

Peer to Patent Project - Use Case Model

Version 0.12

November 21, 2006

Contents

- Terminology
- Listing of Actors
- Use Case Model
- Individual Use Cases

The use case model describes the functionality of the system in terms of actions performed by the user of the system (an Actor) and a description of how the system responds to those actions. Not all use cases are developed at this time.

Per the wikipedia, a use case is a technique for capturing functional requirements of systems. Each use case provides one or more scenarios that convey how the system should interact with the users called actors to achieve a specific business goal or function. Use case actors may be end users or other systems. Use cases typically avoid technical jargon, preferring instead the language of the end user or domain expert. Use cases are often co-authored by business analysts and end users.

For more information about use cases see:

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Use_case

Terminology

Term	Description
Actor	The term Actor is used to describe a person that is using the system from the perspective of a particular role.
Alert	An alert is a message or notification that is generated in response to the occurrence of a specific type of event. Typically a subscriber to email alerts will receive an email notice when that particular type of event occurs.
Use Case	A use case is a written format for describing the functional requirements of our system. The format is widely used in requirements engineering because it allows specifying both what the user of the system does along with the responses of the system. This provides a more robust picture of the system requirements than a traditional thick requirements document.
Tags	A tag is a single word that is used to categorize information. For example, the word "biomedical" could be associated with an example of prior art, so that in the future you could retrieve all prior art that has that tag.
Treemap	Treemapping is a particular method for displaying information about entities with a hierarchical relationship, in a "space-constrained" environment (such as a computer monitor). Treemaps display rows of data as groups of squares that can be arranged, sized and colored to graphically reveal underlying data patterns. This visualization technique allows end users to easily recognize complicated data relationships that are otherwise non-obvious. See: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Treemapping

Listing of Actors

Role	Description
Visitor	A random / unregistered visitor to the website
Member	Visitor that has registered with the website
Applicant	Patent Applicant, also a member.
Contributor	Member who has provided commentary, Prior Art samples
Moderator	Member who has approval authority for content under review on website. The moderator role is narrowly defined as a person who posts for obvious policy violations such as spam, copyright violation or inappropriate content.
Administrator	Administers the system, setup patent applications for use
Data Entry Clerk	Types data into the system, setup applications for use
Examiner	US Patent examiner. An examiner cannot be a Member.
Social Scientist	Analyzes community activity
Stakeholder	Any of the participating actors

Comment: Probably will be difficult to find unbiased moderators...this job might end up being taken up by administrator & clerk

Comment: Should define. This was mentioned in Use case 1 – who are these? Just Lead Sponsors?

Use Case Model

The use case model describes the functionality of the system in terms of actions performed by the user of the system (an Actor) and a description of how the system responds to those actions.

1. Register to become a member
2. Setup a new patent application(*)
3. Find one specific patent application
4. Browse patent applications (*)
5. Add Threaded Comment
6. Rank a claim
7. Submit prior art (*)
8. Approve a prior art submission
9. Rate a prior art submission
10. Subscribe to email alerts (*)
11. Review transmitted report (*)
12. Provide feedback on prosecution history (*)
13. Search for prior art (*)
14. View Patent Application (*)
15. Automatic Claim Charting (**)
16. View and edit my comments, prior art, alerts, or saved searches(**)
17. Tag patent application (*)
18. Create a custom RSS feed(**)
19. Remove a comment or submission from the website (**)
20. Search comments (**)
21. Find help or a tutorial(**)
22. View an email alert(**)
23. Search and save the search (**)
24. Invite a friend to join the community(**)
25. Join special interest group(**)
26. Communicate with a special interest group(**)
27. Post request for Help Finding Prior Art (**)
28. Rate a user (**)

(* = architecturally significant use case)

(** = not documented)

