

I suggest studying the consistency in the quality of Office Actions, in particular First Office Actions. Many times, the First Office Action fails to specifically address each and every claim (e.g., summary rejections listing multiple claims with very little or no details on how each claim is taught or suggested by the cited references). It is not until the Examiner is challenged in a Response that all the claims are finally addressed. This leads to an increased number of Office Actions and Responses since Applicants are reluctant to amend claims until the Examiner clearly points out why the claims are taught or suggested by the cited references. More robust First Office Actions would streamline prosecution by enabling Applicants to amend claims to overcome the rejections earlier in prosecution.

Mark Peterson 50,485