

From: Kyle Anderson

Sent: Thursday, March 7, 2019 11:21 AM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Revised Patent Subject Matter Eligibility Guidance

I write in support of the 2019 Revised Patent Subject Matter Eligibility Guidance. This guidance will improve the clarity, consistency, and predictability of examination and post issuance review of patents by the USPTO. Recent rulings by the courts and the USPTO have been ambiguous and contradictory. Even experienced attorneys are not able advise inventors as to whether their inventions are patentable. In cases where a patent has already been issued, there is no certainty as to whether it will be upheld. The new guidelines will provide a thorough, consistent, and logical application of the current law on subject matter eligibility.

This guidance does not expand on the Supreme Court holdings in Alice. This guidance does not expand on recent lower court rulings that certain inventions are patent eligible under the Alice test. It does not ignore other decisions nor distort the law, but rather acknowledges and solves the conundrum of confusing and apparently contradictory holdings. Adoption of this guidance will provide order, clarity, uniformity, and reduce disputes over section 101 in the courts and the USPTO.

Thank you for yours effort to position the United States to retake the lead in the next wave of technological innovation in areas like quantum computing, artificial intelligence, and medical diagnostics. Protection for discoveries in these fields is the absolute best way to promote progress in science and useful arts in our modern day.

--

Kyle Anderson

From: Arnold Beal

Sent: Thursday, March 7, 2019 10:32 AM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Inventor Patent Rights

3/7/2019

Subject: Inventor Patent Rights

I am a 69-year-old independent inventor currently having four patents and am concerned about protecting my patent rights as intended by our forefathers and granted by the U.S. Patent & Trademark Office. I am asking you to please support the independent inventor to help this nation restore patent protection for inventors by reversing a generation of laws, regulations, and court decisions that have discouraged innovation by failing to secure to inventors their exclusive rights to their discoveries.

I write in support of the 2019 Revised Patent Subject Matter Eligibility Guidance. This guidance will improve the clarity, consistency, and predictability of examination and post issuance review of patents by the USPTO. Recent rulings by the courts and the USPTO have been ambiguous and contradictory. Even experienced attorneys are not able to advise inventors as to whether their inventions are patentable. In cases where a patent has already been issued, there is no certainty as to whether it will be upheld. The new guidelines will provide a thorough, consistent, and logical application of the current law on subject matter eligibility.

This guidance does not expand on the Supreme Court holdings in Alice. This guidance does not expand on recent lower court rulings that certain inventions are patent eligible under the Alice test. It does not ignore other decisions nor distort the law, but rather acknowledges and solves the conundrum of confusing and apparently contradictory holdings. Adoption of this guidance will provide order, clarity, uniformity, and reduce disputes over section 101 in the courts and the USPTO.

Thank you for your effort to position the United States to retake the lead in the next wave of technological innovation in areas like quantum computing, artificial intelligence, and combustion engines, for example. Protection for discoveries in these fields, and others, is the absolute best way to promote progress in science and useful arts in our modern day and for our successful path forward.

Sincerely,

Arnold J Beal

[address redacted]

[phone number redacted]

The Beal Engine [www.BeaEngine.com](http://www.BeaEngine.com)

Tennessee Inventors Association [www.TIAInventors.org](http://www.TIAInventors.org)

From: Jeff Lease

Sent: Thursday, March 7, 2019 8:16 AM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: 2019 eligibility

I am passing this on from a friend of mine, he is also invested in the patent ownership space:

I write in support of the 2019 Revised Patent Subject Matter Eligibility Guidance.

Whatever one's opinion is of Alice/Mayo, whether pro or con, one thing is certain- they are a major source of unpredictability, uncertainty and confusion, and are in desperate need of clarification. These cases have been and are a cause of unnecessary harm to many and their interpretive obscurity allows for abuse. I wholeheartedly support the implementation of the Guidelines and applaud Director Iancu for both directly addressing the issue and solving it in an unbiased and impartial manner.

Peter Ryan Brady Esq.

From: David Breed  
Sent: Thursday, March 7, 2019 4:16 PM  
To: Eligibility2019  
Subject: 2019 Revised Patent Subject Matter Eligibility

Hello,

I am an inventor with approximately 500 pending and granted US patents. Among my many inventions is the airbag crash sensor which went into production on 90% of the world's airbag vehicles in the 1990s. For this, I was awarded the H.H.Bless award as one of the 12 inventors of the airbag and an award for engineering excellence from NHTSA. I now run two small innovative companies.

Approximately 200 of my patents were transferred to an Acacia Research Corporation subsidiary just before the AIA was passed by Congress. Acacia valued the portfolio at between \$50-\$500 million. Due to the AIA and various Supreme Court decisions, they now value this portfolio at \$0. As a result, we have transferred our main focus to China where we perceive there is greater respect for inventions. We do not expect to ever be able to enforce our US patents and now look at them only as a license to practice our own inventions. For example, we are now developing what we think will be a revolutionary invention in the education industry but we expect that if it is successful the large tech companies will practice "efficient infringement", a practice where they steal inventions knowing that they are likely to prevail in the PTAB.

I write in support of the 2019 Revised Patent Subject Matter Eligibility Guidance. This guidance will improve the clarity, consistency, and predictability of examination and post-issuance review of patents by the USPTO. Recent rulings by the courts and the USPTO have been ambiguous and contradictory. Even experienced attorneys are not able to advise inventors as to whether their inventions are patentable. In cases where a patent has already been issued, there is no certainty as to whether it will be upheld. The new guidelines will provide a thorough, consistent, and logical application of the current law on subject matter eligibility.

This guidance does not expand on the Supreme Court holdings in Alice. This guidance does not expand on recent lower court rulings that certain inventions are patent eligible under the Alice test. It does not ignore other decisions nor distort the law, but rather acknowledges and solves the conundrum of confusing and apparently contradictory holdings. Adoption of this guidance will provide order, clarity, uniformity, and reduce disputes over section 101 in the courts and the USPTO.

Thank you for your effort to position the United States to retake the lead in the next wave of technological innovation in areas like quantum computing, artificial intelligence, and medical diagnostics. Protection for discoveries in these fields is the absolute best way to promote progress in science and useful arts in our modern day.

David S. Breed, Ph.D  
Chairman  
Automotive Technologies International, Inc.  
Intelligent Technologies International, Inc.

From: George Burkhardt

Sent: Thursday, March 7, 2019 11:38 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: 2019 Revised Patent Subject Matter Eligibility Guidance Support

USPTO Staff,

I write in support of the 2019 Revised Patent Subject Matter Eligibility Guidance. This guidance will improve the clarity, consistency, and predictability of examination and post issuance review of patents by the USPTO. Recent rulings by the courts and the USPTO have been ambiguous and contradictory. Even experienced attorneys are not able advise inventors as to whether their inventions are patentable. In cases where a patent has already been issued, there is no certainty as to whether it will be upheld. The new guidelines will provide a thorough, consistent, and logical application of the current law on subject matter eligibility.

This guidance does not expand on the Supreme Court holdings in Alice. This guidance does not expand on recent lower court rulings that certain inventions are patent eligible under the Alice test. It does not ignore other decisions nor distort the law, but rather acknowledges and solves the conundrum of confusing and apparently contradictory holdings. Adoption of this guidance will provide order, clarity, uniformity, and reduce disputes over section 101 in the courts and the USPTO.

Thank you for yours effort to position the United States to retake the lead in the next wave of technological innovation in areas like quantum computing, artificial intelligence, medical diagnostics and innovation in general. Protection for discoveries in these fields is the absolute best way to promote progress in science and useful arts in our modern day.

Best Regards,

George Burkhardt

VP Alamo Inventors

From: Doug Comer

Sent: Thursday, March 7, 2019 11:42 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Patent Reform

I write in support of the 2019 Revised Patent Subject Matter Eligibility Guidance. This guidance will improve the clarity, consistency, and predictability of examination and post issuance review of patents by the USPTO. Recent rulings by the courts and the USPTO have been ambiguous and contradictory. Even experienced attorneys are not able advise inventors as to whether their inventions are patentable. In cases where a patent has already been issued, there is no certainty as to whether it will be upheld. The new guidelines will provide a thorough, consistent, and logical application of the current law on subject matter eligibility.

This guidance does not expand on the Supreme Court holdings in Alice. This guidance does not expand on recent lower court rulings that certain inventions are patent eligible under the Alice test. It does not ignore other decisions nor distort the law, but rather acknowledges and solves the conundrum of confusing and apparently contradictory holdings. Adoption of this guidance will provide order, clarity, uniformity, and reduce disputes over section 101 in the courts and the USPTO.

Thank you for yours effort to position the United States to retake the lead in the next wave of technological innovation in areas like quantum computing, artificial intelligence, and medical diagnostics. Protection for discoveries in these fields is the absolute best way to promote progress in science and useful arts in our modern day.

Sincerely,

Doug Comer, Phoenix, AZ

[phone number redacted]

From: Lori Cooper

Sent: Thursday, March 7, 2019 4:15 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Support of the 2019 Revised Patent Subject Matter Eligibility Guidance.

The Honorable Andrei Iancu,

Under Secretary of Commerce for Intellectual Property and

Director of the United States Patent and Trademark Office.

