This mail is incomprehensible, especially by its end, without the details explained in[508]!

AI Facilitates PE-Testing Any ETCI by Its SPLAI-Relation — Automatically or by AI-Theorems.g)

Sigram Schindler*)
TU Berlin & TELES Patent Rights International GmbH
www.fstp-expert-system.com

Abstract

This mail remakes & simplifies[508]. It focuses on requirements to be met by all post-industrial societies' SPLs for preserving their wealth. [1.a]
For any ETCI, it recaps from[508] and models by '**Substantive Mathematical Philosophy, SMP**[h] ●primarily the '**materialism** & **idealism of the SPLAI-Relation**'[d], and ●secondarily that in the huge area of BIOvACETCIs it is a priori PE — always ∨ often. These 2 bullet points enable groundbreaking practical advantages in any patent business and thus dramatically improve any personal and/or financial incentive to invest into ETCI-R&Ds.
WIPO's & the USPTO's AI-cfps are unlimited[597] resp. PEG based[504,566]. No reply has an "**AI-key**"[598] — this mail 3 ones: 1 SPLAI-Relation & 2 SPLAI-Theorems.

The USPTO 2019 PE Guidelines[504,566] assume, by Andrei Iancu, correct ETCIs (almost[b]), as the Supreme Court's SPL framework requires. He also asked for an AI-test that simplifies ETCIs' PE-testing[c]. Starting from the Supreme Court's SPL refinement, he thus stimulated finding 3 AI-keys for testing inventions for PE — as of this mail[f].

1. The First AI-Key: The SPLAI-Relation — For any ETCI being a Necessary & Sufficient PE Criterion.

(Meta)Rational Claim Interpretation, (mrat)ratCI: <2 inputs[d]::= mrat&ratCI in 2 (nISL∨ISL) & ISLKRs, 2 outputs ::= CBN(mrat&ratETCI)> & begin:

1) if [CBN(mrat&ratETCI) is factually {mrat&ratO-crC0n = mrat&rat(($\sum$1≤n≤NKn:=K) ∧ (∧1≤n≤NnE-crC0kn)∧ncrC0n))/ 1≤n≤N} ∧ mrat&rat(E-complete∧-correct∧-definite)] then go on;
— whereby first the domain of any E-(x)crC comprises only a single T-value, a simplification dropped by the end of this first Section — [e),2.a]

2) if [mrat&ratO-inC0n, ∀1≤n≤N are ex- or implicitly lawfully_disclosed] then go on;

3) if [mrat&ratO-crC0n, ∀1≤n≤N are ex- or implicitly enablingly_disclosed]   then output mrat&ratE-crCS = CBN(mrat&ratETCI) & **stop.**

==

(Meta)Rational Claim Construction, (mrat)ratCC: <2 internalinputs ::= CBN((mrat)ratETCI), (in)externaloutput ::= CBN(ratETCI)> & begin:

4) if [CBN(mratETCI) is mrat'*directed to an nPE concept*',   i.e. rat'comprises in ETCI's nPETT0 an E-xcrC directing to this TT0's meaning] then go on;

5) if [CBN(mratETCI) is mrat'*an application of those concepts, …*'   i.e. rat'ratapplication of those concepts] then go on;

6) if [CBN(mratETCI) is mrat'*significantly more than [TT0, but min. §101 invasive & nPRE]*', i.e. rat'an ∈E-crCSETCI\TT0 is basically independent of E-crCSTT0] then go on;

7) if [CBN(mratETCI) is mat'*transforming the nature of the [claim(nPETT0) into claim(nPEETCI)]*',   i.e. rat'ratapplication uses/needsnPETT0] then i&eoutput 'CBN(ratETCI) is PE' & **stop.**

Mathematical Claim Construction, matCC: <internalinput ::= CBN(ratETCI), externaloutput ::= CBN(matETCI)> & begin:

4') if [E-xcrCSTT0 ≠+ Φ] then go on;

5') if [(∏TT0scope(E-crCSETCI) ⊆ scope(E-crCSTT0))] then go on;

6') if [(∃ E-crC* ∈ E-crCSETCI\TT0) ∧ (E-crC* ≇ E-crCSTT0)] then go on;

