

ChatGPT 5.2 ▾

[↑ Share](#) ⋮

Claim\_101\_Analysis\_v1.0.aix  
File

read file as txt and prompt me for a claim to analyze when done

I've finished reading and internalizing your **Claim\_101\_Analysis\_v1.0.aix** file as plain text.

It contains:

- The §101 framework instructions
- Alice/Mayo/Myriad grounding
- Structured two-step eligibility workflow
- Output format rules (concise conclusion + bullets + case grounding)

Ready to run the analysis exactly as your DotAIX spec describes.

**Please paste:**

1. The **full text of one patent claim** (preferably Claim 1)
2. *(Optional)* 1–2 sentences describing the invention's purpose or technical context

I'll then perform the structured **Alice Step One / Step Two** eligibility assessment.

📄 👍 💬 ↗️ ↺ ⋮

9. A method for identifying characteristics of data files, comprising:

receiving, on a processing system, file content identifiers for data files from a plurality of file content identifier generator agents, each agent provided on a source system and creating file content IDs using a mathematical algorithm, via a network;

determining, on the processing system, whether each received content identifier matches a characteristic of other identifiers; and

outputting, to at least one of the source systems responsive to a request from said source system, an indication of the characteristic of the data file based on said step of determining.

Great — let's run this exactly like your **DotAIX §101 structured workflow**: tight, court-style, not hand-wavy.

Here's the claim again (mentally normalized):

#### **Claim 9 – Method**

receiving file content identifiers generated via a mathematical algorithm over a network →

determining whether identifiers match characteristics →

outputting an indication of the characteristic.

---

## §101 Eligibility Analysis

### Governing Framework

Under Alice Corp. v. CLS Bank International, applying Mayo Collaborative Services v. Prometheus Laboratories, Inc., and informed by Association for Molecular Pathology v. Myriad Genetics, Inc.

---

### Step One — Is the claim directed to an abstract idea?

#### Characterization

At its core, the claim:

- receives identifiers
- compares them
- determines a characteristic
- reports a result

That is essentially:

**data collection → comparison/classification → output**

Courts routinely label this as:

- information analysis
- pattern matching
- classification
- mental/organizational processes

#### Key risk factors

- Explicit “**mathematical algorithm**”
- Purely informational content (identifiers)
- No concrete improvement to computing
- Generic “processing system” and “network”
- No technical constraints on how matching occurs


#### Case analogies

Very similar to:

- Electric Power Group, LLC v. Alstom S.A. — collecting/analyzing/displaying information → abstract
- Content Extraction & Transmission LLC v. Wells Fargo Bank, N.A. — data recognition/classification → abstract
- Digitech Image Technologies, LLC v. Electronics for Imaging, Inc. — organizing image data mathematically → abstract

#### Step One conclusion

**Directed to an abstract idea** (data analysis/classification using math).

 Move to Step Two.

---

## Step Two — Inventive Concept?

### Claimed elements

- processing system
- network
- agents
- mathematical algorithm
- receive/determine/output

### Evaluation

These are:

- conventional components
- generic computing steps
- result-oriented functional language

No:

- new architecture
- new data structure
- new hardware configuration
- specific algorithmic improvement
- reduced bandwidth / memory / latency / security enhancement

The claim just says “*use math to classify IDs.*”

Courts treat that as:

abstract idea + generic computer = still abstract

### Case support

- Ultramercial, Inc. v. Hulu, LLC — ordered internet steps not enough
- Two-Way Media Ltd. v. Comcast Cable Communications, LLC — functional network steps without technical details → ineligible

### Step Two conclusion

No inventive concept identified.

---

## Final Determination

Likely §101 ineligible.

Reason:

Merely collects identifiers, applies a mathematical comparison, and outputs results using generic computers and networks, without a specific technical improvement.

---

## Practical Drafting Advice (your patent-agent brain will appreciate this)

If you wanted this to survive:

You’d need to claim something like:

Instead of:

determining whether identifiers match a characteristic

Use:

- specific hashing or fingerprint structure
- concrete collision-resistant scheme
- bandwidth reduction technique
- distributed consensus mechanism
- memory layout optimization
- hardware or protocol improvement

Courts reward:

“improves computer operation itself”

not

“uses computers to analyze information”

---

If you want, paste **another claim** and we'll run it through the same structured analysis.