Dear Mr. Iancu,

I strongly support the 2019 Revised Patent Subject Matter Eligibility Guidance. Determining subject matter eligibility for patenting has become complicated as well as a serious threat to valuable inventions deserving protection. Currently of concern is that protection for valuable discoveries are being improperly taken away due to specious subject matter eligibility arguments. This guidance will improve the clarity, consistency, and predictability of examination and post issuance review of patents by the USPTO.

Sincerely,

Lorelei M. Cooper

From: Steve Crews

Sent: Thursday, March 7, 2019 9:17 AM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: support for issuing the 2019 Revised Patent Subject Matter Eligibility Guidelines

I write in support of the 2019 Revised Patent Subject Matter Eligibility Guidance.

Whatever one's opinion is of Alice/Mayo, whether pro or con, one thing is certain- they are a major source of unpredictability, uncertainty and confusion, and are in desperate need of clarification. These cases have been and are a cause of unnecessary harm to many and their interpretive obscurity allows for abuse. I wholeheartedly support the implementation of the Guidelines and applaud Director Iancu for both directly addressing the issue and solving it in an unbiased and impartial manner. Let's get it done and stop the efficient infringing by those with large check books...armies of lawyers who take advantage of confusion

Thank you.

Stephen L Crews

From: Juan David

Sent: Thursday, March 7, 2019 10:52 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: 2019 Revised Patent Subject Matter Eligibility Guidance

I write in support of the 2019 Revised Patent Subject Matter Eligibility Guidance. This guidance will improve the clarity, consistency, and predictability of examination and post issuance review of patents by the USPTO. Recent rulings by the courts and the USPTO have been ambiguous and contradictory. Even experienced attorneys are not able advise inventors as to whether their inventions are patentable. In cases where a patent has already been issued, there is no certainty as to whether it will be upheld. The new guidelines will provide a thorough, consistent, and logical application of the current law on subject matter eligibility.

This guidance does not expand on the Supreme Court holdings in Alice. This guidance does not expand on recent lower court rulings that certain inventions are patent eligible under the Alice test. It does not ignore other decisions nor distort the law, but rather acknowledges and solves the conundrum of confusing and apparently contradictory holdings. Adoption of this guidance will provide order, clarity, uniformity, and reduce disputes over section 101 in the courts and the USPTO.

Thank you for yours effort to position the United States to retake the lead in the next wave of technological innovation in areas like quantum computing, artificial intelligence, and medical diagnostics. Protection for discoveries in these fields is the absolute best way to promote progress in science and useful arts in our modern day.

Live long and prosper...Juan V. David, MUP, PhB

From: William Deaton

Sent: Thursday, March 7, 2019 9:52 AM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: 2019 Revised Patent Subject Matter Eligibility Guidance

I urge the adoption of the 2019 Revised Patent Subject Matter Eligibility Guidance. It is imperative to improve the clarity, consistency, and predictability of examination and post issuance review of patents by the USPTO. Recent rulings by the courts and the USPTO have been ambiguous and contradictory. Even experienced attorneys are not able advise inventors as to whether their inventions are patentable. In cases where a patent has already been issued, there is no certainty as to whether it will be upheld. The new guidelines will provide a thorough, consistent, and logical application of the current law on subject matter eligibility.

It is past time for the USPTO to lead in the efforts to make our patent system more predictable and to provide the strong protection for inventors and creators that our founders intended when a patent system was included in the Constitution. Adoption of this guidance will provide order, clarity, uniformity, and reduce disputes over section 101 in the courts and the USPTO.

The United States should retake its leading role with regard to intellectual property in the next wave of technological innovation in areas like quantum computing, artificial intelligence, and medical diagnostics. Protection for discoveries in these fields is the absolute best way to promote progress in science and useful arts in our modern day.

Regards,

William Deaton

From: Daniel DellaVecchia  
Sent: Friday, March 8, 2019 7:27 AM  
To: Eligibility2019  
Subject: Patents

I write in support of the 2019 Revised Patent Subject Matter Eligibility Guidance. This guidance will improve the clarity, consistency, and predictability of examination and post issuance review of patents by the USPTO. Recent rulings by the courts and the USPTO have been ambiguous and contradictory. Even experienced attorneys are not able advise inventors as to whether their inventions are patentable. In cases where a patent has already been issued, there is no certainty as to whether it will be upheld. The new guidelines will provide a thorough, consistent, and logical application of the current law on subject matter eligibility.

This guidance does not expand on the Supreme Court holdings in Alice. This guidance does not expand on recent lower court rulings that certain inventions are patent eligible under the Alice test. It does not ignore other decisions nor distort the law, but rather acknowledges and solves the conundrum of confusing and apparently contradictory holdings. Adoption of this guidance will provide order, clarity, uniformity, and reduce disputes over section 101 in the courts and the USPTO.

Thank you for yours effort to position the United States to retake the lead in the next wave of technological innovation in areas like quantum computing, artificial intelligence, and medical diagnostics. Protection for discoveries in these fields is the absolute best way to promote progress in science and useful arts in our modern day.

Respectfully;

Daniel DellaVecchia

From: Lisa Dennis

Sent: Friday, March 8, 2019 10:18 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: 2019 Revises Patent Subject Matter Eligibility Guidance

the 2019 Revised Patent Subject Matter Eligibility Guidance.

This guidance improve the clarity, consistency, and predictability of examination and post issuance review of patents by the USPTO.

Without the Guidance, neither inventors nor patent attorney have certainty as to whether their inventions are patentable. In cases where a patent has already been issued, there is no certainty as to whether it will be upheld.

The new guidelines provide a logical application of the current law on subject matter eligibility.

Adoption of this guidance will provide clarity and reduce disputes over section 101 in the courts and the USPTO.

Protection for new discoveries is the absolute best way to promote progress in science and useful arts in our modern day.

From: wendy denzel

Sent: Thursday, March 7, 2019 11:52 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: 2019 Revised Patent Subject Matter

I write in support of the 2019 Revised Patent Subject Matter Eligibility Guidance. This guidance will improve the clarity, consistency, and predictability of examination and post issuance review of patents by the USPTO. Recent rulings by the courts and the USPTO have been ambiguous and contradictory. Even experienced attorneys are not able advise inventors as to whether their inventions are patentable. In cases where a patent has already been issued, there is no certainty as to whether it will be upheld. The new guidelines will provide a thorough, consistent, and logical application of the current law on subject matter eligibility.

This guidance does not expand on the Supreme Court holdings in Alice. This guidance does not expand on recent lower court rulings that certain inventions are patent eligible under the Alice test. It does not ignore other decisions nor distort the law, but rather acknowledges and solves the conundrum of confusing and apparently contradictory holdings. Adoption of this guidance will provide order, clarity, uniformity, and reduce disputes over section 101 in the courts and the USPTO.

Thank you for yours effort to position the United States to retake the lead in the next wave of technological innovation in areas like quantum computing, artificial intelligence, and medical diagnostics. Protection for discoveries in these fields is the absolute best way to promote progress in science and useful arts in our modern day.

From: Mike duToit

Sent: Thursday, March 7, 2019 2:59 AM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Letter in support of the 2019 Revised Patent Subject Matter Eligibility Guidance.

To whom it may concern,

I write in support of the 2019 Revised Patent Subject Matter Eligibility Guidance. This guidance will improve the clarity, consistency, and predictability of examination and post issuance review of patents by the USPTO. Recent rulings by the courts and the USPTO have been ambiguous and contradictory. Even experienced attorneys are not able advise inventors as to whether their inventions are patentable. In cases where a patent has already been issued, there is no certainty as to whether it will be upheld. The new guidelines will provide a thorough, consistent, and logical application of the current law on subject matter eligibility.

This guidance does not expand on the Supreme Court holdings in Alice. This guidance does not expand on recent lower court rulings that certain inventions are patent eligible under the Alice test. It does not ignore other decisions nor distort the law, but rather acknowledges and solves the conundrum of confusing and apparently contradictory holdings. Adoption of this guidance will provide order, clarity, uniformity, and reduce disputes over section 101 in the courts and the USPTO.

Thank you for yours effort to position the United States to retake the lead in the next wave of technological innovation in areas like quantum computing, artificial intelligence, and medical diagnostics. Protection for discoveries in these fields is the absolute best way to promote progress in science and useful arts in our modern day.

thanks

Mike du Toit

[phone number redacted]

From: Glen

Sent: Thursday, March 7, 2019 7:31 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: support of the 2019 Revised Patent Subject Matter Eligibility Guidance

I Glen Wade Duff write in support of the 2019 Revised Patent Subject Matter Eligibility Guidance. This guidance will improve the clarity, consistency, and predictability of examination and post issuance review of patents by the USPTO. Recent rulings by the courts and the USPTO have been ambiguous and contradictory. Even experienced attorneys are not able advise inventors as to whether their inventions are patentable. In cases where a patent has already been issued, there is no certainty as to whether it will be upheld. The new guidelines will provide a thorough, consistent, and logical application of the current law on subject matter eligibility.

This guidance does not expand on the Supreme Court holdings in Alice. This guidance does not expand on recent lower court rulings that certain inventions are patent eligible under the Alice test. It does not ignore other decisions nor distort the law, but rather acknowledges and solves the conundrum of confusing and apparently contradictory holdings. Adoption of this guidance will provide order, clarity, uniformity, and reduce disputes over section 101 in the courts and the USPTO.

