 35 U.S.C. 101 (Utility)
- Double Patenting (Statutory)
- Double Patenting (Nonstatutory)
- Other Omitted Rejection(s)

Search

Did the examiner indicate what was searched?

Yes

No

What type of search was it? Check all that apply.

Classification Search

Inventor Name Search

Text Search

NPL Search

Updated Previous Search

Did the reviewer conduct a search?

Yes

In-Part

No

Comments (document search strategy and/or provide any comments that may aid the examiner in the future):

102 Rejections Made

Correctness

Overall, were the 35 U.S.C. 102 rejection(s) in compliance? Yes In-Part No

For all claims determined to have a non-compliant 35 U.S.C. 102 rejection made, was a compliant 35 U.S.C. 103 rejection applied? Yes No

Claimed features are explicitly/inherently disclosed in the prior art relied upon? Yes In-Part No N/A

Does the claim interpretation appear to be reasonable? Yes In-Part No N/A

Examiner's reliance on inherency is correctly applied? Yes In-Part No N/A

Effective date(s) of the reference(s) applied as prior art is sufficient? Yes In-Part No N/A

Correctness Comments:

Clarity

Overall, how was the clarity of the 35 U.S.C. 102 rejection(s)? Above Average Average Below Average

Sufficient explanations were provided to clarify the basis of the rejection so as to allow applicant to understand rejection. Above Average Average Below Average

Statements of inherency were clearly explained. Above Average Average Below Average N/A

The examiner explained their claim interpretation. Above Average Average Below Average N/A

Annotation(s) were provided that reasonably pin-point where each claim limitation is met by the reference. Above Average Average Below Average

The Office action contained clear suggestions to overcome rejections. Above Average Average Below Average N/A

Clarity Comments:

102 Rejections Omitted

Give a thorough description of the proposed 35 U.S.C. 102 rejection(s) that should have been made:

Type of prior art for the omitted rejection is (check all that apply):

- US Patent
- PG Pub
- Foreign Patent or Published Application
- NPL
- Other

Prior art for the omitted rejection was found using/in:

- Internet Search
- IDS
- PALM Inventor Name
- 892
- International Search Report (ISR)
- Classification Search
- Text Search
- Other

Is another prior art rejection, either under 35 U.S.C. 102 or 103 and determined to be in compliance, applied against every claim addressed by the omitted rejection above?

- Yes No

Comments:

103 Rejections Made

Correctness

Overall, were the 35 U.S.C. 103 rejection(s) in compliance?	<input type="radio"/> Yes	<input type="radio"/> In-Part	<input type="radio"/> No	
For all claims determined to have a non-compliant 35 U.S.C. 103 rejection made, was a compliant 35 U.S.C. 102 rejection applied?	<input type="radio"/> Yes		<input type="radio"/> No	
Claimed feature(s) are found in or suggested by the prior art relied upon?	<input type="radio"/> Yes	<input type="radio"/> In-Part	<input type="radio"/> No	
Does the claim interpretation appear to be reasonable?	<input type="radio"/> Yes	<input type="radio"/> In-Part	<input type="radio"/> No	<input type="radio"/> N/A
Examiner's reliance on inherency is correctly applied?	<input type="radio"/> Yes	<input type="radio"/> In-Part	<input type="radio"/> No	<input type="radio"/> N/A
Examiner's reliance on Official Notice is correctly applied?	<input type="radio"/> Yes	<input type="radio"/> In-Part	<input type="radio"/> No	<input type="radio"/> N/A
Examiner's reliance on legal precedents is correctly applied?	<input type="radio"/> Yes	<input type="radio"/> In-Part	<input type="radio"/> No	<input type="radio"/> N/A
Were the relevant portions of the prior art relied upon correctly set forth?	<input type="radio"/> Yes	<input type="radio"/> In-Part	<input type="radio"/> No	
Were the differences between the claim limitation(s) and teaching(s) of the prior art references relied upon correctly set forth?	<input type="radio"/> Yes	<input type="radio"/> In-Part	<input type="radio"/> No	
Was the proposed modification or combination of prior art references correctly set forth?	<input type="radio"/> Yes	<input type="radio"/> In-Part	<input type="radio"/> No	
Was the rationale to combine (e.g., reasons for obviousness) correctly set forth?	<input type="radio"/> Yes	<input type="radio"/> In-Part	<input type="radio"/> No	
Effective date(s) of the reference(s) applied as prior art are sufficient?	<input type="radio"/> Yes	<input type="radio"/> In-Part	<input type="radio"/> No	<input type="radio"/> N/A
Was the 35 U.S.C. 103 non-compliant rejection inherited from a non-compliance under 35 U.S.C. 102?	<input type="radio"/> Yes		<input type="radio"/> No	
Correctness Comments:	<input type="text"/>			