Use Case 1	Register to become a member	Comment: Would an examiner or key stakeholder have pre-existing accounts? Would they still have to register?
Description	Visitor enters data into a form so that they can become a member of peer review community.	
Pre-conditions	None	
Target Outcome	Visitor is a Member of the online patent peer review community	
Participating Actors	Visitor to the public website	
User Activity		System Response
1. Visitor uses public website and locates the registration link	<p>System displays the registration form which allows the member to select an identifier to be used for system login and identification purposes.</p> <p>The required fields of this form are: Name, Email address, User identifier, Password. Re-type password</p> <p>The full set of optional data fields is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Affiliation • Job Title • Other Affiliation • Other Job Title • Professional Category (e.g. research scientist, legal professional etc - we'll have to develop these categories) • Education (with room to list multiple degrees, the schools and the subject area) • Publications • Grants Received • Awards Received • Areas of Interest (by keyword) • Contact Information • Location (e.g. city, state, zip) • Free text description 	
2. Visitor enters data into the form that is presented and clicks the Next button	<p>System captures the data that was submitted and:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stores the data • Capture security information (such as the IP address) • Creates a new member account with associated account identifier • Sets the status of the account to 'pending' • Emails the user a confirmation message <p>Presents instructions to the user for how to complete the registration process using email.</p>	
3. Visitor logs into email and clicks on the	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sets the status of the account to 'active' • Welcome message is sent to the new member and provides follow- 	

link to activate the membership	up instructions describing how to log in to the online system.	Comment: What might the follow up instructions entail?
Issues	In order to prevent unwanted spam, the system should have security functions to assure the contribution is made by a human not an automated computer program	

Questions

1. Do we all agree that registration should be pseudonymous (no verification of identity)
- 2.

Use Case 2	Setup a new patent application	
Description	The data for an existing USPTO patent application is added to the website and setup to allow community peer reviews	
Pre-conditions	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Application is labeled and tagged according to PCS 2. Application is published to USPTO website 3. Application is classified within 2100 4. Applicant has signed consent and waiver 5. Applicant is a registered Member of the website. 6. Contacts for applicant are gathered and in the system. 	
Target Outcome	Application is available online in our system and is in 'Open' status so comments, ranking claims, submission of prior art, and rating prior art are permitted.	
Participating Actors	Applicant, Administrator	
	User Activity	System Response
	1. Patent Applicant registers as a member of the web community.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An account name / user identifier is created for the applicant. • System provides a link to a "Patent Application Request Form", which a member can fill out to request addition of a patent application to the community.
	2. Patent Applicant submits a patent application request form, which includes the following data values: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Patent Application Number • Application Publication Date 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • System places application in request queue for approval or denial.
	3. Administrator logs in to review pending requests	List of pending requests is displayed
	4a. Administrator follows a procedure to determine whether the application request should be accepted. (Details to be defined). If all criteria are met, then the request is approved.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Workflow status of the request is change to approved.
	4b. (alternative to 4a) Administrator follows a procedure to determine whether the request should be accepted. The criteria are not met and the request is not approved.	Notification of denial returned to applicant.
	4. Setup of data in the system <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clerical staff retrieves source data from USPTO website • Data is entered into the system 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alert generated to subscribers of the patent application request event. • System makes application active • Notification of status is returned to applicant

<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Claims are data-entered into the database queue by a clerk• Clerk indicates application is ready for use and presses SUBMIT button.	
--	--

Use Case 3	Find one specific patent application	
Description	Locate a single application so that you can do something with the application.	
Pre-conditions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Patent is online and in the system • User knows enough identifying information to find a specific patent. 	
Target Outcome	A single specific patent application has been located in the system.	
Participating Actors	Visitor, Member	
	User Activity	System Response
	1. Actor reviews the front page of the public website and locates the link to "Find a patent"	<p>System presents a search form that provides various means to locate a patent. Search modifiers include: Patent Number, Issue Date, Classification, et cetera.</p> <p>This is a subset of functionality on the USPTO website with possible additions that are specific to this application, such as a search of prior art</p>
	2. Actor enters data into the form and presses Submit	System presents a search engine results page that either returns the specific patent application or a list of possible patent applications to the user for selection
	3. The user confirms the patent application to be displayed and presses Submit	<p>System displays the specific patent application.</p> <p>See Use Case 14: View Patent Application</p>

Comment: How about a function to save the entire search result?