Thank you for your effort to position the United States to retake the lead in the next wave of technological innovation in areas like quantum computing, artificial intelligence, and medical diagnostics. Protection for discoveries in these fields is the absolute best way to promote progress in science and useful arts in our modern day.

Cheers,

Glen Duff

As Seen On SHARK TANK!

It's as easy as believing it can be done

[phone number redacted]

ZUP.com

With this Board, EveryBody getZUP!

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE:

The contents of this email message and any attachments are intended solely for the addressee(s) and may contain confidential and/or privileged information and may be legally protected from disclosure.

From: eliotinc

Sent: Thursday, March 7, 2019 10:05 AM

To: eligibility2019@uspto.gov

Subject: 2019 Revised Patent Subject Matter Eligibility Guidance

I write in support of the 2019 Revised Patent Subject Matter Eligibility Guidance. This guidance will improve the clarity, consistency, and predictability of examination and post issuance review of patents by the USPTO. Recent rulings by the courts and the USPTO have been ambiguous and contradictory. Even experienced attorneys are not able advise inventors as to whether their inventions are patentable. In cases where a patent has already been issued, there is no certainty as to whether it will be upheld. The new guidelines will provide a thorough, consistent, and logical application of the current law on subject matter eligibility.

This guidance does not expand on the Supreme Court holdings in Alice. This guidance does not expand on recent lower court rulings that certain inventions are patent eligible under the Alice test. It does not ignore other decisions nor distort the law, but rather acknowledges and solves the conundrum of confusing and apparently contradictory holdings. Adoption of this guidance will provide order, clarity, uniformity, and reduce disputes over section 101 in the courts and the USPTO.

Thank you for your effort to position the United States to retake the lead in the next wave of technological innovation in areas like quantum computing, artificial intelligence, and medical diagnostics. Protection for discoveries in these fields is the absolute best way to promote progress in science and useful arts in our modern day.

Thanks,

Eliot Evans

[address redacted]

From: Guy Fielder

Sent: Thursday, March 7, 2019 10:06 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Support for restoring property rights for patents

I am the named inventor on 24 patents with additional patents allowed, but yet to be issued; and, several patents pending. I write in support of the 2019 Revised Patent Subject Matter Eligibility Guidance. This guidance will improve the clarity, consistency, and predictability of examination and post issuance review of patents by the USPTO. Recent rulings by the courts and the USPTO have been ambiguous and contradictory. Even experienced attorneys are not able to advise inventors as to whether their inventions are patentable. In cases where a patent has been issued, there is no certainty as to whether it will be upheld. The new guidelines will provide a thorough, consistent, and logical application of the current law on subject matter eligibility.

This guidance does not expand on the Supreme Court holdings in Alice. This guidance does not expand on recent lower court rulings that certain inventions are patent eligible under the Alice test. It does not ignore other decisions nor distort the law, but rather acknowledges and solves the conundrum of confusing and apparently contradictory holdings. Adoption of this guidance will provide order, clarity, uniformity, and reduce disputes over section 101 in the courts and the USPTO.

Thank you for yours effort to position the United States to retake the lead in the next wave of technological innovation in areas like quantum computing, artificial intelligence, and medical diagnostics. Protection for discoveries in these fields is the absolute best way to promote progress in science and useful arts in our modern day.

Try to imagine an oil company drilling and producing your minerals and telling you since you are not in the oil business they owe you no royalty.

Thank You,

Guy Fielder

PACid Technologies, LLC

[phone number redacted]

From: billgaudino

Sent: Thursday, March 7, 2019 9:53 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: 2019 Revised Subject Matter Eligibility Guidance

To Whom it May Concern

I write in support of the 2019 Revised Patent Subject Matter Eligibility Guidance. This guidance will improve the clarity, consistency, and predictability of examination and post issuance review of patents by the USPTO. Recent rulings by the courts and the USPTO have been ambiguous and contradictory. Even experienced attorneys are not able advise inventors as to whether their inventions are patentable. In cases where a patent has already been issued, there is no certainty as to whether it will be upheld. The new guidelines will provide a thorough, consistent, and logical application of the current law on subject matter eligibility.

This guidance does not expand on the Supreme Court holdings in Alice. This guidance does not expand on recent lower court rulings that certain inventions are patent eligible under the Alice test. It does not ignore other decisions nor distort the law, but rather acknowledges and solves the conundrum of confusing and apparently contradictory holdings. Adoption of this guidance will rightfully provide order, clarity, uniformity, and reduce disputes over section 101 in the courts and the USPTO.

Thank you for your effort to once again position the United States to retake the lead in the next wave of technological innovation in areas like quantum computing, artificial intelligence, and medical diagnostics. Protection for discoveries in these fields is the absolute best way to promote progress in science and useful arts in our modern day.

Respectfully Yours

Bill Gaudino

From: Mark Greenstein

Sent: Friday, March 8, 2019 6:14 AM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Comment

I am an individual inventor and write in support of the 2019 Revised Patent Subject Matter Eligibility Guidance. This guidance will improve the clarity, consistency, and predictability of examination and post issuance review of patents by the USPTO. Recent rulings by the courts and the USPTO have been ambiguous and contradictory. Even experienced attorneys are not able advise inventors as to whether their inventions are patentable. In cases where a patent has already been issued, there is no certainty as to whether it will be upheld. The new guidelines will provide a thorough, consistent, and logical application of the current law on subject matter eligibility.

This is critical for small inventors. As you know there has been a precipitous decline in applications by small inventors. One of the reasons for this is the uncertainty surrounding patent eligibility. For small inventors, this means that: additional risk concerning whether they can receive patent protection and increased costs and risks in obtaining and enforcing a patent

In prosecuting patents, under the prior practice, examiners have provided, and obstinately cling to rote objections which do not relate to the claims. If the Guidance is adopted and the Director properly polices and enforces conduct by Examiners and the Board of Patent Appeals, this should be much reduced.

Reducing costs and uncertainty by providing for a more uniform process will encourage innovation by small inventors, who lack the resources of larger companies. The plight of the small inventor is exacerbated by the fact larger companies frame issues and lobby very effectively for their own interests, which are typically adverse to disruptive innovation. In many cases these larger companies present their desired changes as beneficial to small inventors (e.g., patent trolls harassing small businesses) even though they know that their proposed changes will harm small inventors. This is demonstrated by the decline in applications by small inventors after implementation of changes sought by larger companies.

The Guidelines are a step in the right direction to encourage innovation. The following articles by prominent law firms provide a sense of what such firms actually believe when not being paid by large clients. In each case they conclude that the guidelines are not improper.

<https://www.bilskiblog.com/2019/02/2019-eligibility-guidance-example/#more-3960>

<https://www.ropesgray.com/en/newsroom/podcasts/2019/February/Podcast-Patentable-Subject-Matter-in-2019>

Finally, while it is tempting when evaluating comments to simply “count noses” or the number of comments advocating for each position, I urge you to reconsider such an approach here. Instead, please

take into account that small inventors are outgunned and that we have less than 1% of the resources to devote to lobbying/comments as compared with larger entities, and the effect of such disparity on small inventor patent applications, when evaluating the comments.

Very truly yours,

Mark Greenstein

From: Brent Hambrick

Sent: Friday, March 8, 2019 5:41 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Support 2019 Revised Patent Subject Matter Eligibility Guidance

We write to you in support of the 2019 Revised Patent Subject Matter Eligibility Guidance because it will improve the clarity, consistency, and predictability of examination and post issuance review of patents by the USPTO.

Ambiguity and inconsistency in recent rulings by the courts and the USPTO—due to unclear guidelines—have left inventors and would-be inventors dispirited. Our nation depends upon persistent and ceaseless innovation to maintain its competitive edge in the global economy, to provide excellence in healthcare solutions, and to uphold national security. Without consistent patent protection, inventors will cease to invent; producers will cease to produce.

Protection for discoveries and technological innovation in fields such as medical diagnostics, artificial intelligence, and quantum computing is the absolute best way to promote progress in science and useful arts in our modern world. Thank you for your efforts to position the United States to regain its advantage in these important areas by the adoption of these new guidelines!

Regards,

Dr. & Mrs. Brent A. Hambrick

From: C Hambrick

Sent: Friday, March 8, 2019 4:59 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: 2019 Revised Patent Subject Matter Eligibility Guidance

Dear Sirs,

I am writing you in support of the 2019 Revised Patent Subject Matter Eligibility Guidance. This guidance will improve the clarity, consistency, and predictability of examination and post issuance review of patents by the USPTO. Recent rulings by the courts and the USPTO have been ambiguous and contradictory. Even experienced attorneys are not able to advise inventors as to whether or not their inventions are patentable. In cases where a patent has already been issued, there is no certainty as to whether that patent will be upheld. The new guidelines will provide a thorough, consistent, and logical application of the current law on subject matter eligibility.

This guidance does not expand on the Supreme Court holdings in Alice. This guidance does not expand on recent lower court rulings that certain inventions are patent eligible under the Alice test. It neither ignores other decisions nor distorts the law; rather, it acknowledges and solves the conundrum of confusing and apparently contradictory holdings. Adoption of this guidance will provide order, clarity, uniformity, and reduction of disputes over section 101 in the courts and the USPTO.

Thank you for your efforts to position the United States to retake the lead in the next wave of technological innovation in areas like quantum computing, artificial intelligence, and medical diagnostics. Protection for discoveries in these fields is the absolute best way to promote progress in science and useful arts in our modern day.

