



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
13/904,963	05/29/2013	Kelly D. Phillipps	3128.2.5	6149

36491	7590	05/15/2015
Kunzler Law Group 50 W. Broadway 10th Floor SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84101		

EXAMINER	
MISIR, DAYWAYSHWAR D	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2129	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
05/15/2015	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

docket@kunzlerlaw.com

Office Action Summary	Application No. 13/904,963	Applicant(s) PHILLIPPS ET AL.	
	Examiner DAVE MISIR	Art Unit 2129	AIA (First Inventor to File) Status Yes

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTHS FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05/29/2013.
☐ A declaration(s)/affidavit(s) under **37 CFR 1.130(b)** was/were filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ An election was made by the applicant in response to a restriction requirement set forth during the interview on ____; the restriction requirement and election have been incorporated into this action.
- 4) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims*

- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are pending in the application.
5a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are rejected.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 9) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

* If any claims have been determined allowable, you may be eligible to benefit from the **Patent Prosecution Highway** program at a participating intellectual property office for the corresponding application. For more information, please see http://www.uspto.gov/patents/init_events/pph/index.jsp or send an inquiry to PPHfeedback@uspto.gov.

Application Papers

- 10) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 11) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 05/29/2013 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

Certified copies:

- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some** c) ☐ None of the:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

** See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 3) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____. |
| 2) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08a and/or PTO/SB/08b)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . | 4) ☐ Other: ____. |

Continuation of Attachment(s) 2). Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08), Paper No(s)/Mail Date
:05/29/2013,09/19/2013,03/06/2014,03/11/2014,04/08/2014,05/19/2014,06/24/2014,07/09/2014,09/17/2014,11/20/2014,04/03/2015.

DETAILED ACTION

The present application, filed on or after March 16, 2013, is being examined under the first inventor to file provisions of the AIA.

This Office Action is sent in response to applicants communication received on 05/29/2013.

Claims 1-26 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 112(b):

(b) CONCLUSION.—The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the inventor or a joint inventor regards as the invention.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 112 (pre-AIA), second paragraph:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112(b) or 35 U.S.C. 112 (pre-AIA), second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the inventor or a joint inventor, or for pre-AIA the applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 8 recites the limitation "the adjusted one or more machine learning parameters" in lines 4-5. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

The Examiner suggests that perhaps in line 2 of the claim just *before* the word "adjusted" the word parameters should be inserted.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

In the event the determination of the status of the application as subject to AIA 35 U.S.C. 102 and 103 (or as subject to pre-AIA 35 U.S.C. 102 and 103) is incorrect, any correction of the statutory basis for the rejection will not be considered a new ground of rejection if the prior art relied upon, and the rationale supporting the rejection, would be the same under either status.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103 which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

A patent for a claimed invention may not be obtained, notwithstanding that the claimed invention is not identically disclosed as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the claimed invention and the prior art are such that the claimed invention as a whole would have been obvious before the effective filing date of the claimed invention to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which the claimed invention pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-14, 17-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over **Ingargiola R. et al.**, US PG Pub. No. 2005/0090911 A1.

With respect to **Claim 1**, Ingargiola teaches:

An apparatus for machine learning results, the apparatus comprising (Abstract; paragraph 12: wherein results from machine learning mechanisms are discussed and used):

an input module configured to receive user input identifying one or more values for one or more machine learning parameters (paragraphs 12-14, 47: wherein

collectively it is discussed, among other things, a user input device for adjusting parameters, indicators, advisor, that are machine learning based components);

a display module configured to display one or more machine learning results for the one or more identified machine learning parameters, the one or more machine learning results determined using machine learning (Abstract; paragraphs 12-13, 46: wherein the use of GUI for displaying machine learning results based on parameters, as previously mentioned, is discussed and used);

and an update module configured to dynamically update the displayed one or more machine learning results in response to the input module receiving additional user input identifying one or more additional values for the one or more machine learning parameters (paragraphs 96, 119, 123, 182, 186, 189: wherein it is discussed the re-specifying or modifying of parameters that necessarily updates the machine learning results).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, before the effective filing date of the claimed invention, to use the teachings of Ingargiola for the purposes of dynamically updating and displaying one or more machine learning results, determined using machine learning, in response to receiving user inputs identifying one or more additional values for one or more machine learning parameters.

