



PATENTABILITY / NOVELTY SEARCH

Is it new enough to file?

A limitation-by-limitation read on what the closest art already discloses and where the invention still stands apart — from mapped claim evidence, not keyword hits.

■ SPECIMEN

This is a **format sample**. The subject, parties, identifiers, counts, confidence values, and evidence references below are **fabricated to demonstrate the report's structure and look** — they are not real search results, not a real client engagement, and contain no legal conclusions.

<p>SUBJECT INVENTION</p> <p>Wearable microneedle glucose-sensing patch</p>	<p>PREPARED FOR</p> <p>[Sample Client]</p>	<p>SCOPE</p> <p>Pre-filing novelty</p>	<p>CORPUS WINDOW</p> <p>2012 – present (illustrative)</p>
<p>REPORT ID</p> <p>PN-SPEC-0000</p>	<p>METHOD</p> <p>Claim-limitation comparison</p>		

01 The read, in one page

In this illustrative invention, six of the seven claim limitations read clear of the closest art. One — recalibrating the reading from multi-day sensor drift — sits squarely on an

existing disclosure, and the per-wearer baseline is adjacent in two references. The filing question turns on the *combination*, not any single element.

The matrix on the next page maps each claim limitation against the four closest references. It shows where each element is anticipated, partially implied, or untouched — so your counsel weighs novelty on the mapped record rather than a relevance headline.

This report does not opine on patentability. It shows where the invention **appears** to stand apart and hands you the evidence behind that reading.

02 Scope & method

WHAT WAS COMPARED

- ◆ **Claim set** — the invention drafted into discrete, independently testable limitations.
- ◆ **Unit of comparison** — each limitation against mapped source passages, not document keywords.
- ◆ **De-duplication** — patent families and repeat jurisdictional filings collapsed to distinct inventions.

HOW NOVELTY IS JUDGED

- ◆ **Anticipation** — a single reference disclosing every limitation of a claim.
- ◆ **Obviousness signal** — limitations split across references that a skilled reader could combine.
- ◆ **Classification check** — a scan for art whose official codes understate the real subject-matter.
- ◆ **Evidence** — every match tied to a source passage, paragraph, and byte span.

03 The closest art, mapped

Each dot of colour is one mapped limitation-to-reference link. Read a row to see where one claim element is covered; read a column to see how much of the claim a single reference reaches.

Claim-limitation coverage matrix

ILLUSTRATIVE LAYOUT · FABRICATED CELLS

CLAIM LIMITATION	R1	R2	R3	R4
1[a] flexible substrate carrying a microneedle array	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
1[b] enzymatic sensor on the array measuring interstitial analyte	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
1[c] low-power radio reporting a reading at an interval	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1[d] on-patch temperature compensation of the reading	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
1[e] controller storing a per-wearer baseline	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1[f] recalibrating the reading from sensor-drift estimated across days	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1[g] the combination of [a]–[f] in a single disposable patch	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discloses limitation Partial / implied Adjacent only Not disclosed

Cells are fabricated

04 Where the closest references land

Two references define the novelty edge. Each is described plainly, then justified by the specific limitations it maps to — with the citation-grade fields every Lambeth IP result carries.

R1

closest reference · illustrative




reaches limitations 1[a], 1[b], 1[c], 1[e]

A disposable enzymatic patch with interval radio reporting

R1 discloses the substrate, the enzymatic interstitial sensor, interval reporting, and a stored baseline — most of the claim's front half. What it does not reach is on-patch temperature compensation or the multi-day drift recalibration.

WHY IT READS AS CLOSEST

It maps to four of seven limitations on its face, including the core sensing chain. The remaining elements (1[d], 1[f], 1[g]) are where the invention may stand apart.

REPRESENTATIVE REFERENCE	MAPPED LIMITATION	PARAGRAPH · BYTE SPAN	CONFIDENCE
US 10,884,210 B2	"a microneedle array carried on a flexible substrate"	¶0038 · 14,602–14,771	 0.91
US 10,884,210 B2	"transmitting a measured value at a reporting interval"	¶0061 · 27,940–28,090	 0.83
US 10,884,210 B2	"storing a wearer-specific baseline value"	¶0072 · 33,118–33,260	 0.74

ILLUSTRATIVE – FABRICATED FOR LAYOUT; NOT LIVE CORPUS OUTPUT.

LIVE

R3

obviousness consideration · illustrative



reaches limitation 1[f]

Multi-day drift recalibration disclosed in a separate reference

R3 discloses estimating sensor drift across days and recalibrating the reading — the very limitation R1 lacks. R1 and R3 are in compatible fields, so a reader could be motivated to combine them, which is an obviousness question for counsel rather than a novelty bar.




WHY IT MATTERS

Novelty of limitation 1[f] alone looks weak against R3; the open question is whether the full single-patch combination 1[g] would have been obvious from R1 + R3.

REPRESENTATIVE REFERENCE	MAPPED LIMITATION	PARAGRAPH · BYTE SPAN	CONFIDENCE
US 2019/0287642 A1	"estimating sensor drift from readings over a plurality of days"	¶0044 · 12,205–12,388	 0.88
US 2019/0287642 A1	"applying a drift correction to a subsequent measurement"	¶0049 · 13,910–14,061	 0.80

ILLUSTRATIVE – FABRICATED FOR LAYOUT; NOT LIVE CORPUS OUTPUT.

05 Where the invention stands apart

CLAIM LIMITATION	STATUS VS. CLOSEST ART	NEAREST REFERENCE	READ
1[d] on-patch temp compensation	Adjacent only	R1 / R4	 appears open
1[f] multi-day drift recalibration	Anticipated	R3	 covered
1[g] single-patch combination	Not disclosed together	—	 appears open

06 How to read this report

EVERY EVIDENCE ROW CARRIES

- ◆ **Reference** — the patent or publication identifier.
- ◆ **Mapped limitation** — the exact claim element the reference is matched to.
- ◆ **Paragraph · byte span** — the precise location of the passage in the source document.
- ◆ **Confidence** — the system's match strength for that link, for your own verification.

WHAT THIS REPORT DOES NOT DO

- ◆ It does not opine that a claim is patentable or grantable.
- ◆ It does not provide a freedom-to-operate clearance.
- ◆ It does not replace attorney review — it shortens the path to it.
- ◆ Confidence is a retrieval score, not a legal opinion.

◆ Scope & boundaries

- § **This is a specimen.** All parties, identifiers, counts, confidence values, paragraph references, and byte spans are fabricated to demonstrate format. They are not live search results and describe no real engagement.
- § **Novelty signal, not an opinion.** A patentability search shows what the closest art discloses and where an invention appears to stand apart. Whether a claim is novel and non-obvious, and whether it will grant, is a legal judgment for your patent counsel.
- § **Not legal advice.** Lambeth IP is a patent technology service. It is not a law firm and does not provide legal advice. Services are governed by the executed Order Form and Terms and Conditions for Patent Search Services.
- § **Scope-bound.** A live report's findings are limited to the claim set, corpus window, and method agreed in the order form.