7') if [((∃ E-crC° ∈ E-crCSETCI\TT0) ∧ (∃ E-crC°° ∈ E-crCSTT0)) : E-crC° ‖ E-crC°°] then output 'CBN(matETCI) is PE' & **stop.**

Mathematical Claim Construction, matAICC: <internalinput ::= CBN(ratETCI), externaloutput ::= CBN(matETCI)> & begin:

4'') if [E-xcrCSTT0 ≠+Φ] = rat'comprises in the nPETT0 an E-xcrC' directing to this TT0's meaning] then go on;

5'') if [(∏TT0scope(E-crCSETCI) ⊆ scope(E-crCSTT0)) = a rat'ratapplication uses nPETT0'] then go on;

6'') if [(∃ E-crC* ∈ E-crCSETCI\TT0) ∧ (E-crC* ≇ E-crCSTT0) = rat'E-crCSETCI\TT0 is basically independent of E-crCSTT0] then go on;

7'') if [((∃αC°∈αCSETCI\TT0)∧(∃αC°°∈αCST0)):αC° ‖ αC°°] = rat'ratapplication uses/needs nPETT0'] then output 'CBN(matETCI) is PE' & **stop.**

Legend: In drafting axioms and drawing necessary & sufficient[f] conclusions from them for answering the questions 1)-7'') by an automaton, e.g. the IES[350], i.e. by artificial intelligence ('AI'), human intelligence ('HI') must not tolerate its often disastrous mental 'generosity'. This is indicated in[2.a] & in the first line of the top box and here not justified in detail[FSTP], but in principle only. It means that, for an ETCI at issue, an mratCI & a ratCI are indispensable, for confirming by the ratCC its ratCI (verified by potentially multiple iterations). This '**mental process model of rational SPL-testing**' is outlined on page 2. Its more detailed explanation will be provided in the textbook[182].

1.a See[488,489,495,503,576,577,586], the ref.[FSTP] & ref.[182] indicating that it is helpful tracking how it has & may evolve(d) in FSTPtech. There & here among many more of the following terms[489ftn2.a)] are used: **AI::=** Artificial Intelligence; **SPL::=** Substantive Patent Law; **(C/E)TCI::=** Classic/Emerging Technology Claimed Invention; **AC::=** application controlled; **CAC::=** conservative AC; **(nPE)|PE(G)::=** (non)patenteligible/-bility (guideline); **PA::=** patentability; **(p)posc::=** (person of) pertinent ordinary skill and creativity; **E-(x)crC(S)::=** elementary (exceptional) creative concepts (set); ……. — see the Ref. List below.
All meanings of these FSTP-notions[489ftn2.a)] are precisely defined — either here or earlier in[FSTP]. E.g. the 3 semiotic SMP notions: "**directed to nPETT0**, ≠+…"[e.g.573p3], "**application uses/needs TT0**, …‖"[e.g.576ftn2.a), HERE FIXED] and "**basically independent of TT0**, ≇"[e.g.488ftn1.b)], 2.d).

.b its still missing details[576,577,508] of ETCIs deal especially with their ('**subtleness**' & '**completeness**' &) '**preemption exclusion**' & '**minimal §101invasivity into R&D**'[f].

.c necessarily being a simplified FSTP-Test[FSTP], by its definition[572] modulo(redundancies) functionally being the only one, i.e. the unique one.

.d Materialistic & idealistic thinking — up to layering specifications, bypassing uncertainties in emerging technologies, …— is the realm of SMP[h], being indispensable for mathematically correctly modelling human thinking & its 'transformation' of an mratACETCI (in mratKR) into its identical rat∨matETCI (in rat∨matKR),[2.a)/f]

.e the ncrCs should definitely be part of a patent granted — what currently is not the case!!! — for avoiding preemptivity problems.[f]

.f The CAFC ignores all these filigree subtleties of (potentially logical) thinking — implied by the Supreme Court's unanimous 6 SPL-framework decisions & interpreted by SMP — thus accepting that its SPL precedents unavoidably is unpredictable as a priori inconsistent due to its not excluding internal ambiguities or contradictions. Its false interpretations of the Supreme Court's framework and all the discrepancies between its boards and its members are caused by its two untenable refusals: ●to interpret this framework **as sufficing** (late) 20th century linguistics[FSTP,Wikipedia], i.e. supported by SMP[h]), and thereafter ●to limit, in its (written) opinions, its English to so substantivized rationality **as necessary**[2.a).

