Portfolio prioritization demonstration

Which patent families should receive the next round of manual research?

Three fictional families. Scoring illustrates one agreed screening rubric, not patent valuation or an objective measure of patent quality.

Family	Screening factors (0–2 each)	Total / tier	Reason / action
DEMO-01	Product alignment 2; evidence availability 2; current business relevance 2	6 / priority review	Strong documented alignment; undertake full selected-claim mapping.
DEMO-02	Product alignment 1; evidence availability 1; current business relevance 2	4 / investigate	Potential commercial relevance; confirm product features and missing sources.
DEMO-03	Product alignment 0; evidence availability 1; current business relevance 0	1 / defer	Limited signal for this business question; retain for separate counsel-led maintenance review.

Interpretation and handoff

Each factor is equally weighted here and uses 0 = no signal, 1 = partial signal, 2 = documented signal. Different decisions require different factors.

A high screen score authorizes deeper research; it does not determine validity, enforceability, value or a renewal decision.

Limitations

Citation counts and portfolio size alone do not establish commercial importance. Missing data is identified before applying the rubric.

Next review

Agree the rubric on a representative cohort before processing the remainder of the portfolio.

Discuss a real project

Tell us what you are trying to understand. We will discuss whether we can help, what information is available and how the work could be scoped.

Email: jim@terrif.io | overlapip.terrifio.chatgpt.site

Prepared 26 October 2026. All patents, products, excerpts and dataset values in this demonstration are fictional. No patent search or real-product assessment is represented.