Q1) The Supreme Court was already held by the Supreme Court in 2010, in Bilski v Kappos that abstract ideas are not patentable. No, there is no inventive concept. Once an abstract idea has been evolved, it's an implementation in any field, particularly new technology is pretty obvious to a person skilled in the art.The courts relied on Bilski v Kappos as precedent. In the given case, they consider the patents as invalid. The courts said that there was no meaningful distinction between the concept of risk hedging in Bilski and the concept of intermediated settlement in the Alice v CLS Bank case. Both were abstract ideas based on fundamental economic practices and escrow is not a patentable invention, and simply using a computer system does not meet the criteria of a patent. “Ordinary and customary use of a general-purpose digital computer is insufficient,” the court said.

Q2) A software patent granted, the satisfaction of the machine transformation test is essential. There must be an inventive concept and that when applied to the machine, it must result in transformation thereby creating an invention. Therefore, a financial database coupled with a personalized list of stock picks will only be patentable if an inventive concept is introduced into it. For instance, if it automatically suggests which one to invest in, and which one not to invest in based on authentic data.

Following point need to consider:-

* It is on the applicant to describe more than just the “Magic Box” or simply describe the function. It will be critical to go into detail about the specifics.
* It should be an improvement to another technology or technical fields