In **T 1841/06** the board stated that the aim and object of the invention was at best the result of balancing various **mental preferences of the user** but it was per se not a technical problem. Having the option of choosing between an original language and the preferred language might be felt as an inconvenience by one user but as an advantage by another. The invention brought about a mental simplification and subjective advantage for some users but it did not provide any objective advantage nor any technical advance in any field of technology.

In **T 478/06** the claimed invention was a method of providing access to geographic information in a computer system. The board noted that, generally, any aspects that are based on the subjective interests, personal preferences and (business/commercial) activities or circumstances of the user are non-technical in nature. Similarly, managing, i.e. using depending on wishes, personal and geographical information was non-technical. Also, the choice of where to provide a control button was a matter of user preference, and/or the commercial circumstances such as which program was available to be modified. The same goes for the second aspect of prompting the user, when the map information was displayed, to indicate if directions were required, neither being a technical consideration.

In **T 1000/09** the board held that effects resulting from a user-defined data presentation depended on the user's perception and/or constituted **indirect technical effects** and/or related to organisational and economic aspects. Regarding the technical, inputting side of the man-machine interface, the desire to provide it with inputting means for controlling the data output was driven by the obvious needs of users.

In **T 862/10** held that choosing the location of the display object in function of the urgency of the message was non-technical. The board judged that determining (or attempting to determine) a user's visual focus of attention as a point on a screen and displaying objects in positions relative to that point could be considered to have a technical effect, but that the particular choice of where to display an object dependent on a value assigned to that object (its "urgency") could not be.

In **T 1472/14** the board found that what the claimed subject-matter did was merely to organise anthropometric data in a database so that they were provided in standardised form or in the form of statistical characteristic values for querying by way of a communication device. The subject-matter of the claim was concerned with evaluation results only, even if those results were transmitted for a stated purpose of producing products. There was no monitoring of the operation of a production plant; instead, only product data were provided. The board did not consider this to be a technical effect going beyond the mere and obvious automation of an abstract idea for standardisation.

e) Data structures

Data structures which are used to store cognitive data are not considered to contribute to the technical character beyond the mere storage of data, but data structures used for functional purposes are considered to contribute to producing a technical effect (e.g., **T 1194/97**, OJ 2000, 525; **T 424/03**; **T 697/17**).