

Patent Filing Analysis Intake Template

AXIOM Analysis

Patent Filing Analysis Intake Template

Version 1.0 | April 12, 2026

Working template for structured patent filing review in the AXIOM portal.

Purpose

Use this template to prepare a patent filing analysis run in AXIOM.

It is designed for:

- draft patent application review
- claim-support review
- prior-art stress testing
- office action / rejection review
- interpretation and risk-focused first-pass analysis

This is a structured analysis intake, not a substitute for patent counsel.

Best AXIOM Settings

Draft Filing Review

- Domain: Law
- Modules: review, risk
- Report Depth: Standard
- Reasoning Engine: AXIOM Gateway or Auto
- Live sources: off

Prior Art / Novelty Stress Test

- Domain: Law
- Modules: review, risk
- Report Depth: Standard
- Reasoning Engine: Gemini or Auto
- Live sources: on

Office Action / Rejection Review

- Domain: Law
- Modules: review, risk
- Report Depth: Standard first, Deep second if needed
- Reasoning Engine: Gemini or Auto
- Live sources: on

Quick Triage Only

- Domain: Law
 - Modules: fast
 - Report Depth: Compact or Standard
 - Reasoning Engine: AXIOM Gateway
 - Live sources: off
-

Important Upload Note

If possible, convert patent materials to .txt or .md before upload.

In the current AXIOM implementation, PDF, DOC, and DOCX files can be stored, but plain-text style files are much more reliable for actual analysis.

Best current upload shape:

- 01_request.md
- 02_application_draft.md
- 03_claim_support_map.md
- 04_prior_art_notes.md
- 05_office_action_or_target_product.md

You do not need all five files for every run.

Data Collection Checklist

Collect as much of the following as possible before running the analysis.

1. Matter Basics

- Project or matter name:
- Jurisdiction:
- Filing stage:
- Application type:
- Target filing date:
- Applicant / assignee:
- Inventor(s):
- Reviewer:
- Date prepared:

2. Analysis Goal

- What kind of run is this?
 - draft review
 - claim-support review
 - prior-art stress test
 - office action review
 - product / feature claim mapping
- What decision are you trying to make?
- What are the top 3 questions you want answered?

3. Invention Summary

- Working title:
- One-sentence invention summary:
- Problem addressed:
- Proposed solution:
- Main technical advantage:
- Commercial advantage:
- What is actually believed to be novel:

4. Patent Text Package

Confirm whether you have each of these:

- Title
- Abstract
- Background
- Summary
- Detailed description
- Figure list / figure descriptions
- Independent claims
- Dependent claims
- Definitions / terminology section

5. Claim Architecture

For each independent claim, collect:

- Claim number:
- Claim category:
 - method
 - system
 - apparatus

- composition
- device
- computer-readable medium
- Short plain-English paraphrase:
- Essential elements:
- Optional elements:
- Narrowest fallback version:
- Broadest intended interpretation:

6. Support Map

For each material claim element, identify:

- Which paragraph(s) support it
- Which figure(s) support it
- Whether the language in the claim matches the language in the specification
- Whether the support is direct, indirect, or weak
- Whether alternative embodiments are described

7. Terminology and Consistency

Collect:

- defined terms
- synonyms used by the inventors
- terms used inconsistently across the draft
- abbreviations / acronyms
- claim terms that do not appear cleanly in the specification

8. Prior Art Set

For each prior art reference, collect:

- Reference name or patent/publication number
- Link or citation
- Short summary
- Why it is close
- Which claim element(s) it overlaps with
- Whether it is novelty risk, obviousness risk, or background only

9. Office Action / Rejection Set

If this run involves prosecution, collect:

- Office action date
- Examiner / office
- Rejection type
- Rejected claims
- Cited references
- Examiner rationale
- Current draft response
- Proposed amendment strategy

10. Product / Feature Mapping Set

If this run involves mapping claims to a product, collect:

- product or feature name
- version / release
- architecture summary
- known matching features
- uncertain mapping areas
- evidence source for each mapping point

11. Missing Inputs

List what you do not yet have:

- missing claim support
 - missing drawings or figure descriptions
 - missing prior art
 - missing inventor clarification
 - missing prosecution documents
 - missing product evidence
-

Suggested File Pack

File 1: 01_request.md

Use this for the business and review context:

Matter name:
Jurisdiction:
Run type:
Decision to support:

Top questions:

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.

Known constraints:

Known uncertainties:

File 2: 02_application_draft.md

Put the actual filing text here:

Title:

Abstract:

Background:

Summary:

Detailed description:

Figures:

Claims:

File 3: 03_claim_support_map.md

Use this structure:

Claim 1:
- Element:
- Support paragraph(s):
- Support figure(s):
- Support strength:
- Notes:

Claim 2:

...

File 4: 04_prior_art_notes.md

Use this structure:

Reference:
- Citation / number:
- Summary:
- Overlapping features:
- Risk type:
- Notes:

File 5: 05_office_action_or_target_product.md

Use this structure:

Type:
- Office action
- Product mapping

Details:

Relevant claims:

Relevant references or features:

Open questions:

Fill-In Intake Block

Copy this block into a working .md file and complete it.

Matter name:
Jurisdiction:
Filing stage:
Application type:
Target filing date:
Applicant / assignee:
Inventor(s):
Prepared by:
Prepared on:

Run type:
- draft filing review
- prior-art stress test
- office action review
- claim mapping

Decision to support:

Primary review questions:
1.
2.
3.

Working title:
One-sentence invention summary:
Problem addressed:
Proposed solution:
Main technical advantage:
Commercial advantage:
Claimed novelty:

Patent text included:
- title
- abstract
- background
- summary
- detailed description
- figures
- claims

Independent claims in scope:

Claim architecture notes:

Known terminology issues:

Claim-support concerns:

Prior art references included:

Office action included:

Target product / feature included:

Known weak spots:

Missing information:

What a useful AXIOM output should focus on:

Recommended Prompt Pairing

Use this template together with:

- [PATENT_FILING_ANALYSIS_PROMPT_2026-04-12.txt](#)

Best pattern:

1. fill out this intake
 2. upload this intake plus the actual patent material
 3. use the short prompt file in the portal request box
-

Practical Notes For Better Results

- Start with Standard depth, not Deep

- Use review + risk for serious analysis
 - Use live sources only when prior art or external references matter
 - If the result is weak, improve the input package before making the prompt longer
 - Make sure claim language and support paragraphs are explicitly visible in the uploaded text
 - If you want novelty pressure testing, include at least a short prior-art package instead of relying only on web lookup
-

Caution

AXIOM can help surface:

- ambiguity
- weak support
- inconsistency
- claim pressure points
- information gaps

It should not be treated as final legal advice or a final patentability opinion.

End of Patent Filing Analysis Intake Template v1.0