103 Rejections Made (con't)

Clarity

Overall, how was the clarity of the 35 U.S.C. 103 rejection(s)?	<input type="radio"/> Above Average	<input type="radio"/> Average	<input type="radio"/> Below Average	
Sufficient explanations were provided to clarify the basis of the rejection so as to allow applicant to understand rejection.	<input type="radio"/> Above Average	<input type="radio"/> Average	<input type="radio"/> Below Average	
The relevant portions of the prior art relied upon were evident from the record or were clearly explained.	<input type="radio"/> Above Average	<input type="radio"/> Average	<input type="radio"/> Below Average	
The differences between the claim limitation(s) and teaching(s) of the prior art references relied upon were clearly explained.	<input type="radio"/> Above Average	<input type="radio"/> Average	<input type="radio"/> Below Average	
The proposed modification or combination of prior art references was clearly explained.	<input type="radio"/> Above Average	<input type="radio"/> Average	<input type="radio"/> Below Average	
The rationale to combine/reasons for obviousness was clearly explained.	<input type="radio"/> Above Average	<input type="radio"/> Average	<input type="radio"/> Below Average	
The explanations pin-point where each claim limitation is met by the reference(s).	<input type="radio"/> Above Average	<input type="radio"/> Average	<input type="radio"/> Below Average	<input type="radio"/> N/A
The examiner explained their claim interpretation.	<input type="radio"/> Above Average	<input type="radio"/> Average	<input type="radio"/> Below Average	<input type="radio"/> N/A
Statements of inherency were clearly explained.	<input type="radio"/> Above Average	<input type="radio"/> Average	<input type="radio"/> Below Average	<input type="radio"/> N/A
Statements of Official Notice were clearly explained.	<input type="radio"/> Above Average	<input type="radio"/> Average	<input type="radio"/> Below Average	<input type="radio"/> N/A
Statements of legal precedents were clearly explained.	<input type="radio"/> Above Average	<input type="radio"/> Average	<input type="radio"/> Below Average	<input type="radio"/> N/A
Claims rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 have been addressed (e.g., "shotgun" rejection avoided).	<input type="radio"/> Above Average	<input type="radio"/> Average	<input type="radio"/> Below Average	
The Office action contained clear suggestions to overcome rejections.	<input type="radio"/> Above Average	<input type="radio"/> Average	<input type="radio"/> Below Average	<input type="radio"/> N/A
Clarity Comments:	<input type="text"/>			

103 Rejections Omitted

Give a thorough description of the proposed 35 U.S.C. 103 rejection(s) that should have been made:

Type of prior art for the omitted rejection is (check all that apply):

- US Patent
- PG Pub
- Foreign Patent or Published Application
- NPL
- Other

Prior art for the omitted rejection was found using/in:

- Internet Search
- IDS
- PALM Inventor Name
- 892
- International Search Report
- Classification Search
- Text Search
- Other

Is another prior art rejection, either under 35 U.S.C. 102 or 103 and determined to be in compliance, applied against every claim addressed by the omitted rejection above?

