

1. I object to the mandate to use underlining for additions and strike-through for deletions.

a) the original claim may have underlining, e.g., an underlined genus or species name in biology. It is helpful to be able to use double underlining to distinguish the insertions from underlined original text.

b) the use of strikethroughs to show deletions has several problems.

--it is likely to lead to errors in the course of preparing the amendment. For example, if I mark up a draft, and draw a line through a word, my secretary must judge whether I mean to simply delete that word, or to set that word as strikeout text.

--if claims are faxed, the strikethrough text can become difficult to read.

I would like to retain the established use of bracketing as an alternative to strikeout.

2. The rules should allow at least one page of the application document to include a filename, or a path and filename. This facilitates recovery of the electronic file, which in turn facilitates compliance with the new rules concerning amendment of the specification and claims.

I would prefer that they allow that text to appear at the bottom of the abstract page. They could require that they be set off in a special way, e.g., below the normal bottom margin, after a line of asterisks, etc.

If that is not acceptable, the next best solution would be to allow a page, following the abstract, which is not considered part of the specification but which can include the document info. This page could bear a heading like "Informal Document Identification--Not Part of Application" and could include, e.g., the path and file name, document creation date, etc.

Iver Cooper