The adoption of these new guidelines will help to ensure consistent, predictable, and correct application of current law across the agency.

Sincerely,

C M Hambrick

"Master, which is the great commandment in the law?

Jesus said unto him, Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind. This is the first and great commandment. And the second is like unto it, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself.

On these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets. "

Matthew 22:36-40

From: ghambrickg

Sent: Friday, March 8, 2019 6:53 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: 2019 Revised Patent Subject Matter Eligibility Guidance

I write in support of the 2019 Revised Patent Subject Matter Eligibility Guidance. This guidance will improve the clarity, consistency, and predictability of examination and post issuance review of patents by the USPTO. Recent rulings by the courts and the USPTO have been ambiguous and contradictory. Even experienced attorneys are not able to advise inventors as to whether or not their inventions are patentable. In cases where a patent has already been issued, there is no certainty as to whether it will be upheld. The new guidelines will provide a thorough, consistent, and logical application of the current law on subject matter eligibility.

This guidance does not expand upon the Supreme Court holdings in Alice. This guidance does not expand on recent lower court rulings that certain inventions are patent eligible under the Alice test. It does not ignore other decisions nor does it distort the law, but rather it acknowledges and solves the conundrum of confusing and apparently contradictory holdings. Adoption of this guidance will provide order, clarity, uniformity, and will reduce disputes over section 101 in the courts and the USPTO.

Thank you for your effort to position the United States to retake the lead in the next wave of technological innovation in areas like quantum computing, artificial intelligence, and medical diagnostics. Protection for discoveries in these fields is the absolute best way to promote progress in science and useful arts in our modern day.

Sincerely,

Grace Hannah Hambrick, RDH

From: Gail Helton

Sent: Thursday, March 7, 2019 11:01 AM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject:

I write in support of the 2019 Revised Patent Subject Matter Eligibility Guidance. This guidance will improve the clarity, consistency, and predictability of examination and post issuance review of patents by the USPTO. Recent rulings by the courts and the USPTO have been ambiguous and contradictory. Even experienced attorneys are not able advise inventors as to whether their inventions are patentable. In cases where a patent has already been issued, there is no certainty as to whether it will be upheld. The new guidelines will provide a thorough, consistent, and logical application of the current law on subject matter eligibility.

This guidance does not expand on the Supreme Court holdings in Alice. This guidance does not expand on recent lower court rulings that certain inventions are patent eligible under the Alice test. It does not ignore other decisions nor distort the law, but rather acknowledges and solves the conundrum of confusing and apparently contradictory holdings. Adoption of this guidance will provide order, clarity, uniformity, and reduce disputes over section 101 in the courts and the USPTO.

Thank you for yours effort to position the United States to retake the lead in the next wave of technological innovation in areas like quantum computing, artificial intelligence, and medical diagnostics. Protection for discoveries in these fields is the absolute best way to promote progress in science and useful arts in our modern day.

--

Thank you,

Gail Helton

From: Odessa Jenkins

Sent: Friday, March 8, 2019 10:03 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: 2019 Revised Patent Subject Matter Eligibility Guidance.

This guidance improves the clarity, consistency, and predictability of examination and post issuance review of patents by the USPTO.

Without the Guidance, neither inventors nor patent attorney have certainty as to whether their inventions are patentable. In cases where a patent has already been issued, there is no certainty as to whether it will be upheld.

The new guidelines provide a logical application of the current law on subject matter eligibility.

Adoption of this guidance will provide clarity and reduce disputes over section 101 in the courts and the USPTO.

Protection for new discoveries is the absolute best way to promote progress in science and useful arts in our modern day.

Sincerely,

An Inventor

From: PJKeller

Sent: Thursday, March 7, 2019 1:31 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: 2019 Revised Patent Subject Matter Eligibility Guidance

Greetings!

I write to support the 2019 Revised Patent Subject Matter Eligibility Guidance [Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053]. This guidance will improve clarity, consistency and predictability of both examinations and post issuance reviews of patents by the USPTO.

Recent rulings by the US courts and USPTO have been ambiguous and contradictory. Even highly experienced attorneys are unable to advise inventors on whether their inventions are indeed patentable. Where a patent has already issued, there is no certainty that it can or will be upheld. These new guidelines will provide a thorough, consistent and logical application of the current law on subject matter eligibility.

This guidance does not expand on the Supreme Court holdings in Alice.

This guidance also does not expand on recent lower court rulings that certain inventions are patent eligible under the Alice test. It does not ignore other decisions nor distort the law, but rather acknowledges and addresses the conundrum of confusing and apparently contradictory holdings. Adoption of this much needed guidance will provide order, clarity and uniformity to, and reduce disputes over, section 101 in the courts and the USPTO.

Thank you for your efforts to position the United States to retake the lead in technological innovation areas such as quantum computing, artificial intelligence and medical diagnostics. Intellectual property protection for discoveries in these fields is absolutely critical, and the only way to promote the progress of science and useful arts in our modern day.

Sincerely,

Peter J. Keller, Manager/President

--

Advanced Audio Devices LLC

P.O. Box 769

Lake Forest, IL 60045

Tel: [phone number redacted]

Fax: [fax number redacted]

From: Glen Kotapish

Sent: Friday, March 8, 2019 12:31 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Feedback Concerning 2019 Revised Patent Subject Matter Eligibility Guidance

Dear Andrei Iancu, Director of the US Patent & Trademark Office,

Thank you for asking for feedback from the USPTO's user community of companies, inventors and attorneys concerning 2019 Revised Patent Subject Matter Eligibility Guidance.

Today I am writing to share my support of the 2019 Revised Patent Subject Matter Eligibility Guidance. These guidelines will improve the examination of patent applications and post issuance review of granted patents by the USPTO. The guidelines help ensure these procedures be performed with more predictability and consistency.

This guidance does not expand on the Supreme Court holdings in Alice nor on recent lower court rulings that certain inventions are patent eligible under the Alice test. It does not ignore other decisions nor distort the law, but rather acknowledges and solves the conundrum of confusing and apparently contradictory holdings. Adoption of this guidance will provide order, clarity, uniformity, and reduce disputes over section 101 in the courts and the USPTO.

Issued patents that stand the test of time are patents that are examined fairly and thoroughly as applications using clear and consistent rules. When and if patents are tested via the PTAB or other avenues of challenge, issued patents that were granted under a clear, consistent, rigorous and fair examination process, should be reviewed in a consistent, rigorous and fair re-examination process using clear rules. Both areas of the USPTO, the issuing part and the patent review system, need to operate with the equal levels of clarity, consistency, based on clear language unambiguous rules that are applied consistently.

Not long before the passing of the AIA I was invited to the USPTO to participate in a panel discussion concerning many of the proposals of this proposed legislation. I shared that such sweeping changes to the way the US patent system had been operating for many years will add more uncertainty than certainty. Unfortunately, recent rulings by the courts and the USPTO have been ambiguous and contradictory – and unfortunately reflect the warnings concerning uncertainty I shared with the panel over seven years ago. Experienced attorneys are not able to advise inventors as to whether their inventions are patentable. In cases where a patent has already been issued, there is no certainty as to whether it will be upheld. The new guidelines will provide a thorough, consistent, and logical application of the current law on subject matter eligibility.

Certainty is vital to the US economy at many levels. Startups and entrepreneurs benefit from receiving quality patents granted via a system that works with clarity. A quality patent helps them secure investment. Established businesses benefit from patents issued by a clear patenting system by being

able to invest in patented product lines enabling them to get a return on this investment. A patent system that works with clarity promotes creation of new businesses, jobs, and brings many innovations to market benefiting society as a whole.

Thank you again for seeking feedback concerning this issue. Also, thank you for providing guidance that will bring more certainty to the US patent system.

Sincerely,

Glen Kotapish

From: Michael John Lee

Sent: Thursday, March 7, 2019 3:34 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Patent matter eligibility

I write in strong support for the 2019 Revised Patent Subject Matter Eligibility Guidance as proposed by Director Iancu. I believe it will strengthen our US patent system for the overall betterment of our country. Too much confusion and unpredictability has appeared after the AIA legislation which I feel will eventually discourage inventors from bringing their ideas and inventions to the USPTO. Post patent challenges are now being abused by some large corporations as they blatantly infringe, and then if challenged file IPRs and drag out the fight in both federal courts and the PTAB court system, which in themselves are sometimes contradictory. Small inventors have no chance to win even if their patent could be proved valid due to the high cost to wage these court battles. This is unfair and amoral. The PTAB "court" system is as close to a sham as can be and a blemish to the USPTO. Director Iancu's proposed changes are urgently needed.

Michael J. Lee, M.D.

From: Michael John Lee

Sent: Thursday, March 7, 2019 3:34 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Patent matter eligibility

I write in strong support for the 2019 Revised Patent Subject Matter Eligibility Guidance as proposed by Director Iancu. I believe it will strengthen our US patent system for the overall betterment of our country. Too much confusion and unpredictability has appeared after the AIA legislation which I feel will eventually discourage inventors from bringing their ideas and inventions to the USPTO. Post patent challenges are now being abused by some large corporations as they blatantly infringe, and then if challenged file IPRs and drag out the fight in both federal courts and the PTAB court system, which in themselves are sometimes contradictory. Small inventors have no chance to win even if their patent could be proved valid due to the high cost to wage these court battles. This is unfair and amoral. The PTAB "court" system is as close to a sham as can be and a blemish to the USPTO. Director Iancu's proposed changes are urgently needed.