- Yes No

Comments:

112(a) Written Description Rejections Made

Correctness

Overall, were the 35 U.S.C. 112(a) Written Description rejection(s) in compliance? Yes In-Part No

Amended or newly added claim limitations rejected as including new matter were properly identified as not having support in the original disclosure? Yes In-Part No N/A

Does the claim interpretation appear to be reasonable? Yes In-Part No N/A

Original disclosure fails to describe claimed invention in sufficient detail for one skilled in the art to conclude the inventor was in possession of the claimed invention (non-new matter situations)? Yes In-Part No N/A

Does the claim interpretation appear to be reasonable? Yes In-Part No N/A

Correctness Comments:

Clarity

Overall, how was the clarity of the 35 U.S.C. 112(a) Written Description rejection(s)? Above Average Average Below Average

The Office action clearly explained the lack of written description (*i.e.*, the rejection identified the claim limitation(s) that lack(s) written description support and explained what is lacking in the specification). Above Average Average Below Average N/A

The Office action contained clear suggestions to overcome rejections. Above Average Average Below Average N/A

Clarity Comments:

112(a) Enablement Rejections Made

Correctness

Overall, were the 35 U.S.C. 112(a) Enablement rejection(s) in compliance?	<input type="radio"/> Yes	<input type="radio"/> In-Part	<input type="radio"/> No	
Does the claim interpretation appear to be reasonable?	<input type="radio"/> Yes	<input type="radio"/> In-Part	<input type="radio"/> No	<input type="radio"/> N/A
Was a <i>Wands</i> factors analysis needed?	<input type="radio"/> Yes		<input type="radio"/> No	<input type="radio"/> N/A
Was a <i>Wands</i> analysis included?	<input type="radio"/> Yes	<input type="radio"/> In-Part	<input type="radio"/> No	
Was the <i>Wands</i> analysis correct?	<input type="radio"/> Yes	<input type="radio"/> In-Part	<input type="radio"/> No	<input type="radio"/> N/A
Correctness Comments:	<input type="text"/>			

Clarity

Overall, how was the clarity of the 35 U.S.C. 112(a) Enablement rejection(s)?	<input type="radio"/> Above Average	<input type="radio"/> Average	<input type="radio"/> Below Average	
Lack of enablement was clearly explained.	<input type="radio"/> Above Average	<input type="radio"/> Average	<input type="radio"/> Below Average	
Relevant <i>In re Wands</i> factors were clearly identified and explained.	<input type="radio"/> Above Average	<input type="radio"/> Average	<input type="radio"/> Below Average	<input type="radio"/> N/A
The Office action contained clear suggestions to overcome rejections.	<input type="radio"/> Above Average	<input type="radio"/> Average	<input type="radio"/> Below Average	<input type="radio"/> N/A
Clarity Comments:	<input type="text"/>			

112(a) Rejections Omitted (WD and/or Enablement)

Omitted 35 U.S.C. 112(a) Enablement Rejection(s)

Give a thorough description of the proposed rejection(s) that should have been made:

Comments:

Omitted 35 U.S.C. 112(a) Written Description Rejection(s)

Give a thorough description of the proposed rejection(s) that should have been made:

Is the omitted 35 U.S.C. 112(a) written description rejection based on the addition of new matter?

Yes

No

Comments:

112(b) Vague/Indefinite Rejections Made

Correctness

Overall, were the 35 U.S.C. 112(b) Vague/Indefinite rejection(s) in compliance? Yes In-Part No

Basis for determination that 35 U.S.C. 112(b) rejection(s) was incorrect (check all that apply):

- Breadth versus indefiniteness was incorrectly interpreted
- Relative terminology was incorrectly identified/rejected
- Ranges and amounts limitations in the claim(s) that are vague and indefinite were incorrectly rejected (e.g., ranges set forth in dependent claims are not within the scope of the independent claim)
- Exemplary language in the claim(s) was incorrectly identified/rejected as being vague and indefinite (e.g., "for example," "such as," etc.)
- Lack of antecedent basis was incorrectly rejected
- Functional language was incorrectly rejected
- Alternative limitations (e.g., a Markush group) were incorrectly rejected
- Other

Correctness Comments:

Clarity

Overall, how was the clarity of the 35 U.S.C. 112(b) Vague/Indefinite rejection(s)? Above Average Average Below Average