Use Case 4	Browse Patent Applications	
Description	A website visitor may use a variety of tools to discover and/or visualize the activity and content created by the community	
Pre-conditions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Patent is online and in the system • User has a general idea of the type of information they are looking for. 	
Target Outcome	One or more patent applications of interest are located in the system.	
Participating Actors	Visitor, Member	
	User Activity	System Response
	1. Actor views the front page of the website and finds the section that say "Browse Patents"	System presents the user with a list of possible methods for browsing the patents: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Find a specific patent (separate use case) • By Area Class or Subclass (e.g. 2100) • Applications which are open for comments, sorted by the date that comment time period ends • "Treemap" visualization tools <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Active Applications <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • E.g. number of submissions • E.g. number of comments • Classification Area • Community Tags for Subject Areas • Community Tags for Prior Art • Browse via Key Statistics <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • By Popular Classification • By Number of Reviews • By Most Recent Activity • By Number of Comments
	2. User selects the preferred browsing method	System displays links to one or more patent applications.
	3. User selects a specific patent application of interest.	The user is presented with a set of choices about what can be done next. (Listed elsewhere)

Comment: Perhaps provide a graphical example as an appendix to this doc

Use Case 5	Add Comment	
Description	The system allows a registered community member to add comments relevant to a specific application.	
Pre-conditions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The actor is logged into the system as a member and is viewing a specific patent (See Use Case 14: View a patent application) 	
Target Outcome	A comment is added to the patent application.	
Participating Actors	Members, Moderators	
	User Activity	System Response
	1. The actor is viewing the "cover page" for a patent application. The actor scrolls down the page and finds a discussion section where they can add threaded comments	<p>A Discussion message board is visible at the bottom of the page. Key features:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This information will not be transmitted to the patent examiner. This is always open for discussion regardless of the workflow state for comments and prior art contributions. File uploads are not allowed. Comments are automatically posted without moderation but can be removed for spam after the fact. A list of comments are displayed along with the following controls: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Slashdot style discussion group functionality appears at the bottom of the page.
	2. User can input a comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The comment is captured and the display is updated. The comment can be viewed by others.
	3. User can change the display of the comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The appearance of the display is updated.
	Issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Need to specify exactly how this behaves. For example, since in our world "everyone is a moderator", can they rate comments? For example, is there karma on user comments?

Use Case 6	Rank a claim	
Description	The community member indicates which of the claims are most important for a specific patent application.	
Pre-conditions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The actor is logged into the system as a member. • The actor has located and displayed a specific open patent application in the online system (See Use Case 14: View an Application) 	
Target Outcome	The rank changes for a claim within the patent application.	
Participating Actors	Members	
	User Activity	System Response
	4. The member views the patent application and clicks on the "Claims" tab within the application.	<p>The Claims Tab allows the following additional functions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Display of the rating values. This is the computed ratings based on aggregate quantitative user input. • A "Rate" button
	5. The member clicks the "Rate" button	<p>An in-line form (or popup) is displayed that allows inputting the rating value and the reason codes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quantitative input on claims. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ E.g. Thumbs up / thumbs down ○ E.g. Identify most important claim ○ E.g. Scalar values • Reason codes explaining the choice. [We use reason codes so that we can create instant polls. The reason codes should be in a lookup table.] • Free text. The purpose of the free text is to capture a reason for which there is no existing code.
	6. The member rates the claim and provides a reason code	<p>The display is updated so that the user rating is integrated into the claims tab.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The system displays the new computed rating for the claim • (optional - nice to have) The system displays the user's own ratings <p>The system allows a user to vote more than once and discards all but the previous vote. The system may also display an instant poll based on the reason codes.</p>

