

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.

□ ↗ ↘ ↕ ↖ ⏮ ...