The rejection(s) clearly state which limitation(s) does not meet 35 U.S.C. 112(b). Above Average Average Below Average

The rejection(s) clearly provided rationale as to why the claim(s) does not meet 35 U.S.C. 112(b). Above Average Average Below Average N/A

The Office action contained clear suggestions to overcome rejections. Above Average Average Below Average N/A

Clarity Comments:

112(b) Vague/Indefinite Rejections Omitted

Reasons for indefiniteness rejection(s) (check all that apply):

- Relative Terminology – Terms of degree in the claim(s)
- Relative Terminology – Subjective terms in the claim(s)
- Numerical ranges and amounts limitations in the claim(s)
- Exemplary language in the claim(s) (e.g., "for example," "such as," etc.)
- Lack of antecedent basis
- Improper alternative limitations (e.g., an improper Markush group)
- Misdescriptive language
- Other (Describe below)

Give a thorough description of the proposed rejection(s) that should have been made:

Comments:

112(a)/(b), 112(f)-Related Rejections Made

Correctness

Overall, were the 35 U.S.C. 112(a)/(b), 112(f)-related rejection(s) in compliance? Yes In-Part No

35 U.S.C. 112(b) Rejection(s) – 112(f) Related

35 U.S.C. 112(b) rejection(s) are correct on the basis that there is no or insufficient disclosure of corresponding structure, material, or acts for performing the function recited in a claim limitation invoking 35 U.S.C. 112(f)? Yes In-Part No N/A

Do the insufficiently supported functions require a computer-related algorithm? Yes In-Part No

35 U.S.C. 112(b) rejection(s) are correct on the basis that it is unclear if the claim(s) invoke 35 U.S.C. 112(f)? Yes In-Part No N/A

35 U.S.C. 112(a) Rejection(s) – 112(f) Related

35 U.S.C. 112(a) rejection(s) are reasonable on the basis that the claim is a single means claim? Yes In-Part No N/A

35 U.S.C. 112(a) rejection(s) related to a 35 U.S.C. 112(b) rejection are reasonable on the basis that the original disclosure fails to describe the claimed invention in sufficient detail so that one skilled in the art can conclude that the inventor was in possession of the claimed invention? Yes In-Part No N/A

Correctness Comments:

Clarity

Overall, how was the clarity of the 35 U.S.C. 112(a)/(b), 112(f)-related rejection(s)? Above Average Average Below Average

The 112(b) or 112(a) rejection was clearly explained. Above Average Average Below Average N/A

The Office action contained clear suggestions to overcome rejections. Above Average Average Below Average N/A

Clarity Comments:

112(a)/(b), 112(f)-Related Rejections Omitted

Reasons for 35 U.S.C. 112(a)/(b), 112(f)-related rejection(s) (check all that apply):

35 U.S.C. 112(b) Rejection(s) – 112(f) Related:

- There should be a 35 U.S.C. 112(b) rejection on the basis that 35 U.S.C. 112(f) is invoked and there is **no or insufficient disclosure** of corresponding structure, material, or acts for performing the claimed function
- There should be a 35 U.S.C. 112(b) rejection addressing the absence of a corresponding algorithm for computer-implemented means-plus-function limitations
- There should be a 35 U.S.C. 112(b) rejection addressing the inadequacy of a corresponding algorithm for computer-implemented means-plus-function limitations
- There should be a 35 U.S.C. 112(b) rejection on the basis that 35 U.S.C. 112(f) is invoked and the supporting disclosure fails to clearly link or associate the disclosed structure, material, or acts to the claimed function
- There should be a 35 U.S.C. 112(b) rejection on the basis that it is unclear whether a claim limitation invokes 35 U.S.C. 112(f)

35 U.S.C. 112(a) Rejection(s) – 112(f) Related:

- There should be a 35 U.S.C. 112(a) rejection on the basis that the claim is a single means claim
- There should be a 35 U.S.C. 112(a) rejection related to 35 U.S.C. 112(b) rejection on the basis that the original disclosure fails to describe the claimed invention in sufficient detail so that one skilled in the art can conclude that the inventor was in possession of the claimed invention (e.g., "Unbounded functional limitations")