The ordinary artisan would have been motivated to modify/use Ingargiola in the manner set forth above for the purposes of predicting the behavior or performance of a system using an interactive and dynamic methodology that includes machine learning [Ingargiola: Abstract; paragraphs 12-16].

(Examiner's Note: Elad and Pinto would also in combination teach the limitations of the above claim, as well as Breckenridge, US 2012/0191631 A1, see PTO-892).

With respect to **Claim 2**, Ingargiola further teaches:

The apparatus of claim 1, further comprising a pre-compute module configured to predetermine, using the machine learning, permutations of the machine learning results at predefined increments between a minimum value for the one or more machine learning parameters and a maximum value for the one or more machine learning parameters, prior to the input module receiving the user input

(paragraphs 47, 51, 104: wherein collectively it is discussed preprocessing and predicting, based on raw data and indicators and advisors, which are machine learning based components, and the use of moving average convergence divergence –MACD- which is necessarily a permutation/combination of time series data between specified minimum and maximum ranges).

With respect to **Claim 3**, Ingargiola further teaches:

The apparatus of claim 2, wherein the pre-compute module is configured to cache the predetermined permutations of the machine learning results for the update module in a results data structure indexed by the one or more machine learning parameters (paragraphs 51, 94-95, 117, 186: wherein collectively it is discussed,

among other things, the storing of user/default selections and the use of indicators in accessing and displaying specified file location/name data).

With respect to **Claim 4**, Ingargiola further teaches:

The apparatus of claim 3, wherein the pre-compute module is configured to determine the machine learning results by looking up the machine learning results in the results data structure using the one or more machine learning parameters (paragraphs 51, 94-95: wherein it is discussed the ability of the system to browse or look up file content).

With respect to **Claim 5**, Ingargiola further teaches:

The apparatus of claim 1, wherein the display module is configured to display one or more attributes of a data set used by the machine learning to determine the one or more machine learning results and one or more impact metrics for each displayed attribute (Fig. 1; paragraphs 13-14, 16: wherein it is shown and described the displaying of a plurality of factors that can be considered as attributes and active indicators that can be considered impact metrics).

With respect to **Claim 6**, Ingargiola further teaches:

The apparatus of claim 1, further comprising a predictive compiler module configured to generate the machine learning, the machine learning comprising program code for a plurality of learned functions from multiple machine learning

classes, the program code generated by the predictive compiler module to predict the machine learning results based on the one or more machine learning parameters (paragraphs 47, 49, 62, 92, 181: wherein collectively it is discussed the use of a plurality of machine learning based components and their parameters used in predicting results).

With respect to **Claim 7**, Ingargiola further teaches:

The apparatus of claim 1, further comprising a recommendation module configured to select a suggested set of machine learning results, the display module configured to display the suggested set of machine learning results to the user prior to the input module receiving the user input (paragraphs 46-47, 51: wherein it is discussed a user interface for, among other things, displaying recommendations to the user).

With respect to **Claim 8**, Ingargiola further teaches:

The apparatus of claim 1, wherein the one or more machine learning parameters comprise one or more of an input and an output of the machine learning adjusted by the user input and the machine learning results comprise one or more of an input and an output of the machine learning determined based on the adjusted one or more machine learning parameters (paragraph 96, 119, 123, 182, 186, 189: wherein it is discussed the user input re-specifying or modifying parameters that necessarily updates or adjusts the machine learning results).

With respect to **Claim 9**, Ingargiola further teaches:

The apparatus of claim 1, wherein the one or more machine learning parameters comprise one or more of an attribute of a feature, a target value for a goal, an action relating to a goal, a confidence metric, and a target of an action (paragraphs 128, 163, 175, 198-201: wherein it is discussed, among other things, the use of features and confidence levels or metrics).

With respect to **Claim 10**, Ingargiola further teaches:

The apparatus of claim 1, wherein the machine learning results comprise one or more of an attribute of a feature, a target value for a goal, an action relating to a goal, a confidence metric, and a target of an action (paragraphs 128, 163, 175, 198-201: wherein it is discussed, among other things, the use of features and confidence levels or metrics).

With respect to **Claim 11**, Ingargiola further teaches:

The apparatus of claim 1, wherein the input module is configured to receive the user input as an adjustment to a slider graphical user interface element corresponding to the one or more machine learning parameters (paragraph 202: wherein as discussed the user interface can include controls such as sliders).