.g 'automatically' refers to legally testing an ETCI by e.g. the FSTP-Test for its satisfying PE, assuming it is factually correct. Any ACvBIOETCI passes this FSTP-Test (as warranted by its ACvBIO- and SPLsupported 'needs/uses structure'), what enables replacing PE testing by an AI-Theorem (see Section 2).

.h The term '**Substantive Mathematical Philosophy, SMP**' is created here for referring by it in any MP — from the Aristotle era over the early Renaissance on to today's post industrial era it always was considered as monolithic (under whatever MP name) — to its nevertheless very specific area of eventual orientation on pure Mathematics and its applications (such as classical Physics). I.e., SMP is defined to ignore MP's long time largest area dealing with Linguistics/Arts/Ethics/ …/Religions, just as the by Leibniz & Newton created Differential/Integral Analysis. The latter could have been called SMP, too — but substantively only for Physics, not for ETs. **This tightening of MP's focus to 'SMP for ETs', i.e. to pre-industrial Mathematics, yields new 'substantive' rationalities[2a] — hitherto without this new SMP not found, yet now having enabled developing cognitions otherwise undetected.** I.e.: SMP denotes this brand-new 'rationality sui generis'. It leads back — for the sake of innovativity and the relation between AI & HI — to thinking about 'Ontologies & Metaphysics' just as about Kant & Frege & Kuhn ….

Before switching to this mail's 2. Section, the ftn[2.a)] shall deepen the understanding of the mental PE-testing processes of an [mrat]ETCI's specification (in [ISL]KR[e.g.372])— shown by the above 2 boxes — for recognizing that it is the quite normal scientificity recognition mental process, yet relaxed as in science § 101 & preemptions are no issues. Additionally, a remark is repeated from[508] that clarifies the groundbreaking SPL-paradigm refinement required by the Supreme Court's SPL-framework. It namely says: Any ETCI is based on at least 1 'abstract idea' and/or 1 'natural phenomenon', both properties being intangible and/or invisible and/or immaterial & of and unknown realizability. Classic inventions did/must not comprise hence so-called 'exceptional creative concepts, E-xcrCs'. But these dramatically 'widen all patenting horizons', enabling by far outnumbering all classical inventions.[b)]

The Supreme Court noticed — worldwide for the first time — the unavoidable need of ETCIs' E-xcrCs, due to their key role in enabling the US society's Constitutional American Way of Life, especially its wealth. Nevertheless, the patent community for years considered the E-xcrCs as an embarrassment — also in spite of showing by the FSTP-Project since years that the Supreme Court's notional refinement of SPL implies its clear legal scientification and thus terminates any legal unpredictability of SPL-precedence about ETCIs. Fortunately, AI now paves the way for changing the mind of these 'skeptics of the SPL-framework', as the latter's & AI's scientific legal preciseness revolutionizes the SPL business by a priori mathematically defining an ETCI's scope (thus avoiding its infringement) and incredibly facilitating it for

- ∀ ETCI — i.e. also any new one, for which no by the Supreme Court established or tolerated precedence exists yet — by enabling any SPL expert to correctly predict whether it is e.g. PE, as exemplified by[c)], and

- ∀ ^{BIOvAC}ETCI by rendering them PE a priori (for BIO) or depending on a trivial check (for AC), as explained in Section 2.