Michael J. Lee, M.D.

From: martha lizarraga

Sent: Thursday, March 7, 2019 2:31 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: 2019 revised patent

I write in support of the 2019 Revised Patent Subject Matter Eligibility Guidance. This guidance will improve the clarity, consistency, and predictability of examination and post issuance review of patents by the USPTO. Recent rulings by the courts and the USPTO have been ambiguous and contradictory. Even experienced attorneys are not able advise inventors as to whether their inventions are patentable. In cases where a patent has already been issued, there is no certainty as to whether it will be upheld. The new guidelines will provide a thorough, consistent, and logical application of the current law on subject matter eligibility.

This guidance does not expand on the Supreme Court holdings in Alice. This guidance does not expand on recent lower court rulings that certain inventions are patent eligible under the Alice test. It does not ignore other decisions nor distort the law, but rather acknowledges and solves the conundrum of confusing and apparently contradictory holdings. Adoption of this guidance will provide order, clarity, uniformity, and reduce disputes over section 101 in the courts and the USPTO.

Thank you for yours effort to position the United States to retake the lead in the next wave of technological innovation in areas like quantum computing, artificial intelligence, and medical diagnostics. Protection for discoveries in these fields is the absolute best way to promote progress in science and useful arts in our modern day.

Martha L.

From: Kieran Loughran

Sent: Thursday, March 7, 2019 12:51 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: 2019 Revised Patent Subject Matter Eligibility Guidance

I write in support of the 2019 Revised Patent Subject Matter Eligibility Guidance. This guidance will improve the clarity, consistency, and predictability of examination and post issuance review of patents by the USPTO. Recent rulings by the courts and the USPTO have been ambiguous and contradictory. Even experienced attorneys are not able advise inventors as to whether their inventions are patentable. In cases where a patent has already been issued, there is no certainty as to whether it will be upheld. The new guidelines will provide a thorough, consistent, and logical application of the current law on subject matter eligibility.

This guidance does not expand on the Supreme Court holdings in Alice. This guidance does not expand on recent lower court rulings that certain inventions are patent eligible under the Alice test. It does not ignore other decisions nor distort the law, but rather acknowledges and solves the conundrum of confusing and apparently contradictory holdings. Adoption of this guidance will provide order, clarity, uniformity, and reduce disputes over section 101 in the courts and the USPTO.

Thank you for yours effort to position the United States to retake the lead in the next wave of technological innovation in areas like quantum computing, artificial intelligence, and medical diagnostics. Protection for discoveries in these fields is the absolute best way to promote progress in science and useful arts in our modern day.

Kieran Loughran

106 Dahill Rd.

Brooklyn, NY 11218

From: johnmolloy345

Sent: Friday, March 8, 2019 11:43 AM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: 2019 Revised Patent Subject Matter Eligibility Guidance

I write in support of the 2019 Revised Patent Subject Matter Eligibility Guidance. This guidance will improve the clarity, consistency, and predictability of examination and post issuance review of patents by the USPTO. Recent rulings by the courts and the USPTO have been ambiguous and contradictory. Even experienced attorneys are not able advise inventors as to whether their inventions are patentable. In cases where a patent has already been issued, there is no certainty as to whether it will be upheld. The new guidelines will provide a thorough, consistent, and logical application of the current law on subject matter eligibility.

This guidance does not expand on the Supreme Court holdings in Alice. This guidance does not expand on recent lower court rulings that certain inventions are patent eligible under the Alice test. It does not ignore other decisions nor distort the law, but rather acknowledges and solves the conundrum of confusing and apparently contradictory holdings. Adoption of this guidance will provide order, clarity, uniformity, and reduce disputes over section 101 in the courts and the USPTO.

Thank you for yours effort to position the United States to retake the lead in the next wave of technological innovation in areas like quantum computing, artificial intelligence, and medical diagnostics. Protection for discoveries in these fields is the absolute best way to promote progress in science and useful arts in our modern day.

Sincerely,

John Molloy

From: Scott Moskowitz

Sent: Thursday, March 7, 2019 8:49 AM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Inventor in support of 2019 Subject Matter Eligibility Guidance

I write in support of the 2019 Revised Patent Subject Matter Eligibility Guidance. This guidance will improve the clarity, consistency, and predictability of examination and post issuance review of patents by the USPTO. Recent rulings by the courts and the USPTO have been ambiguous and contradictory. Even experienced attorneys are not able advise inventors as to whether their inventions are patentable. In cases where a patent has already been issued, there is no certainty as to whether it will be upheld. The new guidelines will provide a thorough, consistent, and logical application of the current law on subject matter eligibility.

This guidance does not expand on the Supreme Court holdings in Alice. This guidance does not expand on recent lower court rulings that certain inventions are patent eligible under the Alice test. It does not ignore other decisions nor distort the law, but rather acknowledges and solves the conundrum of confusing and apparently contradictory holdings. Adoption of this guidance will provide order, clarity, uniformity, and reduce disputes over section 101 in the courts and the USPTO.

Thank you for yours effort to position the United States to retake the lead in the next wave of technological innovation in areas like quantum computing, artificial intelligence, and medical diagnostics. Protection for discoveries in these fields is the absolute best way to promote progress in science and useful arts in our modern day.

Sincerely,

Scott Moskowitz

steganographic cipher

From: Paula Murgia

Sent: Thursday, March 7, 2019 9:46 AM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Open Comments | subject Matter Eligibility

To whom it may concern,

I write in support of the 2019 Revised Patent Subject Matter Eligibility Guidance. This guidance will improve the clarity, consistency, and predictability of examination and post issuance review of patents by the USPTO. Recent rulings by the courts and the USPTO have been ambiguous and contradictory. Even experienced attorneys are not able advise inventors as to whether their inventions are patentable. In cases where a patent has already been issued, there is no certainty as to whether it will be upheld. The new guidelines will provide a thorough, consistent, and logical application of the current law on subject matter eligibility.

This guidance does not expand on the Supreme Court holdings in Alice. This guidance does not expand on recent lower court rulings that certain inventions are patent eligible under the Alice test. It does not ignore other decisions nor distort the law, but rather acknowledges and solves the conundrum of confusing and apparently contradictory holdings. Adoption of this guidance will provide order, clarity, uniformity, and reduce disputes over section 101 in the courts and the USPTO.

Thank you for yours effort to position the United States to retake the lead in the next wave of technological innovation in areas like quantum computing, artificial intelligence, and medical diagnostics. Protection for discoveries in these fields is the absolute best way to promote progress in science and useful arts in our modern day

PJM

[phone number redacted]

Co-Founder: Personal Beasties

Promo Video

From: Steven Olenski

Sent: Thursday, March 7, 2019 5:36 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Support for the 2019 Rev. Patent Subject Matter Eligibility Guidance

TO: Director of the Patent Office

I write in support of the 2019 Revised Patent Subject Matter Eligibility Guidance. This guidance will improve the clarity, consistency, and predictability of examination and post issuance review of patents by the USPTO. Recent rulings by the courts and the USPTO have been ambiguous and contradictory. Even experienced attorneys are not able advise inventors as to whether their inventions are patentable. In cases where a patent has already been issued, there is no certainty as to whether it will be upheld. The new guidelines will provide a thorough, consistent, and logical application of the current law on subject matter eligibility.

This guidance does not expand on the Supreme Court holdings in Alice. This guidance does not expand on recent lower court rulings that certain inventions are patent eligible under the Alice test. It does not ignore other decisions nor distort the law, but rather acknowledges and solves the conundrum of confusing and apparently contradictory holdings. Adoption of this guidance will provide order, clarity, uniformity, and reduce disputes over section 101 in the courts and the USPTO.

Thank you for yours effort to position the United States to retake the lead in the next wave of technological innovation in areas like quantum computing, artificial intelligence, and medical diagnostics. Protection for discoveries in these fields is the absolute best way to promote progress in science and useful arts in our modern day.

Thank you

From: allen passon

Sent: Thursday, March 7, 2019 11:09 AM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: 2019 Revised Patent Subject Matter Eligibility Guidance

I write in support of the 2019 Revised Patent Subject Matter Eligibility Guidance. This guidance will improve the clarity, consistency, and predictability of examination and post issuance review of patents by the USPTO. Recent rulings by the courts and the USPTO have been ambiguous and contradictory. Even experienced attorneys are not able advise inventors as to whether their inventions are patentable. In cases where a patent has already been issued, there is no certainty as to whether it will be upheld. The new guidelines will provide a thorough, consistent, and logical application of the current law on subject matter eligibility.

This guidance does not expand on the Supreme Court holdings in Alice. This guidance does not expand on recent lower court rulings that certain inventions are patent eligible under the Alice test. It does not ignore other decisions nor distort the law, but rather acknowledges and solves the conundrum of confusing and apparently contradictory holdings. Adoption of this guidance will provide order, clarity, uniformity, and reduce disputes over section 101 in the courts and the USPTO.

Thank you for yours effort to position the United States to retake the lead in the next wave of technological innovation in areas like quantum computing, artificial intelligence, and medical diagnostics. Protection for discoveries in these fields is the absolute best way to promote progress in science and useful arts in our modern day.

