REMARKS

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

- rejected claims 1 – 2, 4, 9 – 11, 13, 16 – 17, and 19 under 35 U.S.C. §103 ("§103") as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent App. Publication No. 2020/0065370 to Mannby (hereinafter "Mannby") in view of U.S. Patent App. Publication No. 2020/0356254 to Missig (hereinafter "Missig") in view of U.S. Patent App. Publication No. 2020/0201443 to Huang (hereinafter "Huang");
- rejected claims 3, 7, 12, and 18 under §103 as being unpatentable over Mannby in view of Huang, as applied to claim 1 above and further in view of U.S. Patent App. Publication No. 2024/0086761 to Patel (hereinafter "Patel"); and
- objected to claims 5, 8, 14, and 20 to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

REMARKS CONCERNING CLAIMS

Claims 1-7 and 10-22 are pending, with claims 1, 10, and 16 being independent.

Claims 8 and 9 have been canceled. Claims 1, 10, 16, and 19 have been amended. Claims 21 and 22 have been added.

Support for the amendments can be found in at least claim 8, [0070], [0095] and Figures 4A and 4B 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 1-7 and 10-22 remain pending.

REMARKS CONCERNING REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. 103

I. **REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1 – 2, 4, 6, 9 – 11, 13, 15, 16 – 17, AND 19 UNDER 35 U.S.C. 103 AS BEING UNPATENTABLE OVER MANNBY IN VIEW OF MISSIG IN VIEW OF HUANG.**

Amended claim 1 recites:

> A non-transitory computer-readable storage medium comprising instructions for:
>
> obtaining, via one or more sensors of a wearable electronic device **in operable communication with** a computing system, data corresponding to a user attempting to perform a sequence of handwriting motions associated with one or more target inputs while wearing the wearable electronic device of the computing system**, wherein:**
>
> **the one or more sensors include a biopotential-signal-sensing component, and the biopotential-signal-sensing component is configured to detect data used to determine respective handwriting motions performed by the user;**
>
> identifying, based on at least (i) the data corresponding to the user attempting to perform the sequence of handwriting motions and (ii) the one or more target inputs associated with the sequence of handwriting motions:
>
> a devolved sequence of handwriting motions to suggest to the user for inputting a respective target input of the one or more target inputs, wherein:
>
> the devolved sequence of handwriting motions is a different sequence as compared to the sequence of handwriting motions, and includes fewer handwriting motions as compared to the sequence of handwriting motions; and
>
> causing presentation, via the computing system, of a representation of the devolved sequence of handwriting motions.
>
> (Emphasis added).

Claim 1 has been amended to include analogous subject matter to that of objected to claim 8. In the Office Action, the Examiner noted that claim 8 was objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form

including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. For at least this reason, amended independent claim 1 is patentable over Mannby, in view of Missig, in view of Huang.

Amended independent claims 10 and 16 recite features analogous in scope to those present in claim 1 and, therefore, these claims are patentable over Mannby, in view of Missig, in view of Huang for analogous reasons to those discussed above with respect to independent claim 1. The claims depending from independent claims 1, 10, and 16 are patentable at least by virtue of their respective dependencies on these patentable independent claims

Claims 2, 4, and 6 depend from amended independent claim 1. As explained above, Mannby, in view of Missig, in view of Huang, does not teach all of the features of amended claim 1. As such, claims 2, 4, and 6 are patentable over Mannby, in view of Missig, in view of Huang for at least those reasons explained above with respect to claim 1.

Claims 11, 13, and 15 depend from amended independent claim 10. As explained above, Mannby, in view of Missig, in view of Huang, does not teach all of the features of amended claim 10. As such, claims 11, 13, and 15 are patentable over Mannby, in view of Missig, in view of Huang for at least those reasons explained above with respect to claim 10.

Claims 17 and 19 depend from amended independent claim 16. As explained above, Mannby, in view of Missig, in view of Huang, does not teach all of the features of amended claim 16. As such, claims 17 and 19 are patentable over Mannby, in view of Missig, in view of Huang for at least those reasons explained above with respect to claim 16.

Claim 9 has been canceled, rendering the rejection of claim 9 moot. Accordingly, no remarks are necessary regarding the objection to claim 9.

Thus, for at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-2, 4, 9-11, 13, 16-17, and 19 under 35 U.S.C. 103 based on Mannby, in view of Missig, in view of Huang.

II. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 3, 7, 12, AND 18 UNDER 35 U.S.C. 103 AS BEING UNPATENTABLE OVER MANNBY IN VIEW OF HUANG AS APPLIED TO CLAIM 1 ABOVE AND FURTHER IN VIEW OF PATEL.

Claim 3 depends from amended independent claim 1 via intervening claim 2 and claim 7 depends from amended independent claim 1. Claims 3 and 7 are therefore patentable over

Mannby in view of Huang as applied to claim 1 for at least the reasons explained above with reference to independent claim 1. Patel is not cited for and does not teach or suggest the features missing from Mannby in view of Huang. As such claim 7 and claim 3 are patentable over the combination of Mannby, Huang, and Patel for at least the reasons explained above with respect to claim 1.

Claim 12 depends from amended independent claim 10 via intervening claim 11 and is therefore patentable over Mannby in view of Huang as applied to claim 1 for at least the reasons explained above with reference to independent claim 10. Patel is not cited for and does not teach or suggest the features missing from Mannby in view of Huang. As such claim 12 is patentable over the combination of Mannby, Huang, and Patel for at least the reasons explained above with respect to claim 10.

Claim 18 depends from amended independent claim 16 via intervening claim 17 and is therefore patentable over Mannby in view of Huang as applied to claim 1 for at least the reasons explained above with reference to independent claim 16. Patel is not cited for and does not teach or suggest the features missing from Mannby in view of Huang. As such claim 18 is patentable over the combination of Mannby, Huang, and Patel for at least the reasons explained above with respect to claim 16.

Thus, for at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of claims 3, 7, 12, and 18 under 35 U.S.C. 103 based on Mannby, in view of Missig, in view of Patel.

REMARKS CONCERNING OBJECTIONS

III. **OBJECTED TO CLAIMS 5, 8, 14, AND 20 TO AS BEING DEPENDENT UPON A REJECTED BASE CLAIM, BUT WOULD BE ALLOWABLE IF REWRITTEN IN INDEPENDENT FORM INCLUDING ALL OF THE LIMITATIONS OF THE BASE CLAIM AND ANY INTERVENING CLAIMS.**

Claim 8 has been canceled, rendering the rejection of claim 8 moot. Accordingly, no remarks are necessary regarding the objection to claim 8.

Claims 5, 14, and 20, depend from amended independent claims 1, 10, and 16, respectively. As explained above, independent claims 1, 10, and 16 have each been amended.

Therefore, Claims 5, 14, and 20 now depend from these amended independent claims and are therefore patentable for at least the reasons explained above with respect to claims 5, 14, and 20.

Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the objections to claims 5, 8, 14, and 20.

REMARKS CONCERNING NEW CLAIMS

New dependent claims 21 and 22 depend from independent claims 10 and 16, respectively, and are allowable at least by virtue of their respective dependencies from these independent claims. Thus, new dependent claims 21 and 22 are allowable.

No new subject matter has been added.

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: October 2, 2025

/ 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