---

[2].a The correct 'Supreme Court's SPL framework' interpretation of an ETCI requires implicitly its notional refinement to elementarity alias atomicity — in total in FSTPtech called its 'O-/A-/E-structure' of human mental perception — in many ETCIs superfluous, if these indeed only need its E-level (what often is the case in very young ETs as then compound properties for them are not yet developed). Within the O-/A-/E-structure often exist additional structures, especially the following '**property rationality quality hierarchy**', the '**BIO structure**', the each other iterating '**materialistic/idealistic couple**' below the mrat-level, all structures and their interrelations needed for grasping, by our mind, any cognition about knowledge and its relation to its KR. Thus, the meaning of a bold term/notion, below on the left-most, denotes an ETCI item's "'property rationality quality" (right of the '—' its axiomatic definition[182], e.g. in an ISL[xyz]). This quality of legal and/or factual items, such as notions, may be**:**

- **transcendental –** this ETCI item is excluded from SPL-satisfiable testing, as embodying a highly speculative notion;
- **metaphysical –** not being "highly speculative", but definable such that this property is recognizable to be amenable to metarationalization, i.e. definable by (informal) conjunctions of informal "O(-level)-predicates" of this ETCI, i.e. [mrat]axiomizable,   located on its notional **O-level**;
- **irrational –** all such notions belong principally to Rationality, due to their eventual by definition axiomizability being amenable to mathematization, as Kant implicitly postulated, i.e. principally already   located on its notional **A-level**;
- **metarational –** being definable by an ISL-expression[e.g.372,390] (in basically natural English) describing all semantics of all O-predicates as formal conjunctions of formal "A(-level)-predicates" in ISL, i.e. a priori [rat]axiomizable (often even 'easily'),   located on its notional **A-level**;
- **rational –** being definable by an ISL-expression (again in basically natural English) describing all summands of all such A-predicates, i.e. being rationalizable, i.e. also mathematizable, by "E(-level)predicates" in atomic or exceptional ISL notions,   located on its notional **E-level**;
- **mathematical –** being describable by exactly these E-predicates in mathematical KR,   located on its notional **E-level in** [mat]**KR**.

All axioms are definable by an ISL-expression[e.g.372,390] (in appropriately expanded natural English basics) specifying properties' semantics. Thereby [mrat/rat]'justification in principle' denotes a pre-stage level SMP (as opposed to SMP's above 6 levels) — due to restricted linguistics & semantics developable to SMP. This is in the lower box shown by the 'equals,=' sign, whereas before, in the upper box, the 'is defined as, :=' sign is used for indicating this distinction. Together these two boxes specify the by SMP embodied notional 'cognitive rational quality hierarchy' implying 'notional bijections' alias 'transformations' between its levels of SMP. Locke/Hume & Berkeley/Kant & Frege/Whitehead,/Russell/…… 'initialized' their then (often semiotic) SMP notions.

But none of them could already clarify this here decrypted mental metamorphosis happening in human inventive knowledge noticing & perceiving & creating certainty about it in 'modernized & mathematized cognition science', like FSTPtech, indispensable for efficiently dealing with model-based/future innovations/inventions. Thereby this dualism of 'materialistic' vs 'idealistic' substantive cognitions, i.e. mathematically modeling such an ETCI's specific meaning for determining its '**SPL satisfaction**' will prevail by its ●'testing' this initially even by its structure unknown ETCI vs ●'proving' the conjunction of its hypothetical substantive — hence by its models precisely (though not necessarily unblendingly) specifiable — elementary building blocks, being axioms of elementary/atomic units of AI. Thereby such tests just as their proofs are substance dependently specifiable in [xyz]ISL, xyz∈{Φ, DNA, CRISPR, …, BIO, AC, …}.

These epistemological elaborations will in[182] be concretized, as to their substantive Ontologies & their Metaphysics being undefined but in SEQtech needed.

.b as the needed factual properties are semantically only partially known — needed legal SPL properties must, e.g. for being PE, never be semantically only partially known — i.e. the subject matters comprising & embodying them are often not as needed per se enablingly known, but only the compounds comprising & embodying them.

.c Examples are provided e.g. by ETCI°s of which at least 1 E-crC° has a domain with at least 2 T-values — which for E-xcrCs by their definition evidently is impossible. Such ETCI°s are therefore not comprised by the [SPL]AI- alias FSTP-Test on the cover page.