--

Allen Passon

From: 'Phillip Perez'

Sent: Thursday, March 7, 2019 5:04 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: RE: 2019 Revised Patent Subject Matter Eligibility Guidance...

I write in support of the 2019 Revised Patent Subject Matter Eligibility Guidance. This guidance will improve the clarity, consistency, and predictability of examination and post issuance review of patents by the USPTO. Recent rulings by the courts and the USPTO have been ambiguous and contradictory. Even experienced attorneys are not able advise inventors as to whether their inventions are patentable. In cases where a patent has already been issued, there is no certainty as to whether it will be upheld. The new guidelines will provide a thorough, consistent, and logical application of the current law on subject matter eligibility.

This guidance does not expand on the Supreme Court holdings in Alice. This guidance does not expand on recent lower court rulings that certain inventions are patent eligible under the Alice test. It does not ignore other decisions nor distort the law, but rather acknowledges and solves the conundrum of confusing and apparently contradictory holdings. Adoption of this guidance will provide order, clarity, uniformity, and reduce disputes over section 101 in the courts and the USPTO.

Thank you for yours effort to position the United States to retake the lead in the next wave of technological innovation in areas like quantum computing, artificial intelligence, and medical diagnostics. Protection for discoveries in these fields is the absolute best way to promote progress in science and useful arts in our modern day.

Sincerely,

Phillip Perez

PMP Designs

San Diego, CA

From: Powell, Mark

Sent: Thursday, March 7, 2019 1:09 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: 2019 Revised Subject Matter Eligibility Guidance

I support the 2019 Revised Patent Subject Matter Eligibility Guidance. This guidance will improve the clarity, consistency, and predictability of actions by the USPTO. Going forward stakeholders will know with more certainty which inventions are eligible for a patent and which are not. This guidance is good for innovation and the U.S. economy.

From: Trent Ramsperger

Sent: Friday, March 8, 2019 10:38 AM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: RE: 2019 Revised Patent Subject Matter Eligibility Guidance

I write in support of the 2019 Revised Patent Subject Matter Eligibility Guidance. This guidance will improve the clarity, consistency, and predictability of examination and post issuance review of patents by the USPTO. Recent rulings by the courts and the USPTO have been ambiguous and contradictory. Even experienced attorneys are not able advise inventors as to whether their inventions are patentable. In cases where a patent has already been issued, there is no certainty as to whether it will be upheld. The new guidelines will provide a thorough, consistent, and logical application of the current law on subject matter eligibility.

This guidance does not expand on the Supreme Court holdings in Alice. This guidance does not expand on recent lower court rulings that certain inventions are patent eligible under the Alice test. It does not ignore other decisions nor distort the law, but rather acknowledges and solves the conundrum of confusing and apparently contradictory holdings. Adoption of this guidance will provide order, clarity, uniformity, and reduce disputes over section 101 in the courts and the USPTO.

Thank you for yours effort to position the United States to retake the lead in the next wave of technological innovation in areas like quantum computing, artificial intelligence, and medical diagnostics. Protection for discoveries in these fields is the absolute best way to promote progress in science and useful arts in our modern day.

Trent Ramsperger

Clear Vision Appraisal

From: Peter Reali

Sent: Thursday, March 7, 2019 2:12 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: 2019 Revised Patent Subject Matter Eligibility Guidance, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

To whom it may concern:

This comment is in support the 2019 Revised Patent Subject Matter Eligibility Guidance.

I am a supporter of patent holders rights to his inventions and private property rights. Obscurity in patent law interpretation limits or denies these rights.

The Mayo vs. Prometheus Laboratories Supreme Court decision is a source of unpredictability, uncertainty and confusion, and requires clarification in many cases.

These cases have been and are a cause of unnecessary harm to many patent holders and their interpretive obscurity allows for abuse.

Again, I support the implementation of the Guidelines and thank Director Iancu for both directly addressing the issue and solving it in an unbiased and impartial manner.

Also, thanks to Peter Ryan Brady for his remarks.

Sincerely,

Peter Reali

From: Stephen Reed

Sent: Thursday, March 7, 2019 6:45 AM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: "2019 Revised Patent Subject Matter Eligibility Guidance"

Dear Director of the Patent Office,

I am writing to you today to let you know I support the new Revised Patent Subject Matter Eligibility Guidance for 2019.

Inventors have taken a severe beating since the introduction of the America Invents Act.

Whatever the motivation of the originators of that act, the effect has been catastrophic for patent owners and inventors.

For centuries, the US patent system protected inventors and helped spur the US economy to become the strongest in the world. We need to restore the protections we previously provided to the innovators, creators, and patent holders who have done so much for our economy and standard of living.

Thank you for listening to my views,

Regards,

Stephen Reed

Stephen Reed

[address redacted]

[email address redacted]

[phone number redacted]

SDRFilms.com

From: Steve Rehkemper  
Sent: Thursday, March 7, 2019 7:47 PM  
To: Eligibility2019  
Subject: 2019 Revised Patent Subject Matter Eligibility Guidance

To Whom It May Concern:

I have been a professional independent inventor practicing in the toy and consumer products industries since 1983. I am a named inventor on many many patents since then. All ideas and inventions begin with an individual. Unfortunately patent laws and the court system are so badly flawed that it's not a time effective or cost effective tool for individuals to use to obtain justice when victimized by IP thieves.

I write in support of the 2019 Revised Patent Subject Matter Eligibility Guidance. This guidance will improve the clarity, consistency, and predictability of examination and post issuance review of patents by the USPTO. Recent rulings by the courts and the USPTO have been ambiguous and contradictory. Even experienced attorneys are not able advise inventors as to whether their inventions are patentable. In cases where a patent has already been issued, there is no certainty as to whether it will be upheld. The new guidelines will provide a thorough, consistent, and logical application of the current law on subject matter eligibility.

This guidance does not expand on the Supreme Court holdings in Alice. This guidance does not expand on recent lower court rulings that certain inventions are patent eligible under the Alice test. It does not ignore other decisions nor distort the law, but rather acknowledges and solves the conundrum of confusing and apparently contradictory holdings. Adoption of this guidance will provide order, clarity, uniformity, and reduce disputes over section 101 in the courts and the USPTO.

Thank you for your efforts to position the United States to retake the lead in the next wave of technological innovation in areas like quantum computing, artificial intelligence, and medical diagnostics. Protection for discoveries in these fields is the absolute best way to promote progress in science and useful arts in our modern day.

Much has been said by lawmakers about how companies in China are involved in US IP theft. If anyone in government bothered to connect the dots they would find that some very bad changes in the US patent law have paved the way for rampant IP theft not just by the Chinese but by many others as well as patent after patent are quickly invalidated.

Regards,

Steve Rehkemper  
Rehco LLC  
1300 W. Washington Blvd.Chicago, IL 60607  
[phone number redacted] – Tel  
[fax number redacted] - Fax

From: Nea Ross

Sent: Thursday, March 7, 2019 8:37 AM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: 2019 Revised Patent Subject Matter Eligibility Guidance

I write in support of the 2019 Revised Patent Subject Matter Eligibility Guidance. This guidance will improve the clarity, consistency, and predictability of examination and post issuance review of patents by the USPTO. Recent rulings by the courts and the USPTO have been ambiguous and contradictory. Even experienced attorneys are not able advise inventors as to whether their inventions are patentable. In cases where a patent has already been issued, there is no certainty as to whether it will be upheld. The new guidelines will provide a thorough, consistent, and logical application of the current law on subject matter eligibility.

This guidance does not expand on the Supreme Court holdings in Alice. This guidance does not expand on recent lower court rulings that certain inventions are patent eligible under the Alice test. It does not ignore other decisions nor distort the law, but rather acknowledges and solves the conundrum of confusing and apparently contradictory holdings. Adoption of this guidance will provide order, clarity, uniformity, and reduce disputes over section 101 in the courts and the USPTO.

Thank you for yours effort to position the United States to retake the lead in the next wave of technological innovation in areas like quantum computing, artificial intelligence, and medical diagnostics. Protection for discoveries in these fields is the absolute best way to promote progress in science and useful arts in our modern day.

NP Ross

From: thanaa salloum

Sent: Thursday, March 7, 2019 7:59 AM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: I support Revised Patent Subject Matter Eligibility Guidance 2109

I write in support of the 2019 Revised Patent Subject Matter Eligibility Guidance. This guidance will improve the clarity, consistency, and predictability of examination and post issuance review of patents by the USPTO. Recent rulings by the courts and the USPTO have been ambiguous and contradictory. Even experienced attorneys are not able advise inventors as to whether their inventions are patentable. In cases where a patent has already been issued, there is no certainty as to whether it will be upheld. The new guidelines will provide a thorough, consistent, and logical application of the current law on subject matter eligibility.

This guidance does not expand on the Supreme Court holdings in Alice. This guidance does not expand on recent lower court rulings that certain inventions are patent eligible under the Alice test. It does not ignore other decisions nor distort the law, but rather acknowledges and solves the conundrum of confusing and apparently contradictory holdings. Adoption of this guidance will provide order, clarity, uniformity, and reduce disputes over section 101 in the courts and the USPTO.

Thank you for yours effort to position the United States to retake the lead in the next wave of technological innovation in areas like quantum computing, artificial intelligence, and medical diagnostics. Protection for discoveries in these fields is the absolute best way to promote progress in science and useful arts in our modern day.

