

# Kluwer Patent Blog

## EPO guidelines on patentability of artificial intelligence and machine learning

Kluwer Patent blogger · Thursday, November 8th, 2018

For the first time, the European Patent Office has published guidelines on the patentability of artificial intelligence (AI) and machine learning (ML) technologies. The guidelines (G-II 3.3.1) came into force on 1 November 2018.

As the guidelines provide, AI and ML are “based on computational models and algorithms for classification, clustering, regression and dimensionality reduction, such as neural networks, genetic algorithms, support vector machines, k-means, kernel regression and discriminant analysis.”

As these models and algorithms “are *per se* of an abstract mathematical nature, irrespective of whether they can be ‘trained’ based on training data”, the guidance concerning mathematical methods (G-II 3.3) – which are generally excluded from patentability, applies.



However, “If a claim is directed either to a method involving the use of technical means (e.g. a computer) or to a device, its subject-matter has a technical character as a whole and is thus not excluded from patentability under **Art. 52(2)** and **(3)**.”

The new guidelines give two examples of technical application of AI and ML: “For example, the use of a neural network in a heart-monitoring apparatus for the purpose of identifying irregular heartbeats makes a technical contribution. The classification of digital images, videos, audio or speech signals based on low-level features (e.g. edges or pixel attributes for images) are further typical technical applications of classification algorithms.”

Conversely, “Classifying text documents solely in respect of their textual content is (...) not regarded to be *per se* a technical purpose but a linguistic one (**T 1358/09**). Classifying abstract data records or even “telecommunication network data records” without any indication of a technical use being made of the resulting classification is also not *per se* a technical purpose, even if the

classification algorithm may be considered to have valuable mathematical properties such as robustness (**T 1784/06**).

The EPO warns: “When examining whether the claimed subject-matter has a technical character as a whole (**Art. 52(1), (2) and (3)**), expressions such as ‘support vector machine’, ‘reasoning engine’ or ‘neural network’ are looked at carefully, because they usually refer to abstract models devoid of technical character.”

---

*To make sure you do not miss out on regular updates from the Kluwer Patent Blog, please [subscribe here](#).*

## Kluwer IP Law

The **2022 Future Ready Lawyer survey** showed that 79% of lawyers think that the importance of legal technology will increase for next year. With Kluwer IP Law you can navigate the increasingly global practice of IP law with specialized, local and cross-border information and tools from every preferred location. Are you, as an IP professional, ready for the future?

Learn how **Kluwer IP Law** can support you.

---

79% of the lawyers think that the importance of legal technology will increase for next year.

**Drive change with Kluwer IP Law.**  
The master resource for Intellectual Property rights and registration.



2022 SURVEY REPORT  
The Wolters Kluwer Future Ready Lawyer  
Leading change

This entry was posted on Thursday, November 8th, 2018 at 12:14 pm and is filed under [AI](#), [EPC](#), [EPO](#), [Guidelines](#)

---

You can follow any responses to this entry through the [Comments \(RSS\)](#) feed. Both comments and pings are currently closed.