In the patent application for such an ETCI°' it may occur that such an E-crC°' does not exclude but does enable being preempted by a granted patent for an ETCI°'' having the same E-crCS as ETCI°' — preempted in spite of ETCI°'' uses only one of these 2 T-values, while E-crC°' uses only the other one. This dilemma is easily eliminated, if an ETCI in a patent application from the outset by its '**concept realization tupel set**, **CRTS(E-crCS)**[495] also its scope precisely defines (and its CI verifies) that all claimed RTs in the ETCI indeed occur — which for the second consideration of test1-3 is crucial.

Then, the above predicate in test7'' must solely be expanded to a conjunction, with its new component defining the ETCI's CRTS alias scope[495]. In [IT]ETCIs significantly different implementations practically do cause such problems, yet by courts seen as copyright issues, e.g. in *Google v. Oracle* [599,600,601].

.d **NOTE: In** ∀ ETCIs ∀ elementary properties of ∀ ETCI-elements are in FSTPtech "the same" FFOL predicates over E-crCS in [ratvmat]KR — also ≠[+], ≇, II, III. The definitions of their simple FFOL predicates in [ratvmat]KR are shown above by an ETCI's [matAI]CC. I.e.: These always the same FFOL mathematical predicates destroy all hitherto needed metaphysical disputes, whether an ETCI has an application, and/or is directed to TT0, and/or is significantly more than TT0, and/or has an inventive concept exceeding TT0, and/or is only minimally invasive into freedom of R&D, and/or is not unduly preemptive, and/or does not monopolize of an ET an unduly chunk, …

2. Two more AI-Keys, BIOvAC Theorems, Based on BIOvAC ETCIs — Due to their Functional AI Structures.

This Section uses an additional view to an AI-based ETCI's PE testing: While Section 1 deals with only an ETCI's non-functional SPL-features, this one considers also the ETCI's functional structure. It thus enabled developing 2 more practically extremely important **SPL** AI-theorems that determine an **BIO** ETCI's PE a priori and **AC** ETCIs PE by trivially checking it[3.a]. For the theorems SMP proofs see[576] & what follows — showing 2 ETCIs' 'need/use hierarchies' determining their PE[b].

(#1)

$$DDR\text{-}{}^{IT}ETCI^{19} ::= CBN({}^{mrat}ETCI)::= \qquad \{\{$$

^{mrat}E-crC0S::= {E-crC0k::= k-ISL-sentences, disclosed by E-^{mrat}MUIS0k, 1≤k≤4},

with **N::=** 3: **X1::=** Application (APP), **X2::=** SalesServer (SS), **X3::=** Prod.Server (PS),

with **K::=** 4 — whereby **E-crCS::=** {ek / 1≤k≤4} :

^{rat}EcrC0S::= {(X1,1)e1::= SS-url, (X1,2)e2::=P, (X1,2)e4::= I&f, (X1,3)e5::= pid;

(X2,1)::=e1, (X2,2)::=e2, (X2,3)e3::=PS-url ;

(X3,1)::= e3, (X3,2)::=e4, (X3,3)::= e5} }}

In box: X1 APP ≡ e1 (e2 e4 e5); X2 SS ≡ e1 e2 e3; X3 PS ≡ e3 e4 e5

(#2)

$$Broad\text{-}{}^{CRISPR}ETCI^{1/X} ::= CBN({}^{mrat}ETCI)::= \qquad \{\{$$

^{mrat}E-crC0S := {E-crC0k ::= k-ISL-sentences, disclosed by E-^{mrat}MUIS0k, 1≤k≤16 — here skipped —},

N::= 11+1 ETCI-elements: **X1::=** application (APP-tbd by inventor)[500],

X2::= a eukaryotic cell (EUC), **X3::=** a targeted DNA molecule (TDDNA-M) ,

X4::= a target sequence (TSE), **X5::=** 1-or-several vectors (1os VEC),

X6::= 1. regulatory element(REE1), **X7::=** 1 or several nucleotide sequences (1os NUS),

X8::= CRISPR-Cas system(CR-CasS), **X9::=** guide RNA (gRNA), **X10::=** REE2,

X11::= 1NUS, **X12::=** Type-II-Cas9 protein (T-II-Cas9p),

with **K::=15+1** E-properties, i.e.