Respectfully,

Thanaa Salloum

Arizona Inventor

[phone number redacted]

From: Rick Schmid

Sent: Thursday, March 7, 2019 11:51 AM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Opinion

I write in support of the 2019 Revised Patent Subject Matter Eligibility Guidance. This guidance will improve the clarity, consistency, and predictability of examination and post issuance review of patents by the USPTO. Recent rulings by the courts and the USPTO have been ambiguous and contradictory. Even experienced attorneys are not able advise inventors as to whether their inventions are patentable. In cases where a patent has already been issued, there is no certainty as to whether it will be upheld. The new guidelines will provide a thorough, consistent, and logical application of the current law on subject matter eligibility.

This guidance does not expand on the Supreme Court holdings in Alice. This guidance does not expand on recent lower court rulings that certain inventions are patent eligible under the Alice test. It does not ignore other decisions nor distort the law, but rather acknowledges and solves the conundrum of confusing and apparently contradictory holdings. Adoption of this guidance will provide order, clarity, uniformity, and reduce disputes over section 101 in the courts and the USPTO.

Thank you for yours effort to position the United States to retake the lead in the next wave of technological innovation in areas like quantum computing, artificial intelligence, and medical diagnostics. Protection for discoveries in these fields is the absolute best way to promote progress in science and useful arts in our modern day.

Sincerely,

Rick Schmid

From: Keith Shuman

Sent: Thursday, March 7, 2019 3:41 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: 2019 Revised Patent Subject Matter Eligibility Guidance

I write in support of the 2019 Revised Patent Subject Matter Eligibility Guidance. This guidance will improve the clarity, consistency, and predictability of examination and post issuance review of patents by the USPTO. Recent rulings by the courts and the USPTO have been ambiguous and contradictory. Even experienced attorneys are not able to advise inventors as to whether their inventions are patentable. In cases where a patent has already been issued, there is no certainty as to whether it will be upheld. The new guidelines will provide a thorough, consistent, and logical application of the current law on subject matter eligibility.

This guidance does not expand on the Supreme Court holdings in Alice. This guidance does not expand on recent lower court rulings that certain inventions are patent eligible under the Alice test. It does not ignore other decisions nor distort the law, but rather acknowledges and solves the conundrum of confusing and apparently contradictory holdings. Adoption of this guidance will provide order, clarity, uniformity, and reduce disputes over section 101 in the courts and the USPTO.

Thank you for your effort to position the United States to retake the lead in the next wave of technological innovation in areas like quantum computing, artificial intelligence, and medical diagnostics. Protection for discoveries in these fields is the absolute best way to promote progress in science and useful arts in our modern day.

Keith Shuman

Issued Patent Holder

Maricopa, AZ

From: deanshoes

Sent: Thursday, March 7, 2019 5:10 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: 2019Revised Patent Subject Eligibility Guidance

Option 1 - Get'r Done

Copy and paste the content below to the body of an email and send to [eligibility2019@uspto.gov](mailto:eligibility2019@uspto.gov).

I write in support of the 2019 Revised Patent Subject Matter Eligibility Guidance. This guidance will improve the clarity, consistency, and predictability of examination and post issuance review of patents by the USPTO. Recent rulings by the courts and the USPTO have been ambiguous and contradictory. Even experienced attorneys are not able advise inventors as to whether their inventions are patentable. In cases where a patent has already been issued, there is no certainty as to whether it will be upheld. The new guidelines will provide a thorough, consistent, and logical application of the current law on subject matter eligibility.

This guidance does not expand on the Supreme Court holdings in Alice. This guidance does not expand on recent lower court rulings that certain inventions are patent eligible under the Alice test. It does not ignore other decisions nor distort the law, but rather acknowledges and solves the conundrum of confusing and apparently contradictory holdings. Adoption of this guidance will provide order, clarity, uniformity, and reduce disputes over section 101 in the courts and the USPTO.

Thank you for yours effort to position the United States to retake the lead in the next wave of technological innovation in areas like quantum computing, artificial intelligence, and medical diagnostics. Protection for discoveries in these fields is the absolute best way to promote progress in science and useful arts in our modern day.

Ronald Smith

Indio, Calif

From: Al and Mary

Sent: Thursday, March 7, 2019 9:08 AM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: USPTO

I am writing in support of the 2019 Revised Patent Subject Matter Eligibility Guidance. This guidance will improve the clarity, consistency, and predictability of examination and post issuance review of patents by the USPTO. Recent rulings by the courts and the USPTO have been ambiguous and contradictory. Even experienced attorneys are not able advise inventors as to whether their inventions are patentable. In cases where a patent has already been issued, there is no certainty as to whether it will be upheld. The new guidelines will provide a thorough, consistent, and logical application of the current law on subject matter eligibility.

This guidance does not expand on the Supreme Court holdings in Alice. This guidance does not expand on recent lower court rulings that certain inventions are patent eligible under the Alice test. It does not ignore other decisions nor distort the law, but rather acknowledges and solves the conundrum of confusing and apparently contradictory holdings. Adoption of this guidance will provide order, clarity, uniformity, and reduce disputes over section 101 in the courts and the USPTO.

Thank you for your effort to position the United States to retake the lead in the next wave of technological innovation in areas like quantum computing, artificial intelligence, and medical diagnostics. Protection for discoveries in these fields is the absolute best way to promote progress in science and useful arts in our modern day.

Sincerely,

Albert D. Smouse

From: KJ Spears

Sent: Friday, March 8, 2019 10:39 AM

To: Eligibility2019

Cc: tiea.auburn

Subject: 2019 Revised Patent Subject Matter Eligibility Guidance

I write in support of the 2019 Revised Patent Subject Matter Eligibility Guidance. This guidance will improve the clarity, consistency, and predictability of examination and post issuance review of patents by the USPTO. Recent rulings by the courts and the USPTO have been ambiguous and contradictory. Even experienced attorneys are not able advise inventors as to whether their inventions are patentable. In cases where a patent has already been issued, there is no certainty as to whether it will be upheld. The new guidelines will provide a thorough, consistent, and logical application of the current law on subject matter eligibility.

This guidance does not expand on the Supreme Court holdings in Alice. This guidance does not expand on recent lower court rulings that certain inventions are patent eligible under the Alice test. It does not ignore other decisions nor distort the law, but rather acknowledges and solves the conundrum of confusing and apparently contradictory holdings. Adoption of this guidance will provide order, clarity, uniformity, and reduce disputes over section 101 in the courts and the USPTO.

Thank you for your effort to position the United States to retake the lead in the next wave of technological innovation in areas like quantum computing, artificial intelligence, and medical diagnostics. Protection for discoveries in these fields is the absolute best way to promote progress in science and useful arts in our modern day.

Sincerely,

Ken M. Spears Jr.

Vice-President of The Inventors and

Entrepreneurs Association at Auburn University

From: Eric Stevens

Sent: Thursday, March 7, 2019 1:14 AM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Comments on 2019 Revised Subject Matter Eligibility Guidance

Director Iancu,

I write in support of the 2019 Revised Patent Subject Matter Eligibility Guidance. This guidance will improve the clarity, consistency, and predictability of examination and post issuance review of patents by the USPTO. Recent rulings by the courts and the USPTO have been ambiguous and contradictory. Even experienced attorneys are not able advise inventors as to whether their inventions are patentable. In cases where a patent has already been issued, there is no certainty as to whether it will be upheld. The new guidelines will provide a thorough, consistent, and logical application of the current law on subject matter eligibility.

This guidance does not expand on the Supreme Court holdings in Alice. This guidance does not expand on recent lower court rulings that certain inventions are patent eligible under the Alice test. It does not ignore other decisions nor distort the law, but rather acknowledges and solves the conundrum of confusing and apparently contradictory holdings. Adoption of this guidance will provide order, clarity, uniformity, and reduce disputes over section 101 in the courts and the USPTO.

Thank you for yours effort to position the United States to retake the lead in the next wave of technological innovation in areas like quantum computing, artificial intelligence, and medical diagnostics. Protection for discoveries in these fields is the absolute best way to promote progress in science and useful arts in our modern day.

Eric Stevens

From: musiccityinventors

Sent: Thursday, March 7, 2019 1:28 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: support of the 2019 Revised Patent Subject Matter Eligibility Guidance

I write in support of the 2019 Revised Patent Subject Matter Eligibility Guidance. This guidance will improve the clarity, consistency, and predictability of examination and post issuance review of patents by the USPTO. Recent rulings by the courts and the USPTO have been ambiguous and contradictory. Even experienced attorneys are not able advise inventors as to whether their inventions are patentable. In cases where a patent has already been issued, there is no certainty as to whether it will be upheld. The new guidelines will provide a thorough, consistent, and logical application of the current law on subject matter eligibility.

This guidance does not expand on the Supreme Court holdings in Alice. This guidance does not expand on recent lower court rulings that certain inventions are patent eligible under the Alice test. It does not ignore other decisions nor distort the law, but rather acknowledges and solves the conundrum of confusing and apparently contradictory holdings. Adoption of this guidance will provide order, clarity, uniformity, and reduce disputes over section 101 in the courts and the USPTO.

