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The answer is: NOT REALLY, … …

The problem being that the proposed new claim construction standard (based on the CAFC’s Phillips decision, 2005) does not yet know the Supreme Court’s framework decisions2). I.e., especially Mayo/Biosig/Alice3) require to search – in construing a ‘claim interpretation’s, CI’s claim construction4) for (with it) thereafter testing the CI, whether it satisfies SPL3) – this CI’s specification for an inventive alias exceptional concept (modeling an abstract idea or a natural phenomenon) that is independent of this CI’s other concepts. But the Phillips based claim interpretation does not yet know any one of these few notional refinements of SPL by the Supreme Court’s framework clearly defined and required to be used for this CI test!

Thus, starting the CI’s PE-analysis from the Phillips-based claim interpretation – due to the preceding reasoning today seen as incomplete, after the Supreme Court’s reinterpretation of § 101 for refining SPL in favor of ETCIs (see Mayo/Biosig/Alice) – drags also Alice’s PE-analysis into incomplete interpretation. This is indeed the USPTO’s and CAFC’s key fault stereotypically committed when dealing with ETCIs, primarily DNA-based ones (explained in more detail several times already in FSTP-papers, once more in)

… … but the flaw is SIMPLY FIXABLE, EVEN IF NOT EVIDENTLY:5)

IN TOTAL: In line with the Supreme Court’s responsibility by the US Constitution for interpreting the 35 USC §§ 101, 102, 103, 112 and with Andrei Iancu’s multiple explicitly concurring statements, this author suggests to replace in this NPRM the targeted claim interpretation/construction4) standard based on the CAFC’s Phillips decision by the corresponding notions based on the Supreme Court’s framework decisions.

Without using the Supreme Court’s framework based SPL refinement it is impossible to guarantee consistency and predictability in SPL precedents alias absolute robustness of granted US patents – as by investors and inventors into patent business urgently needed – while using it properly does guarantee these advantages.

---

1 This author has explained in far more than 20 (FSTP-) publications – US-wide and by scientific (especially AI reasoning – that the meaning of the notion ‘broadest reasonable interpretation, BRI’ is indefinable, as being highly metaphysical.

2 While being a big step into the correct direction, it is not big enough for enabling SPL to dealing with ‘emerging technology, ET’ CIs

3 Meeting by a ‘claimed invention, CI’ the requirements stated/implied by the framework is necessary and sufficient for the CI satisfying SPL.

4 For the distinctions between the notions ‘claim construction’ & ‘claim interpretation’, between ‘inventive alias exceptional concepts’ & ‘ordinary (creative or noncreative) concepts’, and between ‘dependent concepts’ & ‘independent concepts’ see.

5 by simply grasping the SPL-notions’ proper meanings, the precise definitions of which the Supreme Court by its framework’s requirements either clarified or partially even delivered for the first time, see.