Give a thorough description of the proposed rejection(s) that should have been made:

Comments:

101 Eligibility Rejections Made

Basis for 35 U.S.C. 101 Eligibility rejection (check all that apply):

- Transitory signal (e.g., Computer Readable Medium with a BRI that encompasses a transitory signal)
- Software *per se*
- Human Organism
- Law of Nature (e.g., naturally occurring correlations) without significantly more claimed
- Natural Phenomenon (e.g., wind) without significantly more claimed
- Product of Nature (e.g., isolated DNA) without significantly more claimed
- Abstract Idea (e.g., fundamental economic practices, certain methods of organizing human activities, idea itself (standing alone), or mathematical relationships/formulas) without significantly more claimed
- Other (e.g., "information", "use claim", or "data per se")

Correctness

Overall, were the 35 U.S.C. 101 Eligibility rejection(s) in compliance?

- Yes In-Part No

Does the claim interpretation appear to be reasonable?

- Yes In-Part No N/A

Correctness Comments:

Clarity

Overall, how was the clarity of the 35 U.S.C. 101 Eligibility rejection(s)?

- Above Average Average Below Average

The bases for rejection(s) were clearly explained.

- Above Average Average Below Average

Is the rejection based on a failure to recite a statutory category?

- Yes In-Part No

Is the rejection based on a judicial exception?

- Yes In-Part No

The judicial exception was identified.

- Above Average Average Below Average

The rejection identified specific claim(s) and its limitation(s) that recite(s) the judicial exception.

- Above Average Average Below Average

There was an explanation as to why it is a judicial exception.

- Above Average Average Below Average

Any additional elements were identified.

- Above Average Average Below Average

There was an explanation as to why any additional elements, if present, are not significantly more.

- Above Average Average Below Average N/A

If the judicial exception was a product of nature, there was an explanation as to why it does not include markedly different characteristics.

- Above Average Average Below Average N/A

The Office action contained clear suggestions to overcome the rejection.

- Above Average Average Below Average N/A

Clarity Comments:

101 Utility Rejections Made

Correctness

Overall, were the 35 U.S.C. 101 Utility rejection(s) in compliance? Yes In-Part No

Does the claim interpretation appear to be reasonable? Yes In-Part No N/A

Correctness Comments:

Clarity

Overall, how was the clarity of the 35 U.S.C. 101 Utility rejection(s)? Above Average Average Below Average

The bases for rejections were clearly explained. Above Average Average Below Average

The Office action contained clear suggestions to overcome rejections. Above Average Average Below Average N/A

Clarity Comments:

101 Rejections Omitted

35 U.S.C. 101 (Eligibility) Rejection(s)

Basis (check all that apply):

- Transitory signal (e.g., Computer Readable Medium with a BRI that encompasses a transitory signal)
- Software *per se*
- Human Organism
- Law of Nature (e.g., naturally occurring correlations) without significantly more claimed
- Natural Phenomenon (e.g., wind) without significantly more claimed
- Product of Nature (e.g., isolated DNA) without significantly more claimed
- Abstract Idea (e.g., fundamental economic practices, certain methods of organizing human activities, idea itself (standing alone), or mathematical relationships/formulas) without significantly more claimed
- Other (e.g., "information" or "data *per se*")

Give a thorough description of the proposed rejection(s) that should have been made:

Comments:

35 U.S.C. 101 (Utility) Rejection(s)

Give a thorough description of the proposed rejection(s) that should have been made:

Comments:

Double Patenting (Statutory) Rejections Made

Correctness

Overall, were the Statutory Double Patenting rejection(s) in compliance?

Yes

In-Part

No

Does the claim interpretation appear to be reasonable?

Yes

In-Part

No

N/A

Correctness Comments:

Clarity

Overall, how was the clarity of the Statutory Double Patenting rejection(s)?

Above Average

Average

Below Average

Rejected claims were properly identified and matched.

Above Average

Average

Below Average

N/A

The interpretation that the claims are of the "same scope" was clearly explained.

