the basis of the alleged advantages of moving a cursor diagonally over the TV screen (see **T 154/04**, OJ 2008, 46; **T 125/04**, **T 1143/06**).

T 333/95 concerned using a computer to produce animations. In order to produce a scene in which a particular object moves, the selected object takes the place of the cursor, so that the user can move it around with the mouse as desired, while the system records the movements of the mouse and translates them into a script of commands for moving the object in the later display of the animated scene. However, the board in that case clearly considered the feature of "making said graphics object the current cursor" as a technical feature per se. This "graphics object cursor" replaced the normal cursor (also technical) and its movements were recorded and translated into a kind of programming language. There was at least a technical effect in allowing the user to move the selected object around under control of the mouse.

In **T 125/04** the board stated that, in general, the task of **designing diagrams** is non-technical. This is so even if the diagrams arguably convey information in way which a viewer may intuitively regard as particularly appealing, lucid or logical. In **T 125/04** the invention, like **T 643/00**, also concerned an **arrangement of images** but was different in that only the information conveyed by the images, i.e. their "cognitive content" (see **T 1194/97**, OJ 2000, 525), was relevant. The new features had to do with how this content was represented. Unlike **T 643/00**, the invention provided no information about the computer system itself, such as the location where the data are stored.

In **T 1073/06**, the underlying GUI was configured, upon user input, to display objects of a **simulation model**, including graphical link representations to improve the ease of a user's comprehension of the model. The contribution of the claimed subject-matter to the prior art was related to the utilisation of association data stored in the memory to cause the link between the objects in the simulation model to be displayed with the associated graphical link representation. The deciding board held that "an improvement in the comprehension of a model is a purely mental effect, so that the problem solved was not seen as being technical. The claimed 'graphical link representations' related to the state of the simulation model, rather than to the state of the claimed simulation apparatus, and thus constituted presentations of information and are therefore also non-technical" (see **T 336/14**).

iii) Support in performing a technical task

In **T 1741/08** the board held that not everything that supports a technical task has itself a technical character.

In **T 1802/13** the issue was "how" specific cognitive data was actually presented rather than "what" was presented. The crucial consideration was therefore that the feature involved presenting cognitive content which addressed solely the user's mental process. It was established case law of the boards of appeal that, as a general rule, "lowering the cognitive burden of a user" could not, per se, be considered to be a technical effect (see e.g. **T 1741/08**, **T 1539/09** and **T 1237/10**).