With respect to **Claim 12**, Ingargiola further teaches:

The apparatus of claim 1, wherein the input module is configured to receive the user input as a user entry in a graphical table and the display module is configured to display the one or more machine learning results as entries in the graphical table (Fig. 21A; paragraphs 10, 117, 201: wherein it is shown and discussed the use of tables for receiving and displaying data).

With respect to **Claim 13**, Ingargiola further teaches:

The apparatus of claim 1, wherein the input module is configured to receive the user input as a user manipulation of a displayed object (paragraphs 83, 88, 202: wherein it is discussed the user input can include, among other methods, drag and drop of symbols or icons, or the use of sliders).

With respect to **Claim 14**, Ingargiola further teaches:

The apparatus of claim 13, wherein the user input comprises one or more of: an adjustment to a size of the displayed object; an adjustment to a vertical position of the displayed object; an adjustment to a horizontal position of the displayed object; an adjustment to an opacity of the displayed object; an adjustment to a color of the displayed object; an adjustment to a shape of the displayed object; an adjustment to shading of the displayed object; a text entry in a text box for the displayed object; and user interaction with an animation for the displayed object (paragraphs 83, 88, 201, 202: wherein collectively it is discussed the moving and

resizing of windows/displays for a custom view, the use of text boxes, sliders, and drag and drop of symbols or icons that represents a user interaction with objects).

With respect to **Claim 17**, Ingargiola teaches:

A method for machine learning results, the method comprising (Abstract; paragraph 12: wherein results from machine learning mechanisms are discussed and used):

inputting permutations of machine learning parameters incrementally between minimum values for the machine learning parameters and maximum values for the machine learning parameters into a predictive program (paragraphs 47, 51, 104: wherein collectively it is discussed preprocessing and predicting, based on raw data and indicators and advisors, which are machine learning based components, and the use of moving average convergence divergence –MACD- which is necessarily a permutation/combination of time series data between specified minimum and maximum ranges. And, paragraphs 47, 49, 62, 92, 181: wherein collectively it is discussed the use of a plurality of machine learning based components and their parameters used in predicting results, that would necessarily involve the use of a predictive program);

determining machine learning results from the predictive program for the input permutations of the machine learning parameters (Abstract; paragraphs 12, 47, 49, 62, 92-93, 181: wherein collectively it is discussed the use of a plurality of machine learning based components and their parameters used in predicting results);

and populating a results data structure with the determined machine learning results indexed by the machine learning parameters (Abstract; Fig. 21A and 22A; paragraphs 51, 94-95, 117, 186, 201: wherein collectively it is shown and discussed, among other things, the storing, displaying or populating, of user/default selections, and the use of indicators, that are machine learning based components, in accessing and displaying specified file location/name data).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, before the effective filing date of the claimed invention, to use the teachings of Ingargiola for the purposes of inputting permutations of machine learning parameters incrementally between minimum values for the machine learning parameters and maximum values for the machine learning parameters into a predictive program; determining machine learning results from the predictive program for the input permutations of the machine learning parameters; and populating a results data structure with the determined machine learning results indexed by the machine learning parameters.

The ordinary artisan would have been motivated to modify/use Ingargiola in the manner set forth above for the purposes of predicting the behavior or performance of a system using an interactive and dynamic methodology that includes machine learning [Ingargiola: Abstract; paragraphs 12-16].

With respect to **Claim 18**, Ingargiola further teaches:

The method of claim 17, wherein the results data structure is populated prior to receiving user input identifying a value for a machine learning parameter

(paragraphs 47, 51: wherein it is discussed the use of prior data and previously stored predetermined selections).

With respect to **Claim 19**, Ingargiola further teaches:

The method of claim 17, further comprising dynamically displaying one or more corresponding machine learning parameters and machine learning results from the results data structure in response to user input selecting a value for one or more of a machine learning parameter and a machine learning result (paragraphs 13, 96, 123, 186: wherein it is discussed the displaying of results based on a user active selection of indicators, that are machine learning based components).

With respect to **Claim 20**, Ingargiola further teaches:

The method of claim 19, further comprising dynamically changing the displayed one or more corresponding machine learning parameters and machine learning results using the results data structure in response to user input adjusting a value for a machine learning parameter (paragraphs 13, 96, 111, 119: wherein it is discussed the changing of parameters that changes the displayed results).

