



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

Table with 5 columns: APPLICATION NO., FILING DATE, FIRST NAMED INVENTOR, ATTORNEY DOCKET NO., CONFIRMATION NO.
12/680,903 03/31/2010 Shi Cong Feng 82239560 9347

56436 7590 11/23/2016
Hewlett Packard Enterprise
3404 E. Harmony Road
Mail Stop 79
Fort Collins, CO 80528

EXAMINER

COUGHLAN, PETER D

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2129

NOTIFICATION DATE DELIVERY MODE

11/23/2016

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):

- hpe.ip.mail@hpe.com
mkraft@hpe.com
chris.mania@hpe.com

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

Ex parte SHI CONG FENG, YUHONG XIONG, and LI ZHANG

Appeal 2016-001081
Application 12/680,903
Technology Center 2100

Before THU A. DANG, STEPHEN C. SIU, and
NORMAN H. BEAMER, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

DANG, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

DECISION ON APPEAL

I. STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Appellants appeal under 35 U.S.C. § 134(a) from the Examiner's Final Rejection of claims 1–6, 8–14, 17–20, and 23, which constitute all the claims pending in this application. Claims 7, 15, 16, 21, and 22 have been previously canceled. We have jurisdiction under 35 U.S.C. § 6(b).

We reverse.

A. INVENTION

According to Appellants, the invention relates to “Uniform Resource Locator (URL) and/or anchor text analysis for focused crawling” (Spec. [0010]).

B. ILLUSTRATIVE CLAIM

Claim 1 is exemplary and is reproduced below:

1. A method for focused crawling using Uniform Resource Locator (URL) and anchor text analysis, comprising:

training a focused crawler by:

obtaining a training set comprising a first website that comprises a first webpage identified by a first URL,

computing a first score for the first URL, the first score indicating how close the first webpage is to a target page,

extracting a plurality of features from at least one of the first URL and anchor text of the first webpage, and

computing a second score for each of the plurality of features in part based on the first score; and

executing the trained focused crawler on a second website.

C. REJECTIONS

The prior art relied upon by the Examiner in rejecting the claims on appeal is:

Bar-Yossef et al.	US 2006/0122998 A1	June 8, 2006
Corston-Oliver et al.	US 2006/0200342 A1	Sep. 7, 2006
Jiang et al.	US 2006/0277175 A1	Dec. 7, 2006
Guha	US 2007/0038616 A1	Feb. 15, 2007

Claims 1–5, 12, 13, and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated by Jiang.

Claims 6, 14, and 23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jiang and Corston-Oliver.

Claims 8–11 and 17–19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jiang, Guha, and Bar-Yossef.

II. ISSUES

The dispositive issues before us are whether the Examiner has erred in finding Jiang discloses “computing a first score for the first URL,” “extracting a plurality of *features from at least one of the first URL and anchor text*,” and “computing a *second score for each of the plurality of features* in part based on the first score” (claim 1, emphases added).

III. ANALYSIS

Appellants contend “[t]he claims recite two scores” including “(i) the first score for the first URL,” and “(ii) the second score for each of the

plurality of features extracted from at least one of the first URL and anchor text of the first webpage identified by the first URL” (App. Br. 6).

According to Appellants, “the second score as claimed is computed for each of the plurality of features extracted from at least one of the same URL for which the first score was computed and the anchor text of the first webpage identified by that same URL,” which is “entirely different from the rank that is computed for each page based on previously crawled websites” as set forth in Jiang (*id.*).

We have considered all of Appellants’ arguments and evidence presented. We agree with Appellants that the preponderance of evidence on this record fails to support the Examiner’s finding that Appellants’ claim 1, 12, and 20 as set forth before us in this Appeal, are anticipated by Jiang under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a).

Although we agree with the Examiner’s finding that “[t]he second score Appellant refers to is recited as a score computed using the first score” (Ans. 26), we do not agree with the Examiner’s finding Jiang’s “PageRank computed using the measure of similarity” can be “interpreted to correspond to the claimed ‘score/second score’...” (*id.*). In particular, we cannot find any clear disclosure in the sections of Jiang referenced by the Examiner of receiving a “second score” for “*each of the plurality of features*” in part based on the first score, wherein the features are “from at least one of the first URL and anchor text” (claim 1, emphases added), as required in an anticipation rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a).

We are of the view that the Examiner has not fully developed the record to show express or inherent anticipation regarding the disputed limitations of the claims pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 102(a). Therefore, we are

constrained to reverse the Examiner's rejection of independent claims 1, 12, and 20, and claims 2–5, and 13 depending therefrom (App. Br. 6), over Jiang.

The Examiner does not identify how Corston-Oliver, Guha or Bar-Yossef overcomes the deficiencies of Jiang. Accordingly, we also reverse the Examiner's rejection of claims 6, 14, and 23 over Jiang in further view of Corston-Oliver; and claims 8–11 and 17–19 over Jiang, in further view of Guha and Bar-Yossef.

V. CONCLUSION AND DECISION

The Examiner's rejections of claims 1–5, 12, 13, and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a), and claims 6, 8–11, 14, 17–19, and 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), are reversed.

REVERSED