

REMARKS

This amendment responds to the Office Action, in which the Examiner:

- rejected claims 1-17 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. §112(b) (“§112(b)”) as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the inventor or a joint inventor regards as the invention; and
- rejected claims 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. §102(a)(2) (“§102(a)(2)”) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 11,467,675 B1 to Hooker et al., hereinafter “Hooker.”

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW

Applicant’s attorneys thank Examiner Nguyen for the opportunity to discuss the application during a telephone interview on January 26, 2026 with Theodore Rand and Annaliese Parker. In the interview, the Examiner agreed that amending claim 1 would overcome the current rejection of claim 1 but would require further search and consideration. Claim 1 has been amended accordingly. Analogous amendments have been made to claim 20.

REMARKS CONCERNING CLAIMS

Claims 1, 4, and 20 have been amended.

Claims 18 and 19 have been canceled.

Support for the amendments can be found in at least paragraphs [0007], [0025]-[0027], [0038]-[0039], [0064]-[0075], [00145] and [00231], and Figure 1G and 2G of the application as filed. No new matter has been added.

With respect to all amendments, Applicant has not dedicated or abandoned any unclaimed subject matter. Moreover, Applicant has not acquiesced to any characterizations of the invention, nor any rejections or objections of the claims, made by the Examiner. Moreover, the Applicant hereby rescinds any prior disclaimer of claim scope, to the extent they exist, made during the prosecution of this application or made during the prosecution of any patent or other related patents/applications, and advises the Examiner that any such previous disclaimers and the cited references that they were made to avoid may need to be revisited.

After entry of this amendment, the claims 1-17 and 20 remain pending.

REMARKS CONCERNING REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. 112

I. **REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1-17 AND 20 UNDER §112(B) AS BEING INDEFINITE FOR FAILING TO PARTICULARLY POINT OUT AND DISTINCTLY CLAIM THE SUBJECT MATTER WHICH THE INVENTOR OR A JOINT INVENTOR REGARDS AS THE INVENTION**

The Examiner's rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112 is respectfully traversed in view of the amendments to claim 1 as discussed in the Examiner interview. Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the §112 rejection.

REMARKS CONCERNING REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. 102

II. **REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1-20 UNDER §102(A)(2) AS BEING ANTICIPATED BY HOOKER**

Amended claim 1 recites, *inter alia*:

A method of power-efficient processing of neuromuscular signals to confirm occurrence of a predetermined event, the method comprising:

obtaining a first set of neuromuscular signals from a neuromuscular-signal sensing component of a wearable device;

determining, using a low-power detector of the wearable device, that a respective neuromuscular signal of the first set of neuromuscular signals requires further processing to confirm that a predetermined in-air hand gesture has been performed at the wearable device:

processing the first set of neuromuscular signals using a high-power detector of the wearable device **to generate processed** neuromuscular signals, the high-power detector configured to detect a first **set** of in-air hand gestures while consuming a first amount of power from the wearable device and the low-power detector configured to detect a second **set** of in-air hand gestures **while consuming a second amount of power from the wearable device, the second set of in-air hand gestures includes less in-air hand gestures than the first set of in-air hand gestures and the second amount of power** is less than the first amount of power; and

in accordance with a determination, **based on** the processed **neuromuscular signals** that the predetermined in-air hand gesture did occur, registering an occurrence of the predetermined in-air hand gesture;

receiving a second set of neuromuscular signals from the neuromuscular-signal sensing component of the wearable device;
and

after determining, based on a respective neuromuscular signal of the second set of neuromuscular signals and using the low-power detector and not using the high-power detector, that a different predetermined in-air hand gesture, distinct from the predetermined in-air hand gesture, was performed at the wearable device:

performing an action in response to the different predetermined in-air hand gesture at the wearable device.

(Emphasis added).

As discussed during the examiner interview, claim 1 as amended indicates that “the low-power detector . . . [without] using the high-power detector” can determine that “the second set of neuromuscular signals” are “distinct from the predetermined in-air hand gesture” and can perform “an action in response to the different predetermined in-air hand gesture at the wearable device” as required by amended claim 1. As discussed, an example of this is shown in Figure 1G of the Application as Filed.

Additionally, as further discussed during the examiner interview, Claim 1 as amended further includes that “the low-power detector [is] configured to detect a second set of in-air hand gestures” and “the high-power detector configured to detect a first set of in-air hand gestures” where “the second set of in-air hand gestures includes less in-air hand gestures than the first set of in-air hand gestures.”

The features discussed above are neither taught nor suggested by Hoover.

Additionally, as noted above in the Substance of Interview, the Examiner agreed that proposed claim 1 (now amended claim 1) overcomes the current rejections and that further search and consideration were needed.

Independent claim 20 has been amended to recite features analogous to those recited in amended independent claim 1. Therefore, amended independent claims 1 and 20, and the claims that respectively depend from them, including claims 2-17 are also allowable over the cited references for reasons similar to those discussed with respect to amended claim 1.

Thus, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of these rejections.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

By responding in the foregoing remarks only to particular positions asserted by the examiner, the Applicant does not necessarily acquiesce in other positions that have not been explicitly addressed. In addition, the Applicant's arguments for the patentability of a claim should not be understood as implying that no other reasons for the patentability of that claim exist.

In light of the above amendments and remarks, the Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider this application with a view towards allowance. The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at (206) 274-6437, if a telephone call could help resolve any remaining items.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: January 26, 2026

/ Alexander B. Stein /

71,397

Alexander B. Stein

(Reg. No.)

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

1301 Second Avenue, Suite 3000

Seattle, WA 98101

Phone: (206) 274-6437