With respect to **Claim 21**, Ingargiola further teaches:

The method of claim 19, further comprising dynamically changing the displayed one or more corresponding machine learning parameters and machine learning results using the results data structure in response to user input adjusting a

value for a machine learning result (Abstract; paragraphs 119, 182, 186, 192, 202: wherein it is collectively discussed changing parameters that subsequently changes what is displayed).

With respect to **Claim 22**, Ingargiola teaches:

A system for machine learning results, the system comprising (Abstract; paragraph 12: wherein results from machine learning mechanisms are discussed and used):

a pre-compute module configured to predetermine, using one or more predictive programs, permutations of machine learning results for each of the one or more predictive programs at predefined increments between minimum values for machine learning parameters and maximum values for the machine learning parameters (paragraphs 47, 51, 104: wherein collectively it is discussed preprocessing and predicting, based on raw data and indicators and advisors, which are machine learning based components, and the use of moving average convergence divergence – MACD- which is necessarily a permutation/combination of time series data between specified minimum and maximum ranges. And, paragraphs 47, 49, 62, 92, 181: wherein collectively it is discussed the use of a plurality of machine learning based components and their parameters used in predicting results, that would necessarily involve the use of a predictive program);

an input module configured to receive user input from multiple users identifying values for one or more of the machine learning parameters for the one or more predictive programs (paragraphs 12-14, 47, 56, 73: wherein collectively it is

discussed, among other things, a user input device for adjusting parameters, indicators, advisor, that are machine learning based components);

and a display module configured to display one or more of the predetermined machine learning results to the multiple users based on the identified values

(Abstract; Fig. 26; paragraphs 12-13, 46, 56, 73: wherein the use of GUI for displaying machine learning results based on parameters, as previously mentioned, is discussed and used).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, before the effective filing date of the claimed invention, to use the teachings of Ingargiola for the purposes of having a pre-compute module configured to predetermine, using one or more predictive programs, permutations of machine learning results for each of the one or more predictive programs at predefined increments between minimum values for machine learning parameters and maximum values for the machine learning parameters; an input module configured to receive user input from multiple users identifying values for one or more of the machine learning parameters for the one or more predictive programs; and a display module configured to display one or more of the predetermined machine learning results to the multiple users based on the identified values.

The ordinary artisan would have been motivated to modify/use Ingargiola in the manner set forth above for the purposes of predicting the behavior or performance of a system using an interactive and dynamic methodology that includes machine learning [Ingargiola: Abstract; paragraphs 12-16].

Claims 15-16, 23-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over **Ingargiola R. et al.**, US PG Pub. No. 2005/0090911 A1, in view of **Xu Z. et al.**, US Patent No. 8260117 B1.

With respect to **Claim 15**, Ingargiola teaches:

The apparatus of claim 1,
configured to determine an impact on the one or more machine learning results based on different user input received from a different user (Fig. 26; Abstract; paragraphs 56, 73: wherein it is shown and discussed the use of multiple users whose inputs and information can be leveraged in determining settings and subsequent results, i.e., the users impact can be determined).

Ingargiola does not teach:

further comprising a collaboration module.

However, Xu shows (C2, L48-63; C4, L8-20: wherein the use of a collaboration algorithm is described).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, before the effective filing date of the claimed invention, to use the teachings of Xu with that of Ingargiola for the purposes of having a collaboration module.

The ordinary artisan would have been motivated to modify Ingargiola in the manner set forth above for the purposes of satisfying a user interests and their one or more goals [Xu: C4, L8-20].

With respect to **Claim 16**, Ingargiola further teaches:

The apparatus of claim 15, wherein the input module is configured to receive the different user input from the different user, the different user input identifying a different value for a different machine learning parameter, the display module configured to display multiple sets of one or more machine learning results to multiple users, and the update module configured to dynamically update the displayed multiple sets of one or more machine learning results (paragraphs 12-14, 47, 56, 73: wherein collectively it is discussed, among other things, a user input device for adjusting parameters, indicators, advisor, that are machine learning based components. And, Abstract; Fig. 26; paragraphs 12-13, 46, 56, 73: wherein the use of GUI for displaying machine learning results based on parameters, as previously mentioned, is discussed and used; and as shown and discussed therein, these inputs/displays can be to/from multiple users. And, Abstract; paragraphs 119, 182, 186, 192, 202: wherein it is collectively discussed changing parameters that subsequently changes what is displayed).

