

SUBJECT MATTER ELIGIBILITY WORKSHEET:

This worksheet can be used to assist in analyzing a claim for “Subject Matter Eligibility” (SME) under 35 U.S.C. 101 for any judicial exception (law of nature, natural phenomenon, or abstract idea) in accordance with the [2014 Interim Eligibility Guidance](#). As every claim must be examined individually based on the particular elements recited therein, a separate worksheet should be used to analyze each claim.

For purposes of simplicity in this workshop, the questions below only refer to *abstract ideas* and will be used to walk through several of the [abstract ideas examples](#) published on the website. (A blank generic worksheet is available on the training website.) It is suggested that the worksheet be used with the [2014 Interim Eligibility Guidance Quick Reference Sheet](#), which includes an overview of the analysis, along with the flowchart and form paragraphs referenced herein.

Worksheet Summary: Section I is designed to address the first activity in examination, which is to determine what applicant invented and to construe the claim in accordance with its broadest reasonable interpretation (BRI). Next, referring to the eligibility flowchart reproduced in the *Quick Reference Sheet*, Section II addresses *Step 1* regarding the four statutory categories of invention. Section III addresses *Step 2A* by determining whether the claim is directed to an abstract idea. Section IV addresses *Step 2B* by identifying additional elements to determine if the claim amounts to significantly more than an abstract idea.

Application/Example No. and claim: Example 2, claim 19

I. What did applicant invent?

Review the disclosure to identify what applicant considers as the invention. (MPEP 2103(I))

Applicant invented:

A system that, in response to activation of a link, automatically generates a composite web page that combines visually perceptible elements from a host web page with product- or service-related information from an advertising merchant's web page.

This can be a brief description and should not merely reproduce the claim. The take away is that invention is focused on creating the composite webpage.

Establish the broadest reasonable interpretation (BRI) of the claim.

II. Does the claimed invention fall within one of the four statutory categories of invention (process, machine, manufacture or composition of matter) (Step 1)?

Choose A or B:

A. Yes, the claimed invention is a system including a computer store (memory) and a server, which is a machine or a manufacture.

Although this is a product claim, it is not automatically eligible and needs further analysis to ensure that the claim is not directed to an abstract idea without significantly more.

Continue with the SME analysis.

SUBJECT MATTER ELIGIBILITY WORKSHEET:

- B. No, the claimed invention is not one of the four statutory categories. Make a rejection of the claim as being drawn to non-statutory subject matter. Use *Form Paragraphs 7.05 and 7.05.01 available in Custom OACs*.

If the claim could be amended to fall within one of the statutory categories, it is recommended to **continue with the SME analysis** under that assumption. Make the assumption clear in the record if a rejection is ultimately made under *Step 2*, and consider suggesting a potential amendment to applicant that would result in the claim being drawn to a statutory category.

If no amendment is possible, **conclude the SME analysis** and continue with examination under each of the other patentability requirements.

III. Is the claim directed to an abstract idea (Step 2A)?

Courts have found certain concepts to be “abstract ideas”, for example fundamental economic practices, certain methods of organizing human activity, ideas themselves (standing alone), or mathematical relationships/formulae. Assistance in identifying such abstract ideas can be obtained by referring to the [case law chart](#) available on the website and the court case discussions in the 2014 Interim Eligibility Guidance. A claim is “directed” to an abstract idea when the abstract idea is recited (*i.e.*, **set forth** or **described**) in the claim.

Choose A, B, or C:

The claim is eligible.

- A. No, the claim does not recite a concept that is similar to those found by the courts to be abstract. **Conclude SME analysis** and continue with examination under each of the other patentability requirements. If needed, the record can be clarified by providing remarks in the Office action regarding interpretation of the claim (*for example*: the broadest reasonable interpretation of the claim is not directed to an abstract idea.)

The court in this case went on to discuss limitations that it found to add an inventive concept, as seen below. During examination, however, that would not be necessary since no abstract idea was identified.

In this case, the decision explained that the claim does not recite a mathematical algorithm; nor does it recite a fundamental economic or longstanding commercial practice. The claim addresses a business challenge (retaining website visitors) that is particular to the Internet and does not merely recite the performance of some business practice known from the pre-Internet world along with the requirement to perform it on the Internet. Because no idea similar to those previously found by the courts to be abstract has been identified in the claim, the claim should be deemed to be not directed to a judicial exception (Step 2A: NO) and found eligible.

B. Yes, but the streamlined analysis is appropriate as the eligibility is self-evident, and a full eligibility analysis is not needed. Applicant’s claimed invention, explained in Section I above, is not focused on the abstract idea, and the claim clearly does not attempt to tie up an abstract idea such that others cannot practice it. (Refer to the [February 2015 Training](#)

SUBJECT MATTER ELIGIBILITY WORKSHEET:

[Slides](#) for information and examples of a streamlined analysis.) **Conclude SME analysis** and continue with examination under each of the other patentability requirements.

- C. Yes, identify the limitation(s) in the claim that recite(s) the abstract idea and explain why the recited subject matter is an abstract idea. After identifying the abstract idea, **continue with SME analysis.**

The limitation(s) in the claim that set(s) forth or describe(s) the abstract idea is (are):

The reason(s) that the limitation(s) are considered an abstract idea is (are):

IV. Does the claim as a whole amount to significantly more than the abstract idea (Step 2B)?

- A. Are there any additional elements (features/limitations/step) recited in the claim beyond the abstract idea identified above?