Above Average

Average

Below Average

The Office action contained clear suggestions to overcome rejections.

Above Average

Average

Below Average

N/A

Clarity Comments:

Double Patenting (Nonstatutory) Rejections Made

Correctness

What types of rejections were made? Check all that apply.

Anticipatory type
 Obviousness type
 Schneller type

Overall, were the Nonstatutory Double Patenting rejection(s) in compliance? Yes In-Part No

Was it an incorrect *Schneller* type of rejection? Yes In-Part No

Does the claim interpretation appear to be reasonable? Yes In-Part No N/A

Analyzed under the correct standard (e.g., anticipatory or obviousness)? Yes In-Part No N/A

If obviousness standard was applied, was *Graham v. John Deere Co.* analysis performed? Yes In-Part No N/A

Specification is appropriately depended on without bringing in unclaimed features? Yes In-Part No N/A

Secondary reference correctly combined when necessary? Yes In-Part No N/A

Correctness Comments:

Clarity

Overall, how was the clarity of the Nonstatutory Double Patenting rejection(s)? Above Average Average Below Average

The statement of obviousness was clearly explained. Above Average Average Below Average N/A

The *Graham v. John Deere Co.* analysis was clearly explained. Above Average Average Below Average N/A

Anticipatory analysis was clearly explained (e.g., genus/species). Above Average Average Below Average N/A

The *Schneller* analysis was clearly explained. Above Average Average Below Average N/A

The Office action contained clear suggestions to overcome rejections. Above Average Average Below Average N/A

Clarity Comments:

Double Patenting Rejections Omitted

Omitted Double Patenting – Nonstatutory Rejection(s)

Check all that apply:

- Nonstatutory Rejection
- Provisional Nonstatutory Rejection
- Anticipatory type
- Obviousness type

Give a thorough description of the proposed rejection(s) that should have been made:

Prior art for the omitted rejection was found using/in:

- Internet Search
- IDS
- PALM Inventor Name
- 892
- International Search Report (ISR)
- Classification Search
- Text Search
- Other

Comments:

Omitted Double Patenting – Statutory Rejection(s)

Check all that apply:

- Statutory
- Provisional Statutory

Give a thorough description of the proposed rejection(s) that should have been made:

Prior art for the omitted rejection was found using/in:

- Internet Search
- IDS
- PALM Inventor Name
- 892
- International Search Report (ISR)
- Classification Search
- Text Search
- Other

Comments:

Reply to Applicant

Were applicant's rejection-related arguments addressed in the Office action (whether examiner's position was correct or not) including arguments with respect to art still relied upon?

Yes

In-Part

No

N/A

Comments:

Finality

Was the finality of the Office action proper (prosecution closed)?

Yes

No

Indicate the reason(s) (check all that apply):

New grounds of rejection(s) not necessitated by amendment

The Office action is a first action final after RCE, however, an Advisory Action was mailed including an indication that proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection would not be entered because they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search

Other

Comments:

Reply to After-Final Response

Was the after-final response entered?

Yes

No

Should the after-final response have been entered?

The after-final response was properly denied entry The after-final should have been entered

The after-final should have been entered because:

- It includes proposed amendment(s) that do not raise the issue of new matter and do not raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search
- It includes proposed amendment(s) that are deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal
- It includes an affidavit/declaration or other evidence that has good and sufficient reasons as to why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented

Check all that apply:

- The examiner clearly indicated which, if any, rejections have been overcome
- The examiner clearly indicated the status of the claim(s) for the purposes of appeal
- None of the above

Other observations concerning the advisory action:

- The advisory action did not correctly set forth the time period for reply
- The examiner failed to suitably respond to all arguments raised by applicant
- Not all appropriate fields of the form were completed
- None of the above

Comments:

Other Rejections Made

Specify the type of other rejection(s) that was (were) made, e.g., 112(d):

Overall, were the other rejection(s) in compliance?

Yes

In-Part

No

Based on the current compliance standard guidelines, this incorrect rejection is flagged as:

For Consideration

Non-Compliant

Overall, how was the clarity of the other rejection(s)?