Use Case 7	Submit Prior Art	
Description	Community members can submit prior art that predates the date of invention and connect that prior art to one or more claims on a patent application.	
Pre-conditions	Actor is registered as a community member and has located a single specific open patent application online. Actor has reviewed the application (See Use Case 14).	
Target Outcome	A Prior Art reference is submitted for review by the Moderator. Prior art is both uploaded and linked to.	
Participating Actors	Members	
	User Activity	System Response
	1. When viewing the patent application, the member clicks "Submit Prior Art Reference"	Wizard Step 1: The system prompts with request for user to select one or more claims to which this is relevant. The claims are presented on the page as a list with a check box next to each claim, along with a "Next" button. The user may select zero or more claims.
	2. The member selects the claims for this application and presses the NEXT button.	Wizard Step 2: The system prompts the user to pick the type of prior art reference. They can pick from a menu that includes several types of prior art reference: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Issued Patent, • Published Patent Application, • Journal Article, • Book Excerpt , • Open Source Project. (A complete list of the types has not yet been prepared.) A "Next" button is displayed.
	3. The member selects the type of prior art reference and presses the NEXT button.	Wizard Step 3: Based on the type of prior art reference that was selected, a form is displayed. Every form includes the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Date of the prior art reference • Reason Code menu, which displays a menu of common reasons to explain why this prior art is relevant. [The reason code is used to enable instant polls.] • One line summary: WHAT is this about? • Comment by the citation author indicating WHY this prior art is relevant • Tags / keywords for this citation / reference.

	<p>A set of fields that is specific to this type of form will be displayed. Examples of the fields might include</p> <p>Example: U.S. Patent or Patent Application: (a) USPTO Identifier</p> <p>Book: (a) Title (b) Author (c) Publication Date</p> <p>Files: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All files must be uploaded and will be kept private and transmitted to the patent office. • Links to content elsewhere on the Web will be shown to the community • Where prior art is not already on the web, uploaded copy will be displayed unless user designates that content should be kept private. </p> <p>Open Source Project <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The name of the project • Details about how to verify the prior art. </p> <p>Commercial Prior Art Database: (a) Product name (b) Citations details</p> <p>Et Cetera.</p> <p>System automatically remembers the most recent form and pre-selects that form when this page is displayed.</p> <p>A "Next" button is displayed.</p>
<p>4. The user fills out the form and presses the NEXT button</p>	<p>Wizard Step 4: A Search is performed against the values that are input into the form. The search is across prior art citations associated with this application, to identify possible similar prior art that may already be submitted. A list of results is presented. If the user sees a matching prior art item, they can click a button to rate or comment on the matching prior art item.</p> <p>A "Finish" button is displayed along with a "Create Another" button that allows looping back to Step 3 (Wizard Step1)</p>

5. The member clicks the "Finish" button	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The prior art reference is saved • System checks the Invention Date to see if the request can be fulfilled. • A timestamp is generated • System presents an acknowledgement of the submission back to the actor and a description of what to expect in terms of the amount of time until it will be processed (posted or rejected).
6. Moderator reviews prior art submission	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Moderator either approves or rejects prior art submission based on published guidelines. (See Use Case 8)
Issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Who writes the brief description of the patent application? • What is the complete list of sections that can appear in patent applications? We have seen variations that are unexpected. • If we search for matching prior art, what happens if the only difference is the list of claims? Do we create a new prior art reference?

Use Case 8	Approve a prior art submission	
Description	A moderator reviews a prior art submission, checking for spam and inappropriate or proprietary content and approving items that are suitable	
Pre-conditions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The time window for the application comments is open A prior art submission "work item" has been created and is not approved for display 	
Target Outcome	Prior art submission request is processed and approved or returned	
Participating Actors	Moderator	
	User Activity	System Response
	1. The moderator logs in to a special "work list" page to retrieve the next work item.	A work item is presented for approval, with options to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Allow- Post item online. (b) Return - Return to user without approval (c) Hold - Hold in moderator's queue
	2. The moderator reviews the work item along with the overall application and decides to ALLOW	The system: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Updates the item status to ALLOW. The item is posted online The rating of the Member is upgraded.
	3. The moderator reviews the work item along with the overall application and decides to RETURN. The moderator provides a explanation of the outcome either as text or by picking from a menu of standard reasons.	The system: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Updates the item status to RETURN. The item is not posted The item remains visible in the workspace of the author The rating of the Member is unchanged.
	4. The moderator reviews the work item along with the overall application and decides to HOLD.	The system: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Updates the item status to HOLD. The item is not posted The item remains visible in the workspace of the moderator The item remains visible in the workspace of the author
Issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How does a re-submission differ from an initial submission? Can we allow multiple moderators so that there is one for each application? Need to specify the details of each prior art reference / citation format. 	

