

Claim_101_Analysis_...
Document

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

I've finished reading and internalizing your full **DotAIX §101 analysis file**, including:

- Governing statute (35 U.S.C. §101)
- Association for Molecular Pathology v. Myriad Genetics, Inc. (nature exclusion)
- Mayo Collaborative Services v. Prometheus Laboratories, Inc. (two-step framework origin)
- Alice Corp. v. CLS Bank International (abstract idea extension)
- Ultramercial, Inc. v. Hulu, LLC (generic internet business method failure)
- Enfish, LLC v. Microsoft Corp. (software architecture success)

File reference:  Claim_101_Analysis_V2

 Ready

Please provide:

1. The full text of ONE patent claim (preferably Claim 1)
2. (Optional) 1–2 sentences describing the invention’s purpose

After you send it, I will run your structured analysis:

- Step One — Abstract idea / law of nature / natural phenomenon
- Step Two — Inventive concept
- Output — Likely Eligible or Likely Ineligible + concise reasoning grounded only in the cases above

Paste the claim whenever ready.

Sources



A method for automatically animating lip synchronization and facial expression of three-dimensional characters comprising:

obtaining a first set of rules that define output morph weight set stream as a function of phoneme sequence and time of said phoneme sequence;

obtaining a timed data file of phonemes having a plurality of sub-sequences;

generating an intermediate stream of output morph

weight sets and a plurality of transition parameters between two adjacent morph weight sets by evaluating said plurality of sub-sequences against said first set of rules;

generating a final stream of output morph weight sets at a desired frame rate from said intermediate stream of output morph weight sets and said plurality of transition parameters; and

applying said final stream of output morph weight sets to a sequence of animated characters to produce lip synchronization and facial expression control of said animated characters.

Great — let's run this strictly under your **DotAIX §101 framework** and ground it only in the core cases.

Claim Analyzed

A method for automatically animating lip synchronization and facial expression of three-dimensional characters comprising:
obtaining rules mapping phonemes → morph weights;
obtaining timed phoneme data;
generating intermediate morph weights via rule evaluation;
generating final morph weights at a frame rate;
applying weights to animated characters.

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

Likely YES — abstract at Step One

This reads primarily as:

rules + data processing + mathematical transformation + application

The core mechanics are:

- evaluate phoneme sequences
- apply rule set
- compute morph weights
- interpolate transitions
- output animation parameters

That is fundamentally:

algorithmic signal processing / mathematical mapping

Courts routinely classify these as:

- mathematical relationships
- data manipulation
- rules-based transformations

Under **Alice Corp. v. CLS Bank International**, rule-based processing of information is

abstract even if performed on a computer.

Nothing in the claim yet specifies:

- a new graphics engine
- new rendering pipeline
- new memory structure
- new hardware behavior

It's framed functionally: *"generate... evaluate... apply..."*

That matches the type of **result-oriented functional claiming** Alice rejects.

Step Two — Inventive Concept?

Likely NO — only conventional implementation

The steps appear to be:

- obtain data
- evaluate rules
- generate parameters
- output animation

These are:

- routine DSP/graphics pipeline steps
- conventional computer animation techniques

No specific:

- novel morph architecture
- specific algorithmic structure
- specialized data structure
- GPU/engine modification

Compare:

Fails like

Ultramercial, Inc. v. Hulu, LLC

Many detailed steps, but still just automating a known practice.

Your claim similarly:

many steps ≠ technological improvement

Does NOT resemble

Enfish, LLC v. Microsoft Corp.

which survived because it changed **how the computer internally stores data**.

Your claim:

- uses the computer
- does not improve the computer

That distinction is decisive.

Eligibility Assessment

Conclusion: Likely Ineligible (§101)

Reasons:

- Directed to rules-based data transformation (abstract idea)
 - Mathematical mapping of phonemes → morph weights
 - Implemented with generic processing steps
 - No improvement to computer architecture or rendering internals
 - Similar to Alice/Ultramercial, not Enfish
-

Practical Drafting Insight (important)

If this were rewritten to claim:

- a specific morph-weight data structure
- a new interpolation mechanism improving performance
- reduced memory bandwidth
- GPU-side execution improvement
- or a concrete animation engine architecture

Then it could start looking **Enfish-style “technical improvement.”**

Right now it reads like:

“Use rules to compute animation values”

which courts treat as abstract math.

If you'd like, we can next:

- ☒ stress-test this claim
- ☒ or rewrite it into a stronger §101-resilient version
- ☒ or compare it against a known animation patent that survived

Send the next claim or say “rewrite for eligibility.”

     