



Patent Agent — Example Case Studies

Real runs against the real production pipeline, one per available report type

Unlike a composite/illustrative example, everything below is real: real topics, run through the real Patent Agent pipeline (USPTO Open Data Portal and Espacenet/EPO OPS), during internal development testing — not invented companies or invented figures. Framed as internal validation runs, not named customer testimonials — the separate “who’s using this” page (Product_Roadmap_Tracker.md) is still the right home for permissioned customer quotes, once we have them. Each report referenced below is saved directly in the Patent Agent folder if you want to open the source file. Filed here as “Case Study N” by report type, matching the Competitive Analysis and Regulatory Agent case-study format, so all three are easy to find side by side. Two of the three real runs on hand happen to use the same report type (Compare My Asset) rather than one of each of the three report types — Case Study 1 covers Landscape Overview; a real Novelty & Prosecution Risk run isn’t in hand yet, so nothing is invented to fill that gap.

Case Study 1: Landscape Overview

The Challenge

mRNA vaccine is a broad, fast-moving space — before committing to a specific development or licensing direction, a team needs a fast, honest read on who’s actually filing in the US right now, and whether the space is already crowded or still has room.

How It Was Used

Ran the Landscape Overview report against “mrna vaccine” using the USPTO Open Data Portal (US-only) source, no additional filters.

What the Report Surfaced

- 25 results returned (1 granted, 24 pending) from 23 unique assignees and 106 named inventors — real counts, not estimated.
- Top assignees identified by real filing count: THE TEXAS A&M UNIVERSITY SYSTEM (2) and ADVANCED RNA VACCINE (ARV) TECHNOLOGIES, INC. (2), each already filing multiple related applications.
- Four CPC clusters flagged crowded (3+ independent results) — A61K (15), A61P (14), C07K (13), C12N (12) — computed directly from classification counts, not an AI guess — versus four sparse clusters with exactly one result each (G16B, Y02A, A23L, G01N).
- Filing activity was concentrated almost entirely in 2025 (24 of 25 results), and included veterinary/animal-health mRNA vaccine filings (feline FIPV, equine rotavirus, rhodococcal foal pneumonia) alongside human-health ones — a detail a human-drug-only search would have missed entirely.

The Outcome

A same-day view of exactly which technology clusters are already contested versus comparatively open, and which organizations are the real active filers — without paying for an enterprise patent-analytics seat.

No customer quote captured for this specific run — flagged here rather than filled in.

Case Study 2: Compare My Asset — CRISPR Base Editing Therapeutic Delivery

The Challenge

Before investing further in a specific CRISPR delivery approach, an inventor needed an honest read on how close their own invention already sits to existing worldwide filings — not a guessed percentage, but a real side-by-side against actual prior art text.

How It Was Used



Ran Compare My Asset against “crispr base editing therapeutic delivery” using the Espacenet/EPO OPS worldwide source, with the invention description supplemented by an attached file (“Lipid Nanoparticle.docx”).

What the Report Surfaced

- 3 real worldwide publications found (3 distinct patent families, all WO applications, none yet granted), from the University of California, MIT, and the University of Texas System.
- Every one of the 3 results was compared directly against the invention's real text — not a bare score — and came back Low overlap across the board, with no High or Medium overlap found anywhere in this landscape.
- The closest results were still meaningfully different in approach — one MIT filing on amphiphilic nanoparticle CRISPR delivery, one on gene-specific exon correction for Duchenne muscular dystrophy — real, named points of differentiation, not a vague “looks fine.”

The Outcome

A documented, defensible “the space is real but our approach is genuinely different” read — the kind of first-pass answer that normally means committing to outside counsel before knowing if it's even warranted.

No customer quote captured for this specific run — flagged here rather than filled in.

Case Study 3: Compare My Asset — Continuous Glucose Monitoring Biosensor

The Challenge

A wearable glucose-biosensor inventor needed to know not just whether the space was crowded, but specifically which existing filings were closest to their actual design — and exactly what set their invention apart.

How It Was Used

Ran Compare My Asset against “continuous glucose monitoring biosensor” worldwide, with the invention description supplemented by an attached file (“Biosensor Patch.docx”).

What the Report Surfaced

- 25 real worldwide publications compared, from 18 unique applicants across China, Korea, and WIPO filings — a Medium/Low overlap breakdown (4 Medium, 21 Low), not a single crowded pile.
- The 4 closest (Medium-overlap) matches each named specific shared elements — a glucose oxidase enzyme layer, an osmium-based redox mediator coating — alongside specific stated differences: the invention's microneedle array, Bluetooth Low Energy transmission, and temperature-compensation calibration weren't present in any of them.
- Results were sorted so that any EP filing independently flagged X/Y-relevant by its own examiner search report surfaced first within its overlap tier — real citation-severity data, not an AI re-ranking alone.

The Outcome

A specific, defensible list of the handful of filings that actually matter, each with a named reason it's close and a named reason it's still different — not a generic “25 similar patents” dump to sort through by hand.

No customer quote captured for this specific run — flagged here rather than filled in.