Thank you for your effort to position the United States to retake the lead in the next wave of technological innovation in areas like quantum computing, artificial intelligence, and medical diagnostics. Protection for discoveries in these fields is the absolute best way to promote progress in science and useful arts in our modern day.

Many Successes!

James & Cindy Stevens

[phone number redacted]

President of Nashville Inventors Group

From: Lavell Thrasher

Sent: Friday, March 8, 2019 10:26 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: 2019 Revised Patent Subject Matter Eligibility Guidance

I the 2019 Revised Patent Subject Matter Eligibility Guidance.

This guidance improve the clarity, consistency, and predictability of examination and post issuance review of patents by the USPTO.

Without the Guidance, neither inventors nor patent attorney have certainty as to whether their inventions are patentable. In cases where a patent has already been issued, there is no certainty as to whether it will be upheld.

The new guidelines provide a logical application of the current law on subject matter eligibility.

Adoption of this guidance will provide clarity and reduce disputes over section 101 in the courts and the USPTO.

Protection for new discoveries is the absolute best way to promote progress in science and useful arts in our modern day.

Lavell & Jackie Thrasher

From: Mike Underwood

Sent: Thursday, March 7, 2019 10:21 AM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: 2019 Revised Patent Subject Matter Eligibility Guidance

I support of the 2019 Revised Patent Subject Matter Eligibility Guidance. This guidance will improve the clarity, consistency, and predictability of examination and post issuance review of patents by the USPTO. Recent rulings by the courts and the USPTO have been ambiguous and contradictory. It seems quite possibly that those “friendly” with the “efficient infringers” designed the current environment for their purpose. Even experienced attorneys are not able advise inventors as to whether their inventions are patentable. In cases where a patent has already been issued, there is no certainty as to whether it will be upheld. The new guidelines will provide a thorough, consistent, and logical application of the current law on subject matter eligibility.

This guidance does not expand on the Supreme Court holdings in Alice. This guidance does not expand on recent lower court rulings that certain inventions are patent eligible under the Alice test. It does not ignore other decisions nor distort the law, but rather acknowledges and solves the conundrum of confusing and apparently contradictory holdings. Adoption of this guidance will provide order, clarity, uniformity, and reduce disputes over section 101 in the courts and the USPTO.

Those with the USPTO and their congressional and Big Tech “friends” who systemically restructured the system in favor of Efficient Infringement have critically damaged the integrity of our patent system and greatly diminished its international credibility and stature. Those nefarious efforts have helped degrade the U.S. patent system to the lowest international ranking in our nation’s history. Thank you for yours effort to position the United States to retake the lead in the next wave of technological innovation in areas like quantum computing, artificial intelligence, and medical diagnostics. Protection for discoveries in these fields is the absolute best way to promote progress in science and useful arts in our modern day.

Mike Underwood

Small Business Consultant

Denver, CO USA

From: Lois Walters

Sent: Friday, March 8, 2019 4:13 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Support of the 2019 Revised Patent Subject Matter Eligibility Guidance.

The Honorable Andrei Iancu,

Under Secretary of Commerce for Intellectual Property and

Director of the United States Patent and Trademark Office.

Dear Mr. Iancu,

I write in support of the 2019 Revised Patent Subject Matter Eligibility Guidance. This guidance is important to improve the clarity, consistency, and remove the uncertainty of examination and post issuance review of patents by the USPTO. If experienced attorneys have difficulty with recent rulings by the courts and the USPTO how can they advise inventors whether their inventions are patentable?

Furthermore, it seems ridiculous when a patent has been issued that there can be no certainty that patent will be upheld. What is the point to getting a patent in the first place? Moreover, shouldn't we encourage inventions which advance our society? And in that process we need to allow inventors to be compensated for their time, intelligence and the expense their work has cost them.

The 2019 Revised Patent Subject Matter Eligibility Guidance will provide order, clarity, uniformity, and reduce disputes over section 101 in the courts and the USPTO. This needs to be adopted for the good of inventors, their backers and mankind.

Thank you for your efforts to position the United States to retake the lead in the next wave of technological innovation. Protection for our inventors' discoveries is the absolute best way to promote progress in science and useful arts in today's world.

Sincerely,

Lois Walters

From: Judy waters

Sent: Thursday, March 7, 2019 11:31 AM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: 2019 Revised Patent Subject Matter Eligibility Guidance

To whom it may concern.

I write in support of the 2019 Revised Patent Subject Matter Eligibility Guidance. This guidance will improve the clarity, consistency, and predictability of examination and post issuance review of patents by the USPTO. Recent rulings by the courts and the USPTO have been ambiguous and contradictory. Even experienced attorneys are not able advise inventors as to whether their inventions are patentable. In cases where a patent has already been issued, there is no certainty as to whether it will be upheld. The new guidelines will provide a thorough, consistent, and logical application of the current law on subject matter eligibility.

Sincerely

Judy Waters

From: Larry/Kristine Williams

Sent: Thursday, March 7, 2019 6:42 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject:

I write in support of the 2019 Revised Patent Subject Matter Eligibility Guidance. This guidance will improve the clarity, consistency, and predictability of examination and post issuance review of patents by the USPTO. Recent rulings by the courts and the USPTO have been ambiguous and contradictory. Even experienced attorneys are not able advise inventors as to whether their inventions are patentable. In cases where a patent has already been issued, there is no certainty as to whether it will be upheld. The new guidelines will provide a thorough, consistent, and logical application of the current law on subject matter eligibility.

This guidance does not expand on the Supreme Court holdings in Alice. This guidance does not expand on recent lower court rulings that certain inventions are patent eligible under the Alice test. It does not ignore other decisions nor distort the law, but rather acknowledges and solves the conundrum of confusing and apparently contradictory holdings. Adoption of this guidance will provide order, clarity, uniformity, and reduce disputes over section 101 in the courts and the USPTO.

Thank you for yours effort to position the United States to retake the lead in the next wave of technological innovation in areas like quantum computing, artificial intelligence, and medical diagnostics. Protection for discoveries in these fields is the absolute best way to promote progress in science and useful arts in our modern day.

From: michael worden  
Sent: Thursday, March 7, 2019 2:52 PM  
To: Eligibility2019  
Subject: Please help independent inventors!

To Whom It May Concern,

Here is the canned version that I do agree with:

"I write in support of the 2019 Revised Patent Subject Matter Eligibility Guidance. This guidance will improve the clarity, consistency, and predictability of examination and post issuance review of patents by the USPTO. Recent rulings by the courts and the USPTO have been ambiguous and contradictory. Even experienced attorneys are not able advise inventors as to whether their inventions are patentable. In cases where a patent has already been issued, there is no certainty as to whether it will be upheld. The new guidelines will provide a thorough, consistent, and logical application of the current law on subject matter eligibility.

This guidance does not expand on the Supreme Court holdings in Alice. This guidance does not expand on recent lower court rulings that certain inventions are patent eligible under the Alice test. It does not ignore other decisions nor distort the law, but rather acknowledges and solves the conundrum of confusing and apparently contradictory holdings. Adoption of this guidance will provide order, clarity, uniformity, and reduce disputes over section 101 in the courts and the USPTO.

Thank you for yours effort to position the United States to retake the lead in the next wave of technological innovation in areas like quantum computing, artificial intelligence, and medical diagnostics. Protection for discoveries in these fields is the absolute best way to promote progress in science and useful arts in our modern day."

Here is my brief story and background:

I am an Industrial Designer with degrees in Business, Industrial Design, and Technology Commercialization. I have been working on inventions and products for over 25 years, and have received numerous patents. That's the good side. The bad side is that over the years I have seen independent inventors getting pushed around more and more. So much so that in my view the patent system is essentially dead for the average inventor. Meanwhile the corporations, big-box retailers, politicians and lobbyists end up controlling things and are the only ones that make money. Really it is that bad. I have thousands of pages of inventions and notes that I do not even bother looking at. Why? Because I can only pay for so much! Words can not describe the hell I have been through and witnessed over the years! I encourage all to think about how our founding fathers believed in patent rights and how this is yet another part of the system that is being stolen from the very people who create, maintain and contribute to our society.

Regards,

Michael Worden

From: amfstz

Sent: Thursday, March 7, 2019 8:38 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Revised Patent Matter Eligibility Guidance

I write in support of the 2019 Revised Patent Subject Matter Eligibility Guidance. This guidance will improve the clarity, consistency, and predictability of examination and post issuance review of patents by the USPTO. Recent rulings by the courts and the USPTO have been ambiguous and contradictory. Even experienced attorneys are not able advise inventors as to whether their inventions are patentable. In cases where a patent has already been issued, there is no certainty as to whether it will be upheld. The new guidelines will provide a thorough, consistent, and logical application of the current law on subject matter eligibility.

This guidance does not expand on the Supreme Court holdings in Alice. This guidance does not expand on recent lower court rulings that certain inventions are patent eligible under the Alice test. It does not ignore other decisions nor distort the law, but rather acknowledges and solves the conundrum of confusing and apparently contradictory holdings. Adoption of this guidance will provide order, clarity, uniformity, and reduce disputes over section 101 in the courts and the USPTO.

Thank you for yours effort to position the United States to retake the lead in the next wave of technological innovation in areas like quantum computing, artificial intelligence, and medical diagnostics. Protection for discoveries in these fields is the absolute best way to promote progress in science and useful arts in our modern day.

Thank you,

Tim zasly