UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
P.O. BOX 1450
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

MEMORANDUM

DATE: April 12, 2007

TO: Technology Center Directors

FROM: John J. Love
Deputy Commissioner
For Patent Examination Policy

SUBJECT: **Clarification of Interim Guidelines For Examination of Patent Applications for Subject Matter Eligibility**

Certain inconsistencies have come to my attention in the application of the Interim Guidelines For Examination of Patent Applications for Subject Matter Eligibility, which are set forth in section 2106 of the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (8th Ed. Rev. 5, Aug. 2006) (MPEP). The situation arises in the context of whether or not a claim is for a practical application of an abstract idea, law of nature, or natural phenomenon. As stated in the Interim Guidelines, a claim is for a practical application of an abstract idea, law of nature, or natural phenomenon when the claimed invention "transforms" an article or physical object to a different state or thing, or when the claimed invention produces a useful, concrete and tangible result. See MPEP 2106, subsection IV.C.2.

Focus on Result

A practical application in this context can be the result itself, and does not require that steps or additional limitations be added to the claim. As stated in *State Street Bank & Trust Co. v. Signature Financial Group, Inc.*, 149 F.3d 1368, 1373, 47 USPQ2d 1596, 1601 (Fed. Cir. 1998):

> Today, we hold that the transformation of data, representing discrete dollar amounts, by a machine through a series of mathematical calculations into a final share price, constitutes a practical application of a mathematical algorithm, formula, or calculation, because it produces "a useful, concrete and tangible result"-- a final share price momentarily fixed for recording and reporting purposes and even accepted and relied upon by regulatory authorities and in subsequent trades.

It is the result that should be the focus. If the result has a real world practical application/use, then the test has been satisfied. The claim need not include the uses to which the result is ultimately put, just the result itself. Another example would be an improved method for measuring blood sugar levels in human beings. In this example, the end result is the blood sugar level which is a practical application for diagnostic purposes. Accordingly, reciting the improved method, and the result it achieves---the measurement of the blood sugar level---is all that is necessary for patent-eligibility. The diagnostic steps that occur after the determination of the blood sugar level need not necessarily be present in the claims in order for the claims to be statutory.

Use of Specific Terminology

Another area of inconsistency surrounds the use of the terms such as "determining," "calculating," and similar expressions. Some object to these as not creating a tangible result. Such terms may in fact be sufficient to establish a tangible result. *See, e.g., State Street* , 149 F.3d at 1375, 47 USPQ2d at 1602 (holding the calculation of a number having a real world value and to be a "useful, concrete, and tangible result") and *AT&T Corp. v. Excel Communications, Inc.*, 172 F.3d 1352, 50 USPQ2d 1447 (Fed. Cir. 1999) (holding a method claim including the generation of a message record for an interexchange call to be statutory). The specification should be referred to for a meaning of the terms. *See In re Musgrave*, 431 F.2d 882, 893, 167 USPQ 280, 289 (CCPA 1970) ("[w]e cannot agree with the board that these claims (all the steps of which can be carried out by the disclosed apparatus) are directed to non-statutory processes merely because some or all the steps therein can also be carried out in or with the aid of the human mind or because it may be necessary for one performing the processes to think. . . .).