# Example of patent evaluation grid

(combining manual & automatic analysis)

Manual & Automatic Scoring /20

Quality score /10

### VALIDITY & ENFORCEABILITY



Legal robustness of US & EP patents: Patents that survive citations identified by examiner or a complex examination procedure

#### SCOPE OF THE INVENTION



Legal scope: Each independent granted claims has been studied. Claims should be as broad as allowed by the description and easily





Infringement detection: possibility of easily detecting infringement help to enable the assertion of these rights.

(Note: not applicable with more than 200 patent families)





Patent has strong defaults





Grading



# Potential

Patent has extremely strong

Value score /10

## POWER OF NUISANCE & TECHNOLOGICAL IMPACT



Recent Citation Intensity: Number of forward citations for the last five years. High score indicates that examiner thinks the art continues to have value regarding the recent patent applications



Large perimeter in terms of applications - high Originality/Radicalness: High score indicates more breakthrough technologies; low scores indicate more incremental improvement



Cite velocity: The average number of forward citations per patent family per year since publication. If a patent is cited often by other patents, then other entities are more likely to be building on the patented technology, and the highly cited patents are more likely to be fundamental or important in some way

## BUSINESS IMPACT & OFFER OUALITY FOR LICENSEE



Countries of issuance: High score indicates that patent family is large and protected in valuable territories (e.g. US, EP, JP)



Interest of the company: The opinion of the partner expert about the



IP freedom regarding external constraints: co-ownership is considered a limitation for carrot licensing actions.



Shark / Predator presence: Presence of IP sharks / IP predator indicates another entity felt the technology was of commercial value