Comment: Is this the default status?

Comment: Let me do some research.

Use Case 9	Rate a prior art submission	
Description	Community members can rate each Prior Art item associated with an application and view the current rating.	
Pre-conditions	Member submitted Prior art item is approved for an open patent application. The actor is viewing a single specific patent application.	
Target Outcome	Prior art submission rating is changed.	
Participating Actors	Member	
	User Activity	System Response
	1. The member locates a single specific open patent application and selects the option to "View Prior Art References". This link is accessible from both the application "cover page" and the "View Entire Application" page.	<p>A view of the Prior Art References is displayed. This may be represented as a tab on a separate page. Elements for this view include the following items:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • List of prior art references • For each prior art reference, <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Show the associated claim numbers ○ All the fields we gather data on (depends on the type of prior art reference) ○ Display the computed result of ratings for this prior art reference. This is the average of all ratings so far. ○ A "Rate" button ○ Number of comments ○ "View Comments" button that leads to the list of ratings, reason codes, and comments. Not threaded. • Ability to sort by rating data or claim number
	2. The actor clicks the "Rate" button.	<p>An In-line form (or popup) for data input of ratings for this prior art reference is displayed. The form includes the following fields:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Scale value. Buttons for indicating a Scale ranking from 1 to 5, five being best ○ Reason code [Used for instant polls] ○ Free text. Used to capture data where there is no appropriate reason code. ○ A "Submit Button"
	3. The actor rates the Prior Art item by filling out the form	<p>The system:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recalculates the computed rating • Changes the rank of the item and updates the display • Logs the user identity into the database • Discards prior votes by this actor
Issues	○ Need to have an expert design the rating system.	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What should the default ranking be for prior art? Users ratings may be biased towards the items that appear first in the list.
--	--

Use Case 10	Subscribe to Email Alerts	
Pre-conditions	Actor is a member of the community	
Target Outcome	System alert is created	
Participating Actors	Member	
User Activity	System Response	
1. The member indicates they want to subscribe to alerts and Clicks on the "Alerts" button	System displays the alerts page as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Title for the Alert • Specifies one of the following Alert types <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New Applications Added to the System • New claim comments • Prior Art Submitted • PCS class or subclass • Identifies a specific patent they want an alert on OR • Actor has specified community Tags to be used to retrieve the alert contents OR • Actor has specified a full text search query w 	
2. The member specifies alert options and clicks "Submit" to create the alert.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The alert is added to the list of alerts in the member workspace. • System displays a feedback page describing the alert that was setup and next steps. • System sends out the email alert as scheduled with the following information: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 3 lines of text ○ Closing Date for comments on this application ○ Summary of invention ○ Link to full application ○ Instructions on how to participate 	

Comment: What about alerts for new claim comments and prior art submitted

Comment: Members should have ability to customize these options when setting up alert

Use Case 11	Review a transmitted report
Pre-conditions	The patent application comment period closes and reports are submitted to the patent examiner for review
Target Outcome	A review of community comments including prior art occurs
Participating Actors	Examiner
User Activity	System Response
	The time period for comments expires
	The system automatically changes the status of the application so further comments cannot be created.
	The system generates the following reports: (a) Rank Claims (b) Rank Prior Art Claims (c) Top Ten Prior Art (d) Activity Report (Key Statistics)
2. The Examiner logs into their "Examiner's Page" and locates a specific application for processing.	System displays a page with links to the reports. System also has link to unranked claims, unranked prior art submissions, and prior art submissions not within the top ten.
3. The Examiner displays and optionally prints the report	