Choose 1 or 2:

1. No, there are no other elements in the claim in addition to the abstract idea. **Conclude SME analysis** by making a § 101 rejection and continue with examination under each of the other patentability requirements. *Use Form Paragraphs 7.05 and 7.05.015 available in Custom OACs.*

Are there elements in the disclosure that could be added to the claim that may make it eligible? Identify those elements and consider suggesting them to applicant:

SUBJECT MATTER ELIGIBILITY WORKSHEET:

2. Yes, the claim elements (features/limitations/steps) in addition to the abstract idea are:

As noted above, it would not be necessary for an examiner to proceed to Step 2B, in this case. However, the court offered a discussion on this point, which is reflected below, pointing out certain features of the claim that amount to an inventive concept for resolving this particular Internet-centric problem.

A computer store (memory) that stores visually perceptible elements corresponding to numerous host web pages, with each of the host web pages displaying at least one link associated with a commerce object (a product or service) offered for sale by a third-party merchant.

A computer server at an outsource provider that is programmed to receive a signal indicating activation of a link by a website visitor, automatically identify the host web page, and generate and serve to the visitor a composite web page that combines visually perceptible elements from the identified host web page with product- or service-related information about the associated commerce object from the merchant's web page.

Continue with the SME analysis.

- B. Evaluate the significance of the additional elements. Identifying additional elements and evaluating their significance involves the search for an “inventive concept” in the claim. It can be helpful to keep in mind what applicant invented (identified in Section I above) and how that relates to the additional elements to evaluate their significance.

Consider all of the identified additional elements individually and in combination to determine whether the claim as a whole amounts to significantly more than the abstract idea identified above. Reasons supporting the significance of the additional elements can include one or more of the following:

The additional elements must show an “inventive concept”. Many of these considerations overlap, and more than one can often be applied to describe an element. It is not important how the elements are characterized or how many considerations apply from this list. It is important to evaluate the significance of the additional elements relative to applicant's invention.

- improves another technology or technical field
- improves the functioning of a computer itself
- applies the abstract idea with, or by use of, a particular machine
 - *not* a generic computer performing generic computer functions
 - *not* adding the words “apply it” or words equivalent to “apply the abstract idea”
 - *not* mere instructions to implement an abstract idea on a computer
- effects a transformation or reduction of a particular article to a different state or thing

SUBJECT MATTER ELIGIBILITY WORKSHEET:

Automatic generation and transmission of the second (composite) web page is not a routine sequence of events after clicking on a link. The claim is more than "apply the abstract idea on the Internet".

- adds a specific limitation other than what is well-understood, routine and conventional in the field
 - *not* appending well-understood, routine, and conventional activities previously known to the industry, specified at a high level of generality
 - *not* a generic computer performing generic computer functions
- adds unconventional steps that confine the claim to a particular useful application
 - *not* adding insignificant extrasolution activity, such as mere data gathering
- adds meaningful limitations that amount to more than generally linking the use of the abstract idea to a particular technological environment

Complete (1) or (2) below:

1. Yes, the additional elements, taken individually or as a combination, result in the claim amounting to significantly more than the abstract idea because

The claimed combination of the computer store and server meaningfully limits the application of the abstract idea, and show that the claim is directed to a specific way to automate the creation of a composite web page by an outsource provider that incorporates elements from multiple sources in order to solve a problem faced by websites on the Internet.

An explanation of why the claim is eligible is not necessary in the Office action unless there would be a question as to the reasoning such that the record would benefit from clarification.

In particular, the claim describes a solution to an Internet-centric problem, i.e., the problem of retaining website visitors on a host web page that displays advertisement hyperlinks. On the Internet, the routine and conventional functioning of hyperlink protocol would be to instantly transport a visitor who "clicks" on an advertisement hyperlink away from the host's web page and to the merchant web page that is associated with the clicked advertisement.

The claimed combination of components overrides this routine and conventional sequence of events, by instead directing the visitor to an automatically-generated composite web page that combines visual "look and feel" elements from the host web page and product or service information from the merchant web page associated with the clicked advertisement. In this way, rather than instantly losing visitors to the

SUBJECT MATTER ELIGIBILITY WORKSHEET:

merchant web page, the host can instead send its visitors to a web page on the outsource provider's server that 1) incorporates "look and feel" elements from the host web page, and 2) provides visitors with the opportunity to purchase products from the third-party merchant without actually entering that merchant's web page. In this case, these additional limitations amount to more than simply stating "apply the abstract idea on the Internet."

If any elements, individually or as a combination, amount to the claim reciting significantly more than the abstract idea **conclude SME analysis** and continue with examination under each of the other patentability requirements. If needed, the record can be clarified by providing remarks in the Office action regarding interpretation of the claim (*for example*: the claim recites the abstract idea of "x", but amounts to significantly more than the idea itself with the additional element "y" because "abc".)

2. No, the additional elements, taken individually and as a combination, do not result in the claim amounting to significantly more than the abstract idea because

If no elements, taken individually and as a combination, amount to the claim reciting significantly more than the abstract idea, **conclude the SME analysis** by making a § 101 rejection and continue with examination under each of the other patentability requirements. *Use Form Paragraphs 7.05 and 7.05.015 available in Custom OACs.*

Are there elements in the disclosure that could be added to the claim that may make it eligible? Identify those elements and consider suggesting them to applicant:

SUBJECT MATTER ELIGIBILITY WORKSHEET:

Sample Rejection:

Use Form Paragraphs 7.05 and 7.05.015

Claim __ is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to a judicial exception (i.e., a law of nature, a natural phenomenon, or an abstract idea) without significantly more. Claim __ is directed to

The claim does not include additional elements that are sufficient to amount to significantly more than the judicial exception because