With respect to **Claim 23**, Ingargiola teaches:

The system of claim 22, configured to determine an impact on machine learning results from one of the predictive programs based on an identified value for a machine learning parameter for another of the predictive programs (paragraphs 47, 49, 62, 92, 181: wherein collectively it is discussed the use of a plurality of machine learning based

components and their parameters used in predicting results, that would necessarily involve the use of predictive programs, and further it is discussed how these parameters and results can subsequently influence other parameters and results).

Ingargiola does not teach:

further comprising a collaboration module.

However, Xu shows (C2, L48-63; C4, L8-20: wherein the use of a collaboration algorithm is described).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, before the effective filing date of the claimed invention, to use the teachings of Xu with that of Ingargiola for the purposes of having a collaboration module.

The ordinary artisan would have been motivated to modify Ingargiola in the manner set forth above for the purposes of satisfying a user interests and their one or more goals [Xu: C4, L8-20].

With respect to **Claim 24**, Ingargiola further teaches:

The system of claim 23, wherein the multiple users identify the values for different predictive programs of the predictive programs (Abstract; Figs. 4, 7, 12 and 26; paragraphs 12-13, 47, 51, 60, 92, 104: wherein it shown and described how users can select and input various parameters for the machine learning mechanism).

Claim 25 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over **Ingargiola R.** et al., US PG Pub. No. 2005/0090911 A1, in view of **Xu Z.** et al., US Patent No. 8260117 B1, and further in view of **Pelton G.** et al., US PG Pub. No. 2009/0222742 A1.

With respect to **Claim 25**, Ingargiola teaches:

The system of claim 24, wherein the display module is configured to display the impact on the machine learning results for the multiple users and to display the machine learning results for the different predictive programs on different displays for the multiple users (Abstract; Fig. 26; paragraphs 12-13, 46, 56, 73: wherein the use of GUI for displaying machine learning results based on parameters, as previously mentioned, is discussed and used; and as shown and discussed therein, these inputs/displays can be to/from multiple users on different display devices).

Neither Ingargiola nor Xu teaches:

on a shared display.

But Pelton shows (paragraphs 31, 40: wherein it is described the use of a shared collaborative display or workspace).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, before the effective filing date of the claimed invention, to use the teachings of Pelton with that of Ingargiola and Xu for the purposes of having a shared display.

The ordinary artisan would have been motivated to modify Ingargiola and Xu in the manner set forth above for the purposes of enhancing and supporting collaboration between users with similar or relevant tasks [Pelton: paragraphs 40].

Claim 26 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over **Ingargiola R. et al.**, US PG Pub. No. 2005/0090911 A1, in view of **Pelton G. et al.**, US PG Pub. No. 2009/0222742 A1.

With respect to **Claim 26**, Ingargiola teaches:

The system of claim 22, wherein the input module is configured to receive the user input from one or more of: separate client devices for the multiple users over a data network (Abstract; Fig. 26; paragraphs 12-14, 44, 46-47, 56, 73: wherein collectively it is discussed, among other things, a user input device for adjusting parameters, indicators, advisor, that are machine learning based components; and as shown and discussed therein, these inputs/displays can be to/from multiple users on different display devices over a data network that consists of the necessary internet routers and servers).

Ingargiola does not teach:

and a shared interface for the multiple users on a single device.

But Pelton shows (paragraphs 31, 40: wherein it is described the use of a shared collaborative display or workspace for many users).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, before the effective filing date of the claimed invention, to use the teachings of Pelton with that of Ingargiola for the purposes of having a shared interface for the multiple users on a single device.

The ordinary artisan would have been motivated to modify Ingargiola in the manner set forth above for the purposes of enhancing and supporting collaboration between users with similar or relevant tasks [Pelton: paragraphs 40].