Use Case 12	Provide feedback on prosecution history	
Description	After the patent examiner has made a final determination, the system will allow certain results of that decision to be tracked online	
Pre-conditions	The Examiner has made a final determination and approved or denied a patent request. A response has been prepared and all claim amendments are complete. We have a copy of the prosecution history.	
Target Outcome	Decision on whether to approve or deny the application	
Participating Actors	Data Entry Clerk	
	User Activity	System Response
	4. The clerk logs into their "Feedback Page" and using a search function, locates a specific p2p application for processing.	The system displays a menu of options as follows: (a) Rank Claims (b) Rank Prior Art
	5. The actor reviews the application and selects RANK CLAIMS	System displays a list of the claims in order of their rank by the community members with option to rate any single claim with a scale value indicating if the item was more helpful or less helpful. Based on the system ratings, the user ratings will be incremented or decremented.
	6. The actor reviews the application and selects RANK PRIOR ART	System displays the top ten prior art items as ranked by the community members with the option to rate prior art as: (a) Cited (b) A scalar value indicating if the claim is valid or not valid Based on the system ratings, the user ratings will be incremented or decremented.
Issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need an expert to decide if we need a "top ten" • How does the data from the prosecutor history get captured and input into the system? 	

Use Case 13	Search for Prior Art	
Description	Community members can search existing database of prior art on the CPR website for references.	
Pre-conditions	Actor is registered as a community member and has located a single specific open patent application online.	
Target Outcome	Community member submits found art as commentary to patent application.	
Participating Actors	Members	
	User Activity	System Response
	1. The member clicks the "Search for Prior Art" button	System prompts with a page that allows the user to search through any community-provided prior art examples or proceed without searching. [Note: This search could be federated across multiple prior art databases]
	2. The member fills out a form with search input fields for locating prior art and presses Submit button	Search results are presented along with the options to "Select" a found piece of prior art
	3. The member selects a found piece of prior art	System updates patent application to include a reference to the found prior art. The system prompts with request for user input of the following (a) One or more claims to which this is relevant (selected from a list) (b) Selection of reason codes to explain this reference. (c) Textual description of why this is relevant to the application. (optional) (d) Tags for use in subsequent searches (optional).
	4. Actor fills in the fields of the form and presses Submit button	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • System checks the Invention Date to see if the request can be fulfilled. • A timestamp is generated • System presents an acknowledgement of the submission back to the actor and a description of what to expect in terms of the amount of time until it will be processed (posted or rejected).
	5. Moderator reviews prior art submission	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Moderator either approves or rejects prior art submission. (See Use Case 8)
Issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What should the default ranking be for prior art? Users ratings may be biased towards the items that appear first in the list. • Need defenses against spam and inappropriate content 	

Use Case 14	View Patent Application	
Description	Community members can search existing database of prior art on the CPR website for references.	
Pre-conditions	Actor is registered as a community member and has located a single specific open patent application online.	
Target Outcome	A view of the patent application is displayed. The viewer can read the patent application and utilize all the functionality associated with the application.	
Participating Actors	Anyone	
	User Activity	System Response
	<p>1. User clicks on the selected patent application that they wish to see and clicks a link to display the application.</p>	<p>System presents a cover page that includes the following features:</p> <p>Patent Information (taken from USPTO source data)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Title • Number • Inventor • Assignee • Date of Invention • Date of filing • Class and Subclass (in English, not USPCS code) • Abstract • Brief Description <p>Activity View with Metrics and Visualizations for this patent application, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of community members • Ability to link to see actual community members • Number of comments on claims • Number of prior art references • Demographics information on peer group • "Mood" taken from member comments <p>Button to "Join" an ad-hoc community that is organized around this patent application. By joining this group, the following occurs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Member appears in a list of ad-hoc group members • Automatic email alerts • Access to a list of the applications that you have joined • Ability to create a per-patent application profile, why you are interested in this.