^{rat}EcrC0S::= {(e1,1 =)e1::= **altering expression of at least one gene product**;

(e2,1 =)e2::= **containing & expressing** a TDDNA-M;

(e3,1 =)e3::= **comprising** a TSE, (e3,2 =)e4::= **encoding** the gene product;

(e4,1 =)e5::= TSE; (e5,1 =)e6::= **com.** an REE1 [**operable-in** ('opi') a EUC

operably-linked-to ('oli') 1os NUS **encoding** a gRNA **hywi** the TSE], (e5,2 =)e7::= **comprising** an REE2 [**opi** a EUC **oli** 1 NUS **encoding** a T-II-Cas9p];(e6,1 =)e8::= **opi** a EUC **oli** 1os NUS;   (e7,1 =)e9 ::= **encoding** a gRNA;(e8,1 =)e10 ::= **comprising** 1os VEC,

(e8,2 =)e11 ::= **introduced** into EUC; (e9,1 =)e12 ::= **targets** the TSE●, (e9,2 =)e13 ::= **hywi** the TSE●; (e10,1 =)e14::= **opi** a EUC **oli** 1

NUS●; (e11,1 =)e15::= **encoding** a T-II-Cas9p●; (e12,1 =)e16::= **cleaves** the TDDNA-M●}   }}

In box: X1: APP ≡ e1; X2: EUC ≡ e2; X3: TDDNA-M ≡ e3 e4; X4: TSE ≡ e5; X5:1oS VEC ≡ e7 e6; X10: REE2≡e14; X6: REE1≡ e8; X11: 1NUS ≡ e15; X7: 1osNUS ≡ e9; X8: CR-CasS≡e10 e11; X12: T-II-Cas9p ≡ e16; X9: gRNA ≡ e12 e13

Legend: On the right of an above graphic specification of an ETCI's functionality — basically showing its 'need/use structure' — it is additionally provided in ISL. In #2 ${}^{BIO↑ISL}$CBN as such, i.e. the ETCI's 'need/use structure model instantiation', is included by the {{....}} right of the numbered box that graphically specifies redundantly its ETCI's functionality. This graphical and its ${}^{BIO↑ISL}$specification of an ETCI shall show the here applied specification principle[508], i.e. need not model its inventor's meaning — as from its patent's ^{mrat}specification several slight functional variations may be derived, but none of them is really enablingly described in this patent, especially in the BIOtech area[495].

What is evident at the first glance is that a ^{BIO}ETCI is much more voluminous than an ^{IT}ETCI. The reason is that a former's E-crCs currently must be self-defining alias axiomized, whereas a latter's E-crCs need — for FSTPtech preciseness, not for today's usual AI-unqualified ^{mrat}specifications — separate definitions often to be provided by the ETCI specification (as in *DDR* is the case for excluding the just mentioned vagueness). Examples have repeatedly been outlined already[FSTP]. Both kinds will be clarified in more detail in[602].

Finally: The above 2 graphs show that the Supreme Court by its SPL-framework for any ETCI warrants its being 'application controlled, AC', i.e. that its need/use-structure is always as simple as shown by its dashed line bordered separate 'application area' and '^{nPE}TT0 area'. This separation and abstraction from the application's internal structure greatly facilitate determining an ^{IT}ETCI's CRTS, any ^{BIOvAC}ETCI being trivial anyway.

Mathematical ^{SPL}AI-Theorem about ^{matAI}CCs for <^{internal}input ::= CBN(${}^{rat \mid mat \, AC}$ETCI^{CRTS})>   holds: **Any ^{AC}ETCI^{CRTS} is PE,**

and especially

Mathematical ^{CRISPR}AI-Theorem about ^{matAI}CCs for <^{internal}input ::= CBN(${}^{rat \mid mat \, BIOvCRISPR}$ETCI)>   holds: **Any ^{BIOvCRISPR}ETCI is PE.**

Legend: Of the foreseeable huge mass of ${}^{ACvBIO \, rat}$ETCIs any one is PE — as it passes its specific one of these 2 trivial AI theorems!

Excerpt from the FSTP-Project's Reference List (as of 11.03.2020).