Above Average

Average

Below Average

Comments:

Other Rejections Omitted

Give a thorough description of any other rejection(s) that should have been made:

Specify the type of other rejection(s) that was (were) made, e.g., 112(d):

Based on the current compliance standard guidelines, this omitted rejection is flagged as:

For Consideration

Non-Compliant

112(f) Analysis

Evaluating the claim limitations using the three-prong 112(f) analysis, should one or more claim limitations be interpreted as invoking 112(f)?	<input type="radio"/> Yes	<input type="radio"/> No	
For limitations including "means"?	<input type="radio"/> Yes	<input type="radio"/> No	
For limitations including a substitute term for "means"?	<input type="radio"/> Yes	<input type="radio"/> No	
Are there applicant remarks in the record directed toward the invocation of 112(f)?	<input type="radio"/> Yes	<input type="radio"/> No	
Was invocation of 112(f) documented by the examiner?	<input type="radio"/> Yes	<input type="radio"/> In-Part	<input type="radio"/> No
Were the 112(f) presumptions placed on the record?	<input type="radio"/> Yes	<input type="radio"/> In-Part	<input type="radio"/> No
Was there a discussion of how the presumptions were overcome?	<input type="radio"/> Yes	<input type="radio"/> In-Part	<input type="radio"/> No
Was the examiner's documentation of invocation correct?	<input type="radio"/> Yes	<input type="radio"/> In-Part	<input type="radio"/> No
Was the examiner's documentation of invocation clear?	<input type="radio"/> Yes	<input type="radio"/> In-Part	<input type="radio"/> No

Comments:

Other Quality-Related Items

Allowable Subject Matter

Did the examiner indicate allowable subject matter?	<input type="radio"/> Yes	<input type="radio"/> No	
Did the examiner write a Reasons for Allowance?	<input type="radio"/> Yes	<input type="radio"/> No	<input type="radio"/> N/A
Did the Reasons for Allowance add substance to the record?	<input type="radio"/> Yes	<input type="radio"/> In-Part	<input type="radio"/> No
Would a Reasons for Allowance have helped in understanding why the claims were allowed?	<input type="radio"/> Yes	<input type="radio"/> No	
Comments:	<input type="text"/>		

Restrictions/Election of Species

Did the examiner make a requirement for restriction/election of species?	<input type="radio"/> Yes	<input type="radio"/> No	
Was the requirement for restriction/election of species proper?	<input type="radio"/> Yes	<input type="radio"/> In-Part	<input type="radio"/> No
Was sufficient rationale set forth in making the requirement for restriction/election of species?	<input type="radio"/> Yes	<input type="radio"/> In-Part	<input type="radio"/> No
Was rejoinder properly practiced?	<input type="radio"/> Yes	<input type="radio"/> No	<input type="radio"/> N/A
If the requirement for restriction/election of species was traversed by applicant, did the examiner appropriately reply to the reasons or arguments advanced by applicant in the traverse?	<input type="radio"/> Yes	<input type="radio"/> In-Part	<input type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> N/A
Comments:	<input type="text"/>		

Other Quality-Related Items (con't)

Interview

Was there an Interview Summary form? Yes No

Is there evidence of an undocumented interview on the record? Yes No

Is the record of the interview clear and complete? Yes In-Part No

Was the interview initiated by the examiner? Yes No Unknown

Was the interview documentation substantive in nature? Yes In-Part No

Comments:

Other Issues

Are there any other issues not described elsewhere? If so, indicate the type of issue(s) and describe them below. Yes No

Comments:

Accolades

Where office action (or the work examiner displays in the application as a whole) demonstrates (check all that apply):

- N/A
- Technical analysis
- Legal analysis
- Clarity
- Customer service
- Responses to arguments
- Reasons for allowance
- Interview thoroughness
- Other (describe below)

Accolade Comments:

Additional Comments

Additional Review Comments:

Review Circumstances

Please describe any circumstances about the review performed that affect the scope of responses provided.