	<p>Buttons that allow “Showing Reviewers” and “Inviting Reviewers” to participate.</p> <p>“View Entire Application” link. This leads to a drill-down page where the full text of the application can be seen.</p> <p>Start Date for comment time period End Date for comment time period</p> <p>Tag Cloud for showing most popular key words</p> <p>Button to “Add Tags”</p> <p>Threaded Discussion message board. This information will not be transmitted to the patent examiner. This is always open for discussion regardless of the workflow state for comments and prior art contributions. File uploads are not allowed. Comments are automatically posted without moderation but can be removed for spam after the fact.</p> <p>Button for experts to “Submit Prior Art Reference”.</p> <p>Search button and text field. Allows searching within participating patent applications.</p>
<p>2. The user clicks the “View Entire Application” link.</p>	<p>System displays a header with basic information about the patent application.</p> <p>Header includes the following information about the patent application:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Title • Number • Names of inventors • (more) <p>Four tabs are displayed: Abstract, Claims, Descriptions, and Images / Illustrations. The user interaction consists of a tabbed user interface or page sections that can expand and collapse. Each tab displays the USPTO text for the application.</p> <p>The Claims Tab allows the following additional functions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Display of the rating values. This is the computed ratings based on aggregate quantitative user input. • A “Rate” button triggers an in-line form (or popup) that allows inputting the rating value and the reason codes. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Quantitative input on claims <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Thumbs up / thumbs down

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Reason codes explaining the choice. We use reason codes so that we can create instant polls. The reason codes should be in a lookup table. • A "View" button takes you to a list of ratings, who created them, and the reason code. Or it may generate an instant poll based on the results. • "View Prior Art" link. This leads to a view of the prior art that is attached to this specific claim. <p>Buttons on this page include:</p> <p>"Submit Prior Art References" button (See Step 3)</p> <p>"Discussion Board Posting", which links back to the cover page and scrolls to the discussion section. (See Step 1)</p> <p>"View Prior Art References" - This may be represented as a tab on a separate page. It is accessible from both the cover page and the "View Entire Application" page. Elements for this view include the following items:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • List of prior art references • For each prior art reference, <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Show the associated claim numbers ○ All the fields we gather data on ○ Display result of ratings for this prior art reference ○ In-line form for data input of ratings for this prior art reference <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Scale value ▪ Reason code ▪ Free text ○ Number of comments ○ "View Comments" button that leads to the list of ratings, reason codes, and comments. Not threaded. • Ability to sort by rating data or claim number
Issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •

Other requirements

1. System has a link for RSS feeds on the page for each individual patent, as well as the page for patent search results. The RSS functionality is substantially in the RSS reader not our application.
 - o ISSUE: Do we need to track who receives RSS feeds?
2. Ratings of members are generated automatically by the system or by examiners as part of the application workflow
 - o ISSUE: Is karma generated by community or exclusively by examiners?
3. System must allow book-marking applications.

Gaps and Holes

1. We have no use case for rating users.
2. Allow users to set a default form for prior art references. We have no user preferences form.
3. We have no use case for requesting help on a prior art search
4. The concept of a “placeholder” is problematic because the user could lump multiple references into the listing. Should someone be able to vote on a placeholder that is not completed?
5. It is not clear that our current process will narrow the number of Prior Art references for the examiner.
6. Use case 11, there is no USPTO integration. Delete that step.
7. Use case 12 is handled by a clerk, not the examiner. If the examiner formally notes that they used our data in their rejection, it would make it far easier for us to capture. Not sure if this is possible. If they do not do this, can we still take credit? How does the matching take place?
8. There is a pretty good argument that we will never have critical mass for searches during our pilot. This means that search may not matter as much as one would expect. This suggests that experts will be our key resource rather than “explorers”.
9. Need to define “reason codes” for Prior Art references.
10. It may help us to have a diagnostic questionnaire that would allow the experts to self-rate (e.g. tell us if they are expert or not). I would imagine that a few well written questions would make it clear under some circumstances.
- 11.