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.
18/822,013	08/30/2024	Malathy MUTHU	ITU2413326PA	2201

193806 7590 06/23/2026

Dinsmore & Shohl LLP - Intuit
255 E Fifth St
Suite 1900
CINCINNATI, OH 45202

EXAMINER
CHOY, PAN G

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3624	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
06/23/2026	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):

cincypair@dinsmore.com
intuit@dinsmore.com
nick.transier@dinsmore.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	**Application No.** 18/822,013	**Applicant(s)** MUTHU et al.	
	Examiner PAN CHOY	**Art Unit** 3624	**AIA (First Inventor to File) Status** Yes

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

THE REPLY FILED 16 June 2026 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

NO NOTICE OF APPEAL FILED

1. ☑ The reply was filed after a final rejection. No Notice of Appeal has been filed. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114 if this is a utility or plant application. Note that RCEs are not permitted in design applications. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:
   a) ☐ The period for reply expires ____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
   b) ☑ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action; or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.
   c) ☐ A prior Advisory Action was mailed more than 3 months after the mailing date of the final rejection in response to a first after-final reply filed within 2 months of the mailing date of the final rejection.The current period for reply expires ____ months from the mailing date of *the prior Advisory Action* or SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection, whichever is earlier.
   Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a), (b) or (c). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THIS ADVISORY ACTION IS THE FIRST RESPONSE TO APPLICANTS FIRST AFTER-FINAL REPLY WHICH WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. ONLY CHECK BOX (c) IN THE LIMITED SITUATION SET FORTH UNDER BOX (c). See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) or (c) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. ☑ The proposed amendments filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
   a) ☑ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
   b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
   c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
   d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.
   NOTE: See notes below (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).
4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. ☑ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s):(a) ☑ will not be entered; or (b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ A declaration(s)/affidavit(s) under **37 CFR 1.130(b)** was/were filed on _____
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing the Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
11. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

12. ☑ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
13. ☐ Note the attached Information *Disclosure Statement*(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____
14. ☐ Other: _____.

STATUS OF CLAIMS

15. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
    Claim(s) allowed:_____.
    Claim(s) objected to:_____.
    Claim(s) rejected:1-20.
    Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:_____.

/PAN G CHOY/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3624

Continuation of REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 12. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The claims do not overcome the 35 U.S.C. 101 rejection as set forth in the previous Office Action.
In the Remarks on page 10, Applicant's argument regarding the 101 rejection that the elements of amended claims 1, 9 and 17 amount to additional elements beyond the alleged abstract idea...necessarily require a machine to perform certain steps.
Applicant did not persuasively explain which additional elements amount to significantly more and integrate the abstract idea into a practical application. Instead, merely alleged that the elements related to training of a neural database by minimizing a loss between a predicted output..., and necessarily require a machine to perform certain steps. However, training a neural database is no more than training a generic model using a collection of functions and data by a user in some unspecified way without any technological implementation details, which fails to reflect any apparent improvement to computers or other technology. In fact, claim 1 did not recite an addition element for performing the steps, for example, the claim did not indicate what/who is extracting entity data from an electronic data repository, and even if a computer was recited for training the neural database, it is no more than adding the words "apply it" or using "a particular machine" with an abstract idea, or mere instructions to implement the abstract idea on a computer. The Supreme Court has repeatedly made clear that merely limiting the field of use of the abstract idea to a particular existing technological environment does not render the claims any less abstract. See Affinity Labs of Texas, LLC v. DirecTV, LLC, 838 F.3d 1253, 1258 (Fed. Cir. 2016). As to the learning/training per se, such an argument overlooks the entire education system. Reciting machine learning is placing such learning in a computer context, offing no technological implementation details beyond the conceptual idea to use a machine for learning.
In the Remarks on page 14, Applicant argues that none of the cited portions of Tangari teaches any features related to "training the neural database by minimizing a loss, determined based on a loss function , between a predicted output for a training data instance of the augmented training data and a label assigned to the training data instance, wherein: the lost function comprises one or more parameters that correspond to the metadata of the augmented training data, and the neural database comprises a neural network (NN)-base system is trained to retrieve a predicted list of one or more second entities that supply materials for the first entity and associated with the good or the service" as recited in amended claim 1. However, Applicant's arguments are directed to the newly amended claims, and therefore, further research and consideration are required upon submission. Since the amendments do not place the application in condition for allowance, they will not be entered at this time. Claims 1-20 remain rejected under the art and rationale discussed in the Final Office Action mailed 04/17/2026.