Examiner's Note:

The Examiner cites particular columns, line numbers, and paragraphs in the references as applied to the claims above for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings in the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested that, in preparing responses, the applicant fully consider the references in its entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the examiner and the additional related prior arts made of record that are considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure to further show the general state of the art. The Examiner's interpretations in parenthesis are provided with the cited references to assist the applicants to better understand how the examiner interprets the prior art to read on the claims. Such comments are entirely consistent with the intent and spirit of compact prosecution.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. See PTO-892.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to DAVE MISIR whose telephone number is (571)272-5243. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th 7:30 - 5 PM, F 7:30 - 4 PM (Off Alternate Fridays).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jeffrey Gaffin can be reached on 571-272-4146. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/JEFFREY A GAFFIN/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2129

Application/Control Number: 13/904,963
Art Unit: 2129

Page 22

/DAVE MISIR/
Examiner, Art Unit 2129

Notice of References Cited	Application/Control No. 13/904,963		Applicant(s)/Patent Under Reexamination PHILLIPPS ET AL.	
	Examiner DAVE MISIR		Art Unit 2129	Page 1 of 2

U.S. PATENT DOCUMENTS

*		Document Number Country Code-Number-Kind Code	Date MM-YYYY	Name	Classification
*	A	US-2005/0090911 A1	04-2005	Ingargiola et al.	700/036
*	B	US-2008/0162487 A1	07-2008	Richter, James Neal	707/10
*	C	US-7,480,640 B1	01-2009	Elad et al.	706/14
*	D	US-7,499,897 B2	03-2009	Pinto et al.	706/46
*	E	US-2009/0222742 A1	09-2009	Pelton et al.	715/753
*	F	US-2010/0010948 A1	01-2010	ITO et al.	706/20
*	G	US-2010/0010878 A1	01-2010	Pinto et al.	705/10
*	H	US-8,229,864 B1	07-2012	Lin et al.	706/11
*	I	US-2012/0191630 A1	07-2012	Breckenridge et al.	706/12
*	J	US-2012/0191631 A1	07-2012	Breckenridge et al.	706/12
*	K	US-8,260,117 B1	09-2012	Xu et al.	386/262
*	L	US-2012/0284213 A1	11-2012	Lin et al.	706/12
*	M	US-2014/0180738 A1	06-2014	Phillipps et al.	705/7.12

FOREIGN PATENT DOCUMENTS

*		Document Number Country Code-Number-Kind Code	Date MM-YYYY	Country	Name	Classification
	N					
	O					
	P					
	Q					
	R					
	S					
	T					

NON-PATENT DOCUMENTS

*		Include as applicable: Author, Title Date, Publisher, Edition or Volume, Pertinent Pages)
	U	Cabena P. et al., "Intelligent Miner for Data Applications Guide", IBM Corporation, International Technical Support Organization, 1999.
	V	Kolter J. et al., "DynamicWeighted Majority: An Ensemble Method for Drifting Concepts", Journal of Machine Learning Research, 8, 2007, pp. 2755-2790.
	W	Purpura S. et al., "Statistically adaptive learning for a general class of cost functions (SA L-BFGS)", 2012.
	X	Frank E. et al., "Weka-A Machine LearningWorkbench for Data Mining", Data Mining and Knowledge Discovery Handbook, 2nd ed., 2010.

*A copy of this reference is not being furnished with this Office action. (See MPEP § 707.05(a).)
Dates in MM-YYYY format are publication dates. Classifications may be US or foreign.

Notice of References Cited	Application/Control No. 13/904,963	Applicant(s)/Patent Under Reexamination PHILLIPPS ET AL.	
	Examiner DAVE MISIR	Art Unit 2129	Page 2 of 2

U.S. PATENT DOCUMENTS

*		Document Number Country Code-Number-Kind Code	Date MM-YYYY	Name	Classification
*	A	US-2014/0205990 A1	07-2014	Wellman et al.	434/362
*	B	US-8,965,814 B1	02-2015	Rangan, Venkat	706/12
	C	US-			
	D	US-			
	E	US-			
	F	US-			
	G	US-			
	H	US-			
	I	US-			
	J	US-			
	K	US-			
	L	US-			
	M	US-			

FOREIGN PATENT DOCUMENTS

*		Document Number Country Code-Number-Kind Code	Date MM-YYYY	Country	Name	Classification
	N					
	O					
	P					
	Q					
	R					
	S					
	T					

NON-PATENT DOCUMENTS

*		Include as applicable: Author, Title Date, Publisher, Edition or Volume, Pertinent Pages)
	U	Hall M. et al., "The WEKA Data Mining Software: An Update", SIGKDD Explorations, Volume 11, Issue 1, 2009.
	V	
	W	
	X	

*A copy of this reference is not being furnished with this Office action. (See MPEP § 707.05(a).)
Dates in MM-YYYY format are publication dates. Classifications may be US or foreign.