

From: Kassa, Jessica
Sent: Wednesday, April 27, 2016 4:02 PM
To: WorldClassPatentQuality; QualityMetrics2017
Subject: Master Review Form suggestions

To Whom It May Concern:

For 101, 112, and even 102/103 the rejection may need evidence cited from art, definitions and/or from the specification in order to adequately support the rejection. There should be radio button questions for whether adequate supporting evidence was cited and explained. The questions may also capture whether appropriate sections of the MPEP and/or case law were cited.

The 101 section should capture data for rejections related to Myriad 101 and for more common lack of utility

The form could capture which form paragraphs were appropriately or inappropriately used so the office can capture trends in the incorrect usage of form paragraphs.

The form should indicate whether suggestions for correcting/overcoming rejections were made as appropriate for each rejection—not just a general catch all question at the end of the form.

The points/questions on the form should be phrased consistently.

The form could ask whether the office action was consistent in applying, e.g., art and enablement rejections or is there an inappropriate squeeze where an embodiment is both rejected as not enabled and obvious over art.

The form should indicate whether explanation, as needed, is provided for withdraw of rejections.

Jessica Kassa
Patent Examiner AU 1616