Many FSTP-Project mails, including this one, are written in preparation of the textbook[182] – i.e. are not fully self-explanatorily independent of other FSTP-mails.

[182] S. Schindler: "Basics of Innovation Theory & AI Based Patent Technology", Textbook, in prep.
[480] S. Schindler: "A Fresh Look at the USPTO's PE-Guideline—by Andrei Iancu before the AEI", pub. 17.07.2018[*]
[488] S. Schindler: "*UC's* vs. *Broad/MIT/Harvard's* CRISPR Patents & the Supreme Court's Framework", Part I, publ. 20.09..2018[*])
[495] S. Schindler, B. Wittig: "*UC's* vs. *Broad's* CRISPR Patents …", Part III, publ. 30.01.2019[*])
[504] USPTO: The 2019 §§ 101&112 Guidelines, 07.01.2019[*])
[508] S. Schindler, B. Wittig: "The ^{SPL}AI-Relation of 'Application-Controlled ETCIs, ^{AC}ETCIs', Part V", pub. 18.02.2020,
[552]S. Schindler:"CAFC's Anew Legal Errors in … Need Supreme Court Clarification.",publ.15.10.2019[*])
[566] USPTO: The 2019 § 101 October PE Guideline, 18.10.2019[*])
[573] S. Schindler: "An Unnoticed AI Requ. Met by the Supreme Court's PE Philosophy …",pub.09.12.2019[*])
[575] B. Wegner, B. Wittig, S. Schindler, C. Negrutiu, D. Schönberg, J. Schulze, R. Wetzler: "Mathematically Modeling the Meaning of FSTPtech Specifications of ETCIs", in prep.
[576] S. Schindler:"The 'AI^{SPL}-test mod(SPL) ≅ FSTP-Test' is the Strong PE-Test ∀ ETCIs ", pub 03.01.2020[*])
[577] S. Schindler: "The USPTO's PE-Guidance is still Mute about 'Wild Preemptivity'—…",pub.19.12.2019[*])

[585] D. Kwon: "Hundreds of CRISPR patents have been granted … and the number of applications continues to grow at a rapid pace.", The Scientist, 15.07.2019[*].
[586] S. Schindler:"AI-testing an ETCI Warrants Much Better Information than its PE-Test …", pub. 09.01.2020[*]
[587-595] AIPLA / AIPPI / AUTM / CCIA / EFF / IEEE / IPO / R STREET / T. Rue:"Reply to USPTO's AI-Enquiry.
[596] S. Schindler: "AI Facilitates Testing ∀ ETCI for PE & PA — Automat. or by AI-Theorem'", pub. 10.03.2020[*]
[597]WIPO Draft Issues Paper on Intellectual Property Policy and Artificial Intelligence, 13.12.2019
[598]Max Planck Institute: "On the Draft Issues Paper of the WIPO on IP Policy and AI, 11.02.2020
[599] CAFC: *Oracle* vs *Google*, 27.3.2018
[600] Google`s Cert. Petition to the USSC in *Google* v *Oracle*, 24.6.2019, granted on 15.11.2019
[601] Amicus Brief to the USSC in *Google* v *Oracle*, 27.9.2019
[602] B. Wittig, S. Schindler, B. Wegner: "Specifying ^{BIO}ETCs in Patent Applications in Today's § 112 Style for being a priori PE", in prep.
[603]] S. Schindler: "On Patenting versus Copyrighting Programs", to be publ 22.03.2020.
[*] The complete FSTP Ref. List & ∀ documents on www.FSTP-expert-system.com

3.a In total, this mail is fundamental also for another topical issue: The Supreme Court will run its hearing in the case[2.c] on 24.03.2020 — what I learned only a few days ago. Hence, I'll try to get a brief elaboration out on this alleged copyright issue[603] — scientifically already settled in[2.c] — by the 22.03.2020 at the latest.

.b Today's still here existing serious problem — broadly thought not to exist — is the bizarre assumption that, for ${}^{mrat \, BIOvAC}$ETCIs, there were no new §112-problems[495]. Although, for the AI-keys' proofs, this false assumption is fortunately vastly irrelevant.