In **T 336/14** the board held that in the assessment of inventive step of a claim, in which the non-technical features relate to cognitive content presented to the user of a graphical user interface, i.e. relate to "what" is presented rather than "how" something is presented, it has to be analysed whether the GUI together with the content presented credibly assists the user in performing a technical task (related to "why" that content is presented) by means of a continued and/or guided human-machine interaction process. It has to be established whether the information supplied based on the relevant features credibly enable the user to properly operate the technical system in question, or whether it only addresses the human mental process of an "average user" (on this point, see also **T 1895/17** and **T 772/18**).

In **T 690/11** the invention concerned a dialysis system which comprised a display device, a web server and web browser operating with the display device to display information that could guide an operator through the setup procedure for performing a dialysis treatment and then illustrate the progress of that treatment. In the board's opinion, the claimed features possessed more than mere information content directed exclusively to the human mind. The claimed display related to the interaction between the system and the operator and hence, implied technical means for the transmission and handling of respective signals contributing to the correct operation of the system. This conferred a technical character on the claimed features which had thus to be considered in the assessment of novelty and inventive step.

c) Functional and cognitive data

In **T 1194/97** (OJ 2000, 525) the board held that functional data were to be distinguished from coded cognitive content. A record carrier characterised by having functional data recorded on it was not a presentation of information as such. In this context the term "functional data" included a data structure defined in terms which inherently comprised the technical features of the system in which the record carrier was used.

In **T 2049/12** the board held that a common misconception regarding decision **T 1194/97** was that there were only two kinds of data – cognitive and functional – and that functional (i.e. non-cognitive) data was always technical. The relevant question for assessing whether a data structure had technical character was rather whether it produces a technical effect.

In **T 643/00** the board noted that it was true that non-technical aspects may be found in the design and the use of an interface through which the user interacts with a system (see decision **T 244/00**). Indeed, presenting information through a user interface, if the only relevant effect of the presentation relates to the visually attractive nature of the graphic design or artwork, does not have technical character. However, in its decision the board had not excluded the possibility that an arrangement of menu items (or images) on a screen might be determined by technical considerations. Such considerations might be intended to enable the user to manage a technical task, such as **searching and retrieving images** stored in an image processing apparatus, in a more efficient or faster manner, even if an evaluation by the user on a mental level was involved. Although such evaluation per se did not fall within the meaning of "invention" pursuant to Art. 52 EPC 1973, the **mere**