


ChatGPT 5.2 ▾

 Share ...Claim_101_Analysis_...
Document 

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

I've fully read and internalized your **DotAIX §101 Patent-Eligibility Analysis (.aix) file**, including:

- Governing statute (35 U.S.C. §101)
- Core framework cases: Association for Molecular Pathology v. Myriad Genetics, Inc., Mayo Collaborative Services v. Prometheus Laboratories, Inc., Alice Corp. v. CLS Bank International
- Failure example: Ultramercial, Inc. v. Hulu, LLC
- Eligibility example: Enfish, LLC v. Microsoft Corp.

File source:  Claim_101_Analysis_V2

Ready for analysis

Please paste:

1. Full text of ONE patent claim (preferably Claim 1)
2. (Optional) One-sentence description of the invention's purpose

After you send it, I'll run your structured DotAIX workflow:

- Alice Step One — abstract idea / law of nature / product of nature
- Alice Step Two — inventive concept
- Grounded strictly in the cases from your file
- Output: **Likely Eligible / Likely Ineligible + 2–4 bullets**

Go ahead and drop the claim text.

Sources



A data storage and retrieval system for a computer memory, comprising:
means for configuring said memory according to a logical table, said logical table including:
a plurality of logical rows, each said logical row including an object identification number (OID) to identify each said logical row, each said logical row corresponding to a record of information;
a plurality of logical columns intersecting said plurality of logical rows to define a plurality of logical cells, each said logical column including an OID to identify each said logical column; and

means for indexing data stored in said table.

§101 Eligibility Analysis (DotAIX Framework Applied)

Claim reviewed:

A data storage and retrieval system for a computer memory ... logical table with rows/ columns identified by OIDs ... means for indexing data stored in the table.

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

No — not abstract.

This claim is directed to a **specific computer memory architecture and data structure**, not to organizing information or performing a business practice on a generic computer.

It mirrors the claim upheld in Enfish, LLC v. Microsoft Corp., where the court held that a **self-referential logical table** was a **technical improvement to how computers store and retrieve data**.

Key observations:

- Recites **specific structural components** (logical table, rows, columns, OIDs)
- Defines **how memory is configured internally**
- Targets **computer functionality itself**, not user-facing business logic
- Not merely “store data in a database” at a functional level

Under *Alice Step One*, improvements to **internal computer operation** are **not abstract**.

Step Two — Inventive concept?

Not reached.

Because the claim is **not abstract at Step One**, eligibility is established without needing Step Two (per *Enfish*).

✅ Conclusion: Likely Eligible

Why:

- Improves **computer memory structure**, not a business/economic practice
 - Recites **concrete architecture**, not result-oriented functional language
 - Changes **how the machine operates internally**
 - Closely tracks the fact pattern upheld in *Enfish*
-

Practical takeaway (for your DotAIX lens)

This type of claim survives §101 because it:

- specifies **runtime/data-structure mechanics**, and
- claims **how the computer works differently**, not just what outcome is desired.

This is exactly the pattern you’ve been aiming for with DotAIX’s **execution/runtime-layer**

framing — claims that modify **system behavior or architecture** are much safer than claims that just “apply rules using AI.”

If you'd like, paste another claim and we